

Introduction

MARY ANN MASLAK

The field of development encompasses the study of how society functions with specific regard to the betterment of all individuals in particular communities. It is widely acknowledged and accepted that education—the formal, nonformal, and informal ways and means that enable and facilitate the transmission of knowledge—plays a critical role in development because it provides the foundational intellectual resources for the enhancement of an individual's life. In other words, education enables development by offering, widening, and deepening individuals' knowledge and skills, which are essential for advancement (Stromquist 2005; Young 2000). Thus, studies in international and comparative educational policies and programs, by judiciously exploring the education–development nexus in both industrialized and nonindustrialized settings, have no doubt furthered our understanding of development. This book is another attempt to shed light on the intimate relationship between education and development in comparative terms, but it does so by focusing on one segment of the population—adolescent girls and young women.

In the last three decades or so, a plethora of scholarship has revealed the unquestionable underenrollment and underachievement of primary school-age girls in many parts of the world. At the same time, it should be noted that there has been discernable progress. Many factors, such as the enactment of better and more effective policies, the increase in funding, and the implementation of sound initiatives, have contributed to the general improvement of the educational situation of girls in many parts of the world, especially at the primary level. However, the case of the education of adolescent girls and young women presents a far less rosy picture. To begin with, not as much attention has been devoted to the study of this segment of the population. Studies that have been conducted reveal the indisputable, disconcerting fact that adolescent and adult

females in many countries have neither enjoyed the same access to schooling nor obtained the same levels of schooling as their male counterparts. Moreover, their experiences in educational programs warrant attention to understand the successes and failures of projects designed to meet the needs of this segment of the population. While there have been calls and actions to address the inequity besetting adolescent girls and women, they generally espoused vague, albeit well-intentioned, goals and objectives that are far from comprehensive or effective. Although there is the obviously right and necessary emphasis on the need for equity between the sexes, the laudable aim has not been nearly adequately realized by programmatic schemes.¹

The dearth of literature on the education of adolescent girls and young women leaves us with many unanswered questions. How have educational policies addressed the needs of the adolescent girl and adult woman? How have international, national, regional, and local initiatives addressed education for this segment of the population? How have international and national non-government organizations worked to address the educational aspirations of females? And in terms of studying and researching, what methods have been developed and used in order to reach a clearer understanding of the female research participant? In short, we have not yet critically, systematically, and methodically examined the phenomenon of the undereducation of adolescent girls and adult women.

If we believe that education is one conduit through which advancement toward a better life can be obtained, we must examine the situations, circumstances, and conditions that contribute to and/or hinder the enrollment in and successful completion of educational programs on the part of adolescent girls and young women. In short, we must pinpoint and evaluate the educational policies, programs, and practices that offer and/or deny the individual, within the given social structures that define her home and work settings, opportunities for change and amelioration. In addition, we must also identify and assess the extent to which organizations and agencies are encouraged to or prohibited from developing and initiating policies and implementing programs for girls and women in order to promote educational obtainment. Hence, this volume's exploration of adolescent girls and adult women's education² is based on the premise that the use of interdisciplinary and comparative approaches to examine educational policies, programs, and practices will reveal the complexities of the factors, situations, circumstances, and conditions that specifically pertain to this sector of the population.

This introductory chapter lays out the general parameters of the intellectual concerns and investigative approaches of the volume's chapters, while offering the conceptual premise that underpins this anthology. The conceptual underpinning of the present endeavor derived from the major tenets of both the Women in Development (WID) and Gender and Develop-

ment (GAD) bodies of feminist literature. The various chapters, all seeking to understand the plight of females, draw from the strengths and insights from WID and GAD, but they also illuminate their inadequacies. To rectify their shortcomings, many of the chapters, without always explicitly saying so, complement and extend the WID and GAD interpretations by utilizing social theory's methodological relationism.³ As Ritzer (1975a; 1975b; 1979; 1991), Ritzer and Gindoff (1994), and House (1990) note, methodological relationism, demonstrates the ways in which structures and agency are inextricably and meaningfully integrated. It refers to both methodological holism and methodological individualism.⁴ Methodological holism uses social structures as units of analysis to build *macroscopic* social theories of how society functions. Methodological individualism uses the *microscopic* individual (or group of individuals) as the unit of analysis to examine how the actions, behaviors, and perceptions of the individual (or group of individuals) relate to the larger social systems. Accordingly, the authors of this volume contend, in one way or another, that the *integration* of agency and structure offers a more complete and accurate foundation for, conceptualization of, and explanation of the phenomenon of the undereducation of adolescent girls and young women.

To illustrate this major intellectual concern and analytic approach of ours, a brief definition of the two major conceptual terms of *agency* and *structure* is helpful. *Agency* is the action that propels deliberate movement through a structure(s) by an individual(s) and/or collective(s), with the expressed purpose of achieving a goal or desired outcome. It assumes recognition and response from others.⁵ Two types of agency are useful in our work. *Oppositional agency* is the act of challenge in which an individual, alone or in concert with others, acts and plans to act against the established norms in a system (Jeffrey 2001). *Allegiant agency* is the collective and collaborative movement of an individual or group that aligns with popular thought in order to achieve a purpose (Jeffrey 2001). *Social structure*, on the other hand, refers to a set of interrelated and coexisting frameworks that provide the social conditions for and requirements of action (Ritzer 1991; Ritzer and Gindoff 1994). Macroobjective structures include institutions and organizations such as the state, the church, the community, and the family. Macrosubjective structures include communal values and societal norms, both secular and religious, that are developed and endorsed by the objective structures.⁶ Relational characteristics among structures develop from both the location of and interaction between individuals belonging in some way to a group structure, which, in turn, promotes associations of membership, feeling of belonging, and identification that determines different groups (Merton 1968).⁷ To put it another way, the nexus between agency and structure is engendered and determined by the fact that social relationships are forged and structured by the organizational patterns and experienced by individuals (or groups of individuals) (Radcliffe-Brown 1952).

AN INTERDISCIPLINARY LENS OF
FEMINIST THOUGHT: WID AND GAD

Feminist thought, of which WID and GAD are integral parts, to the extent it focuses on the female epistemological perspectives, is a useful foundation upon which to base our study of women's education, especially when it is filtered through the agency-structure analytic lens. From the angle of agency, feminist thought enables us to understand women's lives from a *personal* perspective, examining the particular social, economic, cultural, geographic, and/or historical circumstances, situations, and conditions that affect their lives (see Boswell 2003; Choi 2004; Hauser and Kuo 1998). From a structural perspective, feminist thought grapples with "*systems . . . [that] describe and explain women's situations and experiences*" (Frye 2000, 195, emphasis added). For example, it illuminates how the societal divisions and categories of gender, class, and religious and ethnic affiliation relate to women and their education (see Adbi 1998; Coats 2000; Patel 1998; Wermuth & Monges 2002).

These perspectives are incorporated in both the WID and GAD frameworks as they relate to women's education, with varying degrees of success. WID comprises a set of principles that emphasizes women's roles in the development process.⁸ WID emerged as a reaction to international development policies and programmatic initiatives based on the notion that every individual had equal access to opportunities for achieving goals and objectives. In order to include women in the development discourse, WID usually depicts women as oppressed individuals whose situation is defined by the universally accepted notions of social, cultural, and economic inequities.⁹ Although the WID policies and programs of the 1970s and 1980s have indeed advanced the ways we think about women's oppression and the strategies used to alleviate it, development practitioners and scholars agree that they achieved relatively meager success in realizing the central goal of elevating women's standing. Consequently, there was a shift in development thinking from the focus on the individual (woman) as an explanation for inequity, largely based on her lack of agency, to an emphasis on the complex and inter-related forms of *social structures* that cause women's oppression.¹⁰

The GAD movement takes essentially the macroscopic perspective of society as the primary force that causes gender inequity. Specifically, it calls for a holistic conceptualization and analysis of the problems women face by focusing on social inequality resulting from social, cultural, political, and economic structures and their forces. Moreover, it assumes that gender, "a critical component of development, relates to culturally specific forms of social inequality, which are inherent in particular social and cultural institutions" (Young 1993, 135).¹¹

As with WID, although the GAD literature has advanced the way we *think* about women's issues, it is not *realized* in educational policy. As the appendix

clearly shows, women's issues remain at the center of international meetings, and are often prominently featured in the policies generated at those conferences, but policy language remains focused in lofty goals and pragmatic "solutions" in terms of services and programs for adolescent girls and adult women, rather than in holistic conceptualization and specific mention of *how* social constructs shape and ultimately influence the lives of adolescent girls and young women.¹² The problem is that WID and GAD, in the final analysis, offer inadequate and incomplete depictions of both the causes of women's oppression and the means for their emancipation. The WID approach must be criticized for its focus on the individual, independent of her social settings, exclusive of the social forces that dictate her actions. This shortcoming points to the need to examine the agency of the individual (or individuals) *in the context of* the social, cultural, religious, economic and political structures, and/or organizations and systems that shape and ultimately define her life. The GAD approach contends that social structures relate to oppression, but it fails to critically tease out the ways in which the structures are constructed and perpetuated by individuals. Additionally, although both the WID and GAD feminist frameworks have been used extensively in the educational literature, neither fully recognize the relationship between agency and structure, nor adequately explain how agency and structure permeate and percolate to aid our understanding of adolescent girls and adult women's education. Such a shortcoming is consciously and deliberately addressed in this volume by drawing on the insights of social thought.

AN INTERDISCIPLINARY LENS OF SOCIAL THEORY: RELATIONISM

When couched in extreme terms, pitted against each other or seen separately, neither macroscopic (structure) nor microscopic (agency) theories adequately explain sociological phenomena. The macro model ignores the importance of history and the process of social change, failing to consider the influence the individual wields in the forging of the social system and how the social relations affect one's ability to advance. The micro paradigm discounts the importance of the institutional and organizational parameters that shape the social structures in which people inexorably live and work, inadequately explaining how institutions and organizations enable and disable individuals' social action and movement. In short, one-sided adherence to either the macrostructural perspective (i.e., the social facts paradigm) or the micro-individual perspective (i.e., the social definition and social behavior paradigms) results in the inability to comprehensively depict the existing forces, circumstances, situations, and conditions that account for sociological phenomena, thereby ignoring the interactions among them, some of which may help to explain the phenomena.¹³

Thus, analytic frameworks without sufficient explanations of the relationship *between* and *among* individuals and the social structures fail to examine the multifaceted and interrelated parts of the whole of girls' and women's education. By examining the nexus of social structures and their relationships vis-à-vis the gendered relationships of individuals, or groups of individuals, we may provide a deeper understanding of existing theory and/or practice in and for the field.¹⁴ In this way, methodological relationism, integrating both agency and structure, provides a useful general analytic framework for the chapters in this volume.

Methodological relationism is an epistemological framework in which the macro (or structure) and micro (or agency) are conceptualized both independently and in relation to each other (Ritzer and Gindoff 1994). We use it to identify, comprehend, and explain existing phenomena. Scholars who have written in the field, including but not limited to James House, George Ritzer, and Pamela Gindoff, assert methodological relationism shows that a social phenomenon can only be fully understood by investigating the dynamic conditions, circumstances, and situations of the players in a particular situation, focusing on the *interaction* between the macroscopic social elements and microscopic individual movement. It consists of two basic tenets. First, there is the existence of both individuals and wholes. *Individuals* include members of the population, who, to varying degrees, recognize the persistent pattern of expectations and relations in a social system.¹⁵ The *wholes* are the systems and structures in which organizations and institutions function. Second, in order to understand a social phenomenon, both individuals (or collectives of individuals) and wholes (or social structures) cannot be adequately explained without analyzing the inherent relationships between them. In other words, methodological relationism posits that *neither* individuals *nor* wholes alone sufficiently explain a social phenomenon, since the phenomenon is formed by the relationships between individuals and governed by the social-structural elements of the community.¹⁶ Especially influential is George Ritzer (1975a; 1975b; 1979), who gives us the integrated sociological paradigm. Ritzer suggests that the interrelationships among the model's micro/macro and subjective/objective quadrants reveal four major levels of social analysis.¹⁷ The macroobjective quadrant simply identifies maintenance systems, such as organizations and institutions, which define the society's structural parameters. The macrosubjective quadrant includes representations that constitute structural constraints and opportunities. It also includes inherent values and norms that are represented by the institutions. The microsubjective level reflects individuals' perceptions of, attitudes toward, beliefs about, and valuations of the macroobjective structural parameters. Finally, the micro-objective section deals with the patterns of observable action and interaction between individuals and the organizations and institutions.

Unlike other works that focus on social theory's concept of dualism (that is, agency versus structure), this book extends the work of earlier scholars by focusing on the ways in which the dynamic interaction of the concepts help clarify and shed light on educational policies, practices, and programs for adolescent girls and young women. Although most popular from the late 1960s through the 1980s, prompted by the groundbreaking studies on kinship by Levi-Strauss, and later by the sociological works of Bourdieu, Berger and Luckmann (1966), and Giddens (1976; 1977; 1979; 1982), this sociological framework continues to provide a useful perspective for any work that deals with agency and structure.

CONTENTS AND PURPORTS: THE SECTIONS AND CHAPTERS

The book consists of four parts: "Structure and Agency of Educational Policy for Adolescent Girls and Adult Women"; "Structure and Agency of International Forces for Female Education"; "Social Relations as Structural Parameters Defining Females' Agency in Education"; and "Women and the Research Setting: The Intersection of Structure and Agency in Methodologies."

Part I: Structure and Agency of Educational Policy for Adolescent Girls and Adult Women

Significant efforts by development theorists and practitioners over the past three decades have created new opportunities and expanded existing opportunities for education, driven by the initiatives in educational policies. Part I of the book outlines fundamental principles of public policy and their applications in education for females. It defines structure in terms of policies' overarching parameters as outlined by international and national bodies and agency in terms of the abilities of both policies and individuals to promote action and change in the realm of female education.

In chapter 1, "The Intersection of Public Policies and Gender: Understanding State Action in Education," Nelly P. Stromquist examines the case of female education in terms of public policy. She defines structure with reference to the various types of public policies and agency by exploring gendered educational policies that attempt to serve the needs of women and girls. In the past decade activists in the women's movement, as well as researchers and observers of our social world, have reached a consensus that for social change to take place at a comprehensive scale and in sustainable form, the role of the state is essential. The engagement of the state implies that public policies must become a key mechanism to solve certain problems, particularly those involving social inequalities.

Chapter 2, "Assessing the Status and Prospects of Women's Empowerment through Education: A Case Study of Women Students at the University of The Gambia," by Caroline Manion, offers a theoretical discussion of Bourdieu's concept of habitus and its usefulness for our understanding of how gender influences Gambian governmental policy on women's education. Using women's decision-making ability as an indication of empowerment, Manion assesses the impact of the Gambian government's policy efforts to increase women's access to and retention in university as a component of the country's plan to strengthen its human capital resource base. Her findings suggest that structures of patriarchy and economics influence the educational policy that governs women's agency to participate and perform in formal education.

An alternative perspective on policy is offered by Sandra L. Stacki in chapter 3, "Structure and Agency in India's Teacher Education Policy: Women Teachers' Progress through a Critical Feminist Lens." Here, Stacki examines India's National Policy on Education that provides specific directives concerning teachers and teacher-education institutions. Through the lens of critical feminist ethical thought, this chapter explores the ways in which the policy's framework defines women teachers' rights to obtain and maintain teaching positions, and the extent to which its implementation empowers them to function as agents of change for the profession.

Lucy Mule's work concludes this section on educational policy. In "Feast or Famine for Female Education in Kenya? A Structural Approach to Gender Equity," she argues that educational policy and practice in Kenya fail to address educational gender inequity. Mule presents a brief history of educational gender inequity in Kenya, critically analyzes the failure of the expansionist methods of school development used by the state to address the gender divide, especially in the public/private sector, and suggests an alternative discourse that may lead to a reformulation of educational policy and schools that effectively promote educational gender equity in the country.

Part II: Structure and Agency of International Forces for Female Education

One function of globalization is the use of bilateral and multilateral organizations to assist national governments in their quest to improve the lives of their citizens. Large-scale international organizations and governmental offices, including but not limited to UNICEF and ministry of education offices, have maintained enduring and significant influence in the design and implementation of policies and programs for adolescent girls and adult women. Small-scale operations, such as nongovernmental programs and individual scholarship programs, have also had significant impact on the chances and experiences of educational programs for adolescent girls and adult women. Thus, part II of the book substantiates contemporary applications of social

theory by demonstrating the various ways in which structure and agency intersect in the context of globalization as a result of the presence of the international organizations, big and small, on the local scene. The contributors identify structure either in terms of large- or small-scale programs that have shaped and governed education for females. They define agency in terms of the collective actions taken by the international organizations, as well as the individual actions of both the donors and recipients in the smaller programs.

David Chapman and Shirley Miske inaugurate this section of the book with their comparative research in Africa. Their chapter, "Promoting Girls' Education in Africa: Evidence from the Field between 1996 and 2003," sums up the work of thirty-four countries that participated in UNICEF's African Girls' Education Initiative (AGEI). They draw on Galal's (2002) three approaches to policy formulation: the *engineering approach* that views education as a production function in which the quantity, quality, and mix of inputs (structures) determine educational outputs and longer-term outcomes (agents); the *industrial organization approach* that considers educational structures in terms of policies and agents in terms of actors (school administrators, teachers); and the *political accountability approach* that concerns the ability of citizens (agents) to influence policymakers' formulation of educational policies and allocation of resources (structures) for female education.

Chapter 6, "The Dance of Agency Structure in an Empowerment Educational Program in Mali and the Sudan," by Karen Monkman, Rebecca Miles, and Peter Easton uses social and feminist thought to analyze data from a study of one nongovernmental organization's program in central Africa. They tell the story of six Malian and Sudanese villages' experiences with an "empowerment program" designed to promote community decision-making and action. Their findings reveal the ways in which an NGO (as a structure of a civil society), and their individual members (as citizens with agency), together, exert impact on the political institutions and society in democratic states.

Cathryn Magno's chapter takes a different perspective on *education*, defining it as the acquisition of information to function as a politically active member of a community. In "Res publica Revisited: Gendered Agency through Education in NGOs," she demonstrates how individual participation in the political process varies across social groups in a democratic society. Magno furthers the earlier work of both Molyneux (1985) and Hasan (1994) by exploring the critical role played by Israeli and Palestinian nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) in providing structure for women's participation in society and in enabling women's agency through educational processes. Magno's findings suggest that NGOs can provide an alternative structure within which women can safely cultivate and activate their agency to critique the government, gain more political power, and make contributions to public discourse on behalf of women in the community.

Vilma Seeberg's essay, which constitutes chapter 8, presents qualitative results of a mixed methodological study of an international scholarship program for adolescent girls' education in northwestern China. In her chapter entitled "Their One Best Hope: Educating Daughters in China," through the use of the female students' poignant stories, she shows how social, cultural, and economic structural parameters of life influence and affect the agency of the girls to enroll in, continue through, and graduate from school, which is, in large part, funded by the individual financial contributions of sponsors.

*Part III: Social Relations as Structural Parameters
Defining Females' Agency in Education*

The question of the intersection and interaction of structure and agency in the study of adolescent girls' and adult women's education can also be examined more specifically in terms of the weight of sociocultural forces. The authors of this section examine three different cases and correspondingly provide three different perspectives from which to view the intervening power of sociocultural values. They give us meaningful descriptions and discussions of the ways elements of a sociocultural system function as enabling or disabling factors in the agency of adolescent girls and adult women, giving consideration to the microsubjective components (individuals' wishes, aspirations, and actions) as well as the macrosubjective ingredients (sociocultural settings that promote communal values and maintain histories) (Ritzer 1991). In this part of the book, the authors parse the meanings of these contexts so as to show how individual agency is negotiated and mediated through norms generated and defined within the particular social, cultural, and political environments of the school, community, and state.

The authors of chapter 9, "Female Classroom Assistants: Agents of Change in Refugee Classrooms in West Africa?," Jackie Kirk and Rebecca Winthrop show how participants in the International Rescue Committee (IRC) are actually involved in the implementation of an innovative program of training and deploying female classroom assistants in the refugee schools they support. They shed light on the relationship between agency and structure by analyzing the classroom assistants' approach in IRC schools in Sierra Leone and Guinea. Drawing on data collected during recent fieldwork, the authors discuss how agency within the underlying gender-power dynamics of the classroom (in terms of female classroom assistants' creation of a gender equitable and girl-friendly school space) and structure (in terms of the school's administration that promotes, supports, and executes such a program) work in conjunction to advance adolescent girls and adult women in these locations.

Chapter 10, "A World Culture of Equality? The Institutional Structure of Schools and Cross-National Gender Differences in Academic Achievement,"

uses comparative cross-national data that the author, Alexander Wiseman, marshaled. It examines the reasons academic achievements differ by gender. His work not only challenges the assumption that the anticipation of future opportunities (structure) shapes current performance (agency) but also shows how individual association (agency) with citizenship (structure) relates to adolescent girls' achievement in school.

Chapter 11 bears the title of "Looking Beyond the Household: The Importance of Community-Level Factors in Understanding Underrepresentation of Girls in Indian Education." Its author, Amita Chudgar, while acknowledging the importance of household-level factors in understanding differences in school participation by sex, focuses on the role of factors "outside the household." Using empirical data from India, she examines external factors that relate to the social status of women within the community. Her findings indicate that the structure of social class and the agency (or lack thereof) of social status influence household decision-making as regards educational choices and chances for women.

*Part IV: Women and the Research Setting:
The Intersection of Structure and Agency in Methodologies*

Human beings act within the social perimeters that circumscribe their lives. Thus, individuals, regardless of the role they play, experience agency and structure simultaneously. This section of the book examines the interaction of agency and structure as they relate to innovative methodologies and techniques in research that investigates the question of the education of adolescent girls and adult women. The authors accomplish two goals. First, they show how the agency of the participant and researcher functions within the structures of the research setting. The research setting provides the framework for the participant; the research questions provide the structure for the researcher. The interaction between the participant(s) and researcher offers opportunities for agency between and/or among the research participants and researchers. Second, the authors demonstrate how innovative techniques in drawing and photography provide frames within which the individuals can act and react to the methods employed.

In the chapter by Flavia Ramos, "Life's Structures and Individual's Agency: Making Sense of Women's Words," the stories told by Hispanic women and adolescent girls in inner-city America reveal how individual actions and interactions shape and are shaped by the social structures that define life experiences. Ramos focuses on a group of low-income Hispanic women and adolescent girls taking part in two community-based organizations' self-help groups in Massachusetts. Using the structure of the FotoDialogo method, a research tool that uses pictures and storytelling as projective

props that record the voices of both girls and women, Ramos illuminates the ways in which the nonformal groups function in the lives of their participants.

In chapter 13, "Policy as Practice, Agency as Voice, Research as Intervention: Imag(in)g Girls' Education in China," Heidi Ross offers a fitting conclusion for the book. In this work, Ross uses photovoice, a dialogical research methodology that employs photography, to examine data collected from a study of Shaanxi Province's largest NGO-supported girls' education project. In so doing, she demonstrates how the adolescent girls' critical consciousness reflects agency, which is shaped by the social-structural conditions in which they live, and contributes to their school achievement and aspirations.

In short, in one way or another, the various authors interrogate the common underlying theme of this anthology: the inexorable links between agency and structure, and the mutual dependence of the microscopic and macroscopic elements, in the domain of the education of adolescent girls and young women. In the process, we hope to have complicated, and thus enriched, nuanced, and furthered, our current understanding of the manifold factors and forces at work in the complex endeavor of delivering and improving the education of a significant segment of the population, such that it may become a productive citizenry and human capital that readily contributes to and participates in national development and social amelioration.

NOTES

I would like to thank St. John's University for funding conference participation that led to the completion of this edited book. Portions of this chapter are based on Maslak (2003).

1. See the appendix, which, in some parts, is directly quoted from the original documents.

2. We chose to focus our work on both adolescent girls and adult women. UNICEF defines girls (and boys) as children ages 0–18. Adult women are over the age of 18. We do not focus on the "girl child."

3. Whereas Lengermann and Niebrugger-Brantley (1990), more than fifteen years ago, illuminated the points of interface between agency and structure in their review of feminist thought of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, they did not use this argument to specifically address adolescent girls' and women's education.

4. The American sociological literature often uses the terms *microscopic* and *macroscopic*. The European sociological literature often uses the terms *agent/agency* and *structure*. Space does not permit extensive discussion of the similarities and differences of the terminology.

5. This distinction is sometimes described as that of action from mere behavior. For example, Naila Kabeer (1999a, 437), who has written extensively on gender and development, defines female agency as "processes by which those who have been

denied the ability to make strategic life choices acquire such an ability,” Kabeer (1999b).

6. See Ritzer (1975a; 1975b; 1979; 1991) for an in-depth explanation.

7. Radcliffe-Brown (1952) supports the notion of a nexus between agency and structure in terms of social relationships structured by organizational patterns and experienced by individuals or groups of individuals.

8. For discussion of the theoretical frameworks used in the WID literature, see Maslak (2003).

9. For articles that examine the WID movement with regard to women’s education in the governmental sector of nations, see Nelly P. Stromquist (1998; 1999).

10. See Moser (1993) for five approaches to development during this period, 1970 to the mid-1990s.

11. Alili Mari Tripp (2000) and Ferree, Lorber, and Hess (1999) assert that women within the gender schema do not exist in a vacuum, but rather, their gender is intertwined with class, race, and economy, all of which relate to the issues and conditions of domination and oppression. Nupur Chaudhuri (1992, 222) also mentions this point regarding the Muslim population. She states, “the status and role of Muslim women in the Indian subcontinent are best understood by analyzing the socio-economic strata to which these women belong and the political and economic status of the Muslim community itself in the context of wider social, cultural, and economic conditions of the entire India society.” England (1993) provides a useful review (and debate) of sociological theories that have been used to examine gender stratification.

12. See Maslak (2005) for an analysis of EFA (Education for All) policy and GAD.

13. We must keep in mind that that both micro and macro approaches to the study of a phenomenon were developed from the male perspective. Social theory developed by women may advance our understanding of issues concerning women.

14. See Dunn, Almquist, and Chafetz’s (1993) volume that offers a number of chapters dedicated to the discussion of the macro/micro debate. Bulbeck (2001) uses the concepts of agency and structure to examine college students’ understandings of feminisms.

15. This definition is based on the work of James House (1990).

16. Indeed the landmark works of Robert Merton (1975), Hugh Mehan and Houston Wood (1975), and Arthur W. Staats (1976) all emphasize the need to examine both social structural and individual aspects of social systems. Later, James House (1991, 50) grappled with “individual behavior and social organization as joint functions of properties of the individual and of the social situation” (48–49) in an effort to “understand, explain, and predict consequential real-life phenomena and problems.”

17. Ritzer provides an extensive review of the literature that relates to and grounds this work on the integrated sociological paradigm. See George Ritzer (1991) for details.

REFERENCES

- Adbi, A. A. 1998. Economic liberalization and women's education: Prospects for post-apartheid South Africa. *McGill Journal of Education*, 33 (1): 71–84.
- Berger, P. L. and T. Luckmann. 1966. *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. Garden City: Doubleday.
- Boswell, B. 2003. WEAVEing identities. *Feminist Studies*, 29 (3): 581–591.
- Bulbeck, C. 2001. Articulating structure and agency: How women's studies students express their relationships with feminism. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 24 (2): 141–156.
- Chaudhuri, N. 1992. Women in Asia. *NWSA Journal*, 4 (2): 219–227.
- Choi, C. (Hwa Young). 2004. Art as a political act: Expression of cultural identity, self-identity and gender in the work of two Korean/Korean American women artists. DAI-A64/12.
- Coats, M. 2000. Barriers or building blocks? *Adults' Learning*, 11 (7): 16–18.
- Dunn, D., E. M. Almquist, and J. Saltzman Chafetz. 1993. Macrostructural perspectives on gender inequality. In *Theory on gender: Feminism on theory*, edited by P. England, 69–93. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Edel, A. 1959. The concept of levels in social theory. In *Symposium on sociological theory*, edited by Llewellyn Gross, 24–38. Evanston: Row Peterson.
- . 1990. *Education for all*. Jomtien: Thailand.
- England, P. (Ed.). 1993. *Feminism on theory*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter
- Enslin, P. and M. Tjiattis. 2004. Liberal feminism, cultural diversity and comparative education. *Comparative Education Review*, 40 (4): 503–516.
- Ferree, M. M., J. Lorber, and B. B. Hess (Eds.) 1999. *Revisioning gender*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Frye, M. 2000. Feminism. In *Encyclopedia of feminist theories*, edited by L. Code, 195–197. London: Routledge.
- Galal, A. 2002. The paradox of education and unemployment in Egypt. Working Paper No. 67. Cairo: Egyptian Center for Economic Studies.
- Giddens, A. 1976. *New rules of sociological method: A positivist critique of interpretive sociologies*. New York: Basic Books.
- . 1977. *Studies in social and political theory*. New York: Basic Books.
- . 1979. *Central problems in social theory: Action, structure and contradiction in social analysis*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- . 1982. *Profiles and critiques in social theory*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hasan, Z. (Ed.). 1994. *Forging identities: Gender communities and the state*. New Delhi: Kali for Women.
- Hauser, R. M. and H. H. D. Kuo. 1998. Does the gender composition of sibships affect women's educational attainment? *Journal of Human Resources*, 33 (3): 644–657.

- House, J. 1990. Social structure and personality. In *Social psychology: Sociological perspectives*, edited by M. Rosenberg and R. Turner, 525–561. New Brunswick: Transaction.
- Jeffrey, P. 1998. Agency, activism, and agendas. In *Appropriating gender: Women's activism and politicized religion in South Asia*, edited by P. Jeffrey and A. Basu, 42–57. New York: Routledge.
- . 2001. Agency, activism and agendas. In *Women, gender, religion: A reader*, edited by E. A. Castelli, 465–491. New York: Palgrave.
- Kabeer, N. 1999a. *Reversed realities: Gender hierarchies in development thought*. London: Verso.
- . 1999b. Resources, agency, achievements: Reflections on the measurement of women's empowerment. *Development and Change*, 30: 435–464.
- Kosambi, M. 2000. A Window in the prison-house: Women's education and politics of social reform in nineteenth-century western India. *History of Education*, 29 (5): 429–442.
- Lengermann, P. M. and J. Niebrugger-Brantley. (Eds.) 1990. *The women founders: sociology and social theory 1830–1930*. Boston: McGraw Hill.
- Maslak, M. A. 2003. *Daughters of the Tharu: Gender, ethnicity, religion and the education of Nepali girls*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- . 2005. Re-positioning females in the international context: Guiding frameworks, educational policy and future directions for the field. In *International perspectives on education and society*, edited by D. P. Baker and A. W. Wiseman, 145–171. London: Elsevier Science.
- Mehan, H. and H. Wood. 1975. *The reality of ethnomethodology*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Merton, R. 1968. *Social theory and social structure*. New York: The Free Press.
- . 1975. Structural analysis in sociology. In *Approaches to the study of social structure*, edited by P. Blau, 21–52. New York: Free Press.
- Mill, J. S. 1869. *The subjugation of women*. London: Longman, Green, Reader and Dyer.
- Molyneux, M. 1985. Mobilization without emancipation? Women's interests, state and revolution in Nicaragua. *Feminist Studies*, 11: 227–254.
- Moser, C. 1993. *Gender planning and development: Theory, practice and training*. New York: Routledge.
- Patel, I. 1998. Analysis of the effects of sibling gender composition on women's educational attainment. *International Review of Education*, 44 (2–3): 155–175.
- Radcliffe-Brown, R. (1952). *Structure and function in primitive society*. New York: The Free Press.
- Ritzer, G. 1975a. *Sociology: A multiple paradigm science. Revised ed.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- . 1975b. Sociology: A multiple paradigm science. *American Sociologist*. 10: 156–167.

- . 1979. Toward an integrated sociological paradigm. In *Contemporary issues in theory and research: A metasociological perspective*, edited by W. E. Snizek, E. R. Fuhrman, and M. K. Miller, 25–46. London: Aldwych Press.
- . 1991. *Metatheorizing in sociology*. Lexington: Lexington Books.
- Ritzer, G. and P. Gindoff. 1994. Agency-structure, micro-macro, individualism-holism-relationism: A metatheoretical explanation of theoretical convergence between the United States and Europe. In *Agency and structure: Reorienting social theory*, edited by P. Sztompka, 3–23. Amsterdam: Gordon and Breach.
- Robinson-Pant, A. (2004). Education for women: Whose values count? *Gender and Education*, 16 (4): 473–489.
- Staats, A. W. 1976. Skinnerian behaviorism: Social behaviorism or radical behaviorism. *The American Sociologist*, 11: 217–219.
- Stone, L. 1994. *The education feminism reader*. New York: Routledge.
- Stromquist, N. P. 1998. The institutionalization of gender and its impact on educational policy. *Comparative Education*, 34 (1): 85–100.
- . 1999. Women education in the twenty-first century. In *Comparative education: The dialectic of the global and the local*, edited by R. Arnove and C. Torres, 179–205. New York: Rowman & Littlefield.
- . 2005. Comparative and international education: A journey toward equality and equity. *Harvard Educational Review*, 75: 89–111.
- Tripp, A. M. 2000. Rethinking difference: Comparative positions from Africa. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 25 (3): 649–675.
- Wermuth, L. and M. A. K. Monges. 2002. Gender stratification. *Frontiers*, 23 (1): 1–14.
- Young, K. 1993. Frameworks for analyses. In *Planning development with women: Making a world of difference*, 127–146. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Young, Y. J. 2000. Educational development. In *Encyclopedia of sociology*, x–x. New York: Macmillan.