



## **Women's empowerment and the will to change**

by Marie-Charlotte Buisson, Floriane Clement, and Stephanie Leder

*Copyright 2021 by Marie-Charlotte Buisson, Floriane Clement, and Stephanie Leder. All rights reserved. Readers may make verbatim copies of this document for non-commercial purposes by any means, provided that this copyright notice appears on all such copies.*

# Women's empowerment and the will to change

Marie-Charlotte Buisson<sup>1\*</sup>, Floriane Clement<sup>2</sup>, Stephanie Leder<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> International Water Management Institute (IWMI), CGIAR, Sri Lanka.

Email: [m.buisson@cgiar.org](mailto:m.buisson@cgiar.org)

<sup>2</sup> Université de Toulouse, INRAE, UMR DYNAFOR, Castanet-Tolosan, France.

Email: [floriane.clement@inrae.fr](mailto:floriane.clement@inrae.fr)

<sup>3</sup> Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences (SLU), Department of Urban and Rural Development, Sweden. Email: [stephanie.leder@slu.se](mailto:stephanie.leder@slu.se)

\*Corresponding author.

## Abstract

A static and apolitical framing of women's empowerment has dominated the development sector. We assess the pertinence of considering a new variable, the will to change, to reintroduce dynamic and political processes into the way empowerment is framed and measured. Using a household survey based on the Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index (WEAI) and qualitative data collected in Nepal, we analyze how critical consciousness influences women's will to change and how this process is affected by visible agency, social structures, and individual determinants. A virtuous circle emerges from the analysis: women with higher visible agency and higher critical consciousness are more willing to gain agency in some, but not all, of the WEAI empowerment domains. These findings support the design of development programs combining interventions increasing visible agency with interventions raising gender critical consciousness to reduce gender inequalities. Through this analysis, we advance current conceptualizations of empowerment processes by establishing that the will to change as an indicator offers valuable insights into the dynamic, relational and politic nature of women's empowerment. Our results finally argue for improving the internal validity of women's empowerment measurement tools by identifying culturally and contextually relevant indicators.

**Keywords:** Women's empowerment, WEAI, development, gender, critical consciousness, Nepal, agriculture

## **1. Introduction**

Today, almost every development project has a 'gender component', illustrating how women's empowerment has moved beyond the scope of gender equality initiatives to become a primary objective of international development programs. The international agricultural development community has considered empowerment as a right, but also more prominently as 'a tool against hunger' (ADB 2013, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) 2018). Through women's empowerment, international development organizations expect to achieve broader development goals, namely, enhance agricultural productivity and improve household nutrition. Consequently, agricultural development and food security programs have rather focused on addressing proximate causes for inequalities by enhancing women's access to assets and physical resources, such as seeds and fertilizer, and their inclusion in visible forms of decision-making, such as participation in local savings or farmers' groups (FAO 2018, FAO 2011, World Bank 2014).

This instrumental framing testifies of the dilution of initial feminist concerns and transformative ambitions into mainstream development discourses and practices (Batliwala 2007, Cornwall 2016, Mukhopadhyay 2004, Parpart 1993, Chakravarti 2008). Whereas feminist scholarship envisions women's empowerment as a dynamic process that addresses the structural causes of gender inequalities, domination, and oppression (Rowlands 1995, Batliwala 1994), much development discourse indeed has lost this critical gist. The development of tools to measure gender interventions in the agricultural development sector reflects to a large extent such an apolitical framing of empowerment. For instance, the Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index (WEAI), which was initially developed for monitoring and evaluation purposes (Alkire et al. 2013), has largely

focused on access to physical assets, participation in agricultural groups, and intra-household decision-making.

In this study, we aim to reflect upon and advance current tools and efforts to measure women's empowerment in the agricultural development sector, furthering recent studies (Alkire et al. 2013, O'Hara and Clement 2018, Malapit et al. 2019). We explicitly address dynamic processes and plural forms of power by considering a new empowerment variable, the will to change. We consider the will to change as the critical step in-between critical consciousness and empowerment. We define the will to change as the degree of motivation or willingness to challenge the status quo of existing gender norms. We analyze how critical consciousness influences the will to change but also how visible forms of agency contribute to the motivation towards a change, thereby considering empowerment as a dynamic and iterative process characterized by feedback loops.

Our analysis draws from household survey data collected across six districts of Nepal in 2015 and 2017, complemented with qualitative data collected in two surveyed villages. We use regression analysis to explore to which extent visible agency and critical consciousness influence the will to change. The analysis is conducted for four domains of empowerment: production, resources, time, and leadership. Finally, we use qualitative insights to explain and illustrate our quantitative results.

The quantitative and qualitative analyses converge to establish a virtuous circle. Agency and critical consciousness jointly contribute to the willingness to have higher levels of agency across several domains. This result highlights the relevance of considering critical consciousness in addition to the agency to capture the dynamics of women's empowerment, reintroduced through the will to change. From a policy perspective,

interventions promoting gender critical consciousness may complement the promotion of visible agency to reach behavioral and societal change.

We also establish two types of heterogeneity that question how we measure and define women's empowerment: heterogeneity across different domains and heterogeneity within the composite indicators of the WEAI. Acknowledging that the way we assess power might significantly shape the way we act upon power structures and relationships (Lukes 2005), these results argue for improving the internal validity of empowerment measurement tools. Carefully choosing culturally and contextually specific indicators would contribute to this objective.

In the next section, we present the conceptual framework that guided our analysis. The framework stems from a review of the feminist literature on power, agency, and empowerment and draws on insights on critical consciousness from the field of critical pedagogy. The third section describes the quantitative and qualitative data from Nepal, the definitions of the indicators, and the empirical model. The fourth section presents the results combining quantitative and qualitative analysis. Finally, the conclusion discusses and summarizes the findings before developing their implications.

## **2. Feminist perspectives on power and empowerment**

To sketch a conceptual framework for our analysis, we draw on feminist scholarship and literature on power. We define empowerment as a process whereby 'individuals and organized groups are able to imagine their world differently and to realize that vision by changing the relations of power that have been keeping them in poverty' (Eyben, Kabeer and Cornwall 2008). Earlier work theorized power as a set of relations, processes, and structures of domination and oppression (Young 1990, Bachrach and Baratz 1962), broadly categorized as 'power-over'. This conceptualization was prominent within the

‘Women in Development’ perspective, which largely influenced development circles in the 1970s-1990s (Rowlands 1998). Most feminists have, however, rejected the conceptualization of power as a good, distributed among individuals and groups and, sharing Foucault’s post-structuralist perspectives on power<sup>1</sup> (1975, 1978, 1980), have conceptualized power as dynamic and exercised across relations, discourses, and everyday social practices (Allen 2016).

An influential perspective of power in the feminist literature is that of power as constitutive and transformative, or the ‘power-to.’ The power-to largely emerged as a reaction against ‘power-over’, which is seen as a masculine conception of power, that is, power as domination and control (Allen 2016). A widely used definition of the power-to is ‘the ability to make strategic life choices’ (Kabeer 1999, 435). This perspective has highly influenced discourses and standardized measurements of women’s empowerment in the development sector in the 2000s (Trommlerová, Klasen and Leßmann 2015).

Similarly, in the agricultural development sector, the WEAI initially focused on visible forms of agency, building on Kabeer’s definition (Malapit et al. 2019). Yet for Kabeer (1999; 438): ‘Agency is about more than observable action; it also encompasses the meaning, motivation and purpose which individuals bring to their activity, their *sense* of agency, or the “power-within”.’

The lack of attention to the ‘power-within’ in international development discourses and practices reveals a crucial gap in integrating some critical foundational aspects of Kabeer’s and other feminists’ works on empowerment (Cornwall and Rivas 2015). For many feminist scholars, increasing the ‘power-within’ constitutes a preliminary and essential step in empowerment processes (Cornwall 2016, Kabeer 2005) as empowerment first entails the realization and understanding of relations and structures

of oppression (Rowlands 1995). Firstly, agency without a sense and meaning can reproduce or reinforce forms of gender subordination and inequalities (Kabeer 1999). For instance, women's greater access to political power has not necessarily resulted in politics and policies that support greater gender equality (Batliwala and Dhanraj 2004, Kabeer 2005), and women's participation in microfinance might serve the development of new forms of patriarchal domination rather than contribute to their empowerment (Rahman 1999 in Selinger 2008). Similarly, misalignment between prevailing conception by development actors and contextual gender norms can further exacerbate gender conflicts and disrupt empowerment paths (Vercillo 2020). Secondly, empowerment might not be perceived as desirable when it contradicts socially accepted norms, practices, and subjectivities. This reveals the influence of the *doxa* (Bourdieu 1977) when particular practices and relations are not questioned or even experienced as unequal. For instance, practices such as seclusion or eating last in the family can remain uncontested when they align to cultural definitions of being a good mother or wife.

This perspective strongly resonates with the concept of critical consciousness developed and popularized by Freire as part of his works on popular education and critical pedagogy. According to Freire, critical consciousness, or conscientization, refers to 'the process in which human beings, not as recipients, but as knowing subjects, achieve a deepening awareness both of the socio-cultural reality which shapes their lives and of their capacity to transform their reality' (Freire, 1970, 51). Freire's conceptualization of critical consciousness shares with feminist views of empowerment the goal to fight against oppression. Critical consciousness encompasses the awareness of alternatives to oppressive gendered cultural norms and other forms of oppression.

Freire (1996) argues that critical consciousness can only be reached through 'dialogue', an emancipatory process to overcome the 'culture of silence'. Building on his work, we

understand the 'power-within' embedded in a collective struggle of creating social transformation towards a more egalitarian society. The essence of dialogue is the 'true word', which is constituted of reflection and action and leads to transformation. The link between critical consciousness and dialogue offers a finer and more relational conceptualization of the power-within, going beyond what Kabeer (1999; 438) describes as individualist 'power-within'. Drawing on Freire's approach, we stress that social relations are constitutive of the power-within.

We see critical consciousness through dialogue as a necessary condition for increasing the agency, yet it might not be sufficient. Realizing the existence of inequalities and injustice does not necessarily lead to the will to change and to challenge the status quo. The economic behavior theory highlights the status-quo bias, high transaction costs, and ultimately comfort in the continuation even when the situation is known to be sub-optimal (Samuelson and Zeckhauser 1988, Kahneman and Tversky 1982). Kabeer (2008) considers the issue of 'loyalty' within families and notably how loyalty between partners can 'mute women's willingness to protest gender inequality' (ibid; 22). Furthermore, a choice can only be exercised if alternatives exist (Kabeer 1999). In turn, the choice not to exercise visible forms of agency can also be a well-thought-out strategy to achieve one's means (Kabeer 2008), as demonstrate Zwarteveen and Neupane (1996).

The will to change or to exercise choice, therefore, emerges as an important but relatively under-theorized and under-researched concept. We only found an explicit reference to it in Charmes and Wieringa (2003), who argue that 'the motivation to change existing gender relations, even when they are perceived to be unequal, depends on many factors, related to one's subjectivities, personal histories and the perceived costs and risks of transformation' (p. 425). To our knowledge, only Trommlerová et al. (2015) have conducted an empirical analysis of the will to change in their assessment of men's and



women's willingness to change their lives in The Gambia. What is more, the feminist literature has not explored, theoretically or empirically, the linkages between the realization of oppressive structures of oppression and injustices (critical consciousness) and the will to change, which are both constitutive of the 'power-within'.

We precisely propose to address this research gap by analyzing how critical consciousness ('power-within') influences the will to change and how this process is affected by agency ('power-to'), social structures, and individual determinants. Hence, we truly consider empowerment as a process by positioning agency as an independent variable that influences the empowerment process, not as an outcome. Our contribution is largely empirical, based on the study of empowerment processes in the context of a climate adaptation and food security development project in Nepal, but we hope to contribute to theoretical developments as well by furthering conceptual reflections initiated in recent studies that propose to broaden and nuance the conceptualization of women's empowerment beyond the 'power-to'. For instance, O'Hara and Clement (2018) evidence the relevance of including critical consciousness in measurements of empowerment. They show that a critical consciousness index is correlated with locally pertinent determinants of empowerment that are not captured by the WEAI. The same finding is echoed by Völker and Doneys (2020), who explore the meaning of empowerment for women in Laos, Myanmar and Vietnam and show how these meanings are driven by cultural, economic, and social contexts and differ from donor-driven definitions. The methodology is steadily responsive to these weaknesses. Thus, Malapit et al. (2019) propose to adapt the WEAI by integrating additional elements of intrinsic agency and collective agency. Bernard et al. (2020) advance current ways to assess women's empowerment analyses by exploring the reasons driving reported patterns of

decision-making. Using the case of milk production and consumption in Senegal, they dig into underlying mechanisms driving household members to challenge or not the status quo. Lastly, Leder and Sachs (2019) defend a more nuanced approach to current measures of empowerment in agriculture by revisiting respondents' WEAI questionnaires with relational life histories and qualitative data. They establish the fundamental importance of intersectionality, intra- and inter-household relations, and contextual variables, such as migration and seasonality in the empowerment processes.

### **3. Data and methods**

#### *3.1. Data and context*

The empirical analysis that follows is based on survey data collected in 2015 and 2017 in Nepal. The quantitative data collected is part of the impact evaluation of the Anukulan project, funded by the UK DFID program "Building Resilience and Adaptation to Climate Extremes and Disasters (BRACED). The Anukulan project aimed at developing climate-resilient livelihoods for local communities in Western Nepal. The project facilitated the emergence of economic opportunities through horticulture, the development of rural marketing organizations, training, and water resource management interventions. The program targeted poor and rural households facing climate extremes and disasters in six districts of the provinces 5, 6, and 7 of Nepal: Doti, Kailali, Kanchanpur, Dadeldhura, Bardiya, and Surkhet. The project had a specific objective related to women's empowerment, and thus the baseline and the follow-up surveys used the abbreviated WEAI (a-WEAI) questionnaire, a streamlined version of the WEAI. The a-WEAI was specially developed for monitoring and evaluating development programs, as the time to administer the questionnaire is reduced by 30% as compared to the WEAI (around two hours for the WEAI) (Malapit et al. 2020). Based on earlier studies (Author et al., 2018a),

we enriched the a-WEAI questionnaire with questions on critical consciousness and the willingness to change its agency status.

The sample design measures a variation equivalent to 58% of the standard deviation of the five WEAI domains of empowerment and targets 600 households. The survey covers 20 Village Development Committees<sup>2</sup> (VDCs). District stakeholder consultations were conducted to identify the treated VDCs as well as the potential control with similar observable characteristics. The 20 VDCs surveyed were randomly selected among these two groups.

The general household questionnaire was administered to 600 households in 2015 with questions on land and water uses, crop production, dietary diversity, group participation, technology adoption, and resilience to climate risks. Besides, the a-WEAI questionnaire (Malapit et al. 2020) was administered to the main female and male decision-makers of the household separately from the same surveyed households. In 2017, as part of the follow-up survey, a subset<sup>3</sup> of the initial respondents responded to the same household and a-WEAI questionnaires, but the household survey data are not available. In this analysis, we use the data collected in 2017 as part of the enriched a-WEAI questionnaire. This questionnaire was answered by 600 women and 544 men from the same households. For robustness checks and to control for household covariates, we use data from the baseline household survey available for 233 of the women respondents and 192 of the men respondents.

The quantitative data is complemented with qualitative data collected in two villages in Doti and Dadedhura districts. In 2015, 2016, and 2020, we conducted 60 semi-structured in-depth interviews with female and male farmers of diverse ages, both Chhetri and Dalit

castes<sup>4</sup>, and of different classes, based on land ownership. In addition, we conducted 16 life histories with diverse women farmers, eight gender-mixed and gender-disaggregated focus group discussions with empowerment rankings, frequent observations, and participatory methods such as transect walks and village resource mappings. The continuous involvement with the same local farmers over several years helped us come closer to local meanings of and pathways to women's empowerment (cf. Author et al. 2017, Author et al. 2019).

### *3.2. Indicators for domains of visible agency*

We use the a-WEAI indicators that measure visible agency across five domains of empowerment (5DE) (Malapit et al. 2020). The 5DE sub-index assesses the roles of women in agriculture as well as their level of engagement in production, resources, incomes, time, and leadership.

The WEAI and a-WEAI were developed as aggregated overall empowerment indicators with the idea of enabling comparisons across different cultural settings and over time. With this external validity objective, the 5DE indicators are, therefore, binary variables that aggregate information from different activities, different types of assets, different groups. However, in doing so, it also rubs out heterogeneity between households that we would need to keep in a micro-level study for contextual or internal validity. To counterbalance the measurement of visible agency toward more internal validity, we build alternative indicators for each of the domains of empowerment developed from the a-WEAI questionnaire. The alternative indicators reflect the quantities (of decisions, assets owned, groups, hours of work) for each woman respondent.

We do not discuss in this paper the domain of empowerment related to income. To avoid overloading the respondent with questions that would not necessarily be relevant in our

local context, information on the willingness to have more control over the income was not collected. Furthermore, we do not use the second sub-index of the a-WEAI, the Gender Parity Index (GPI) in this study.

### *3.3. Indicator of gender critical consciousness*

To capture critical consciousness, we assessed the extent to which individuals agree with oppressive gender norms commonly found in the public and domestic spheres in Nepal. We used the same set of questions that are specific to the Nepal context as O'Hara and Clement (2018). Enumerators presented to women and men respondents six statements and asked them to which extent they agree with these statements using a Likert scale (from strongly agree 1 to strongly disagree 5): (i) "A woman should tolerate violence in order to keep her family together.", (ii) "There are times when women deserve to be beaten.", (iii) "A woman should obey her husband in all things.", (iv) "Women should leave politics to men.", (v) "Women's work should be limited to household chores, such as cleaning and cooking.", (vi) "Education is not valuable for daughters/daughters-in-law.". The responses to the six questions are aggregated into a single normalized index with the same weight for all the statements.

In the case of women respondents, the indicator assesses their level of critical consciousness and ability to step back from the dominant social norms. In the case of men respondents, the indicator evaluates their perception of oppressive gender norms commonly accepted in the public and private sphere. The two indicators are significantly correlated (0.7476) but are also significantly different. On average, women reach a score of 80.7 percent, while it is 77.6 percent for men (p-value of the t-test of difference 0.0021). In the analysis, we use the indicator of women's critical consciousness and the difference between women's and men's critical consciousness indicators in each household. We

expect a large difference between the female and male to be a constraining factor for women's ability to challenge the status quo and enhance an empowerment process.

#### *3.4. Indicators of the will to change*

Finally, we added a set of questions to the a-WEAI questionnaire to reflect the motivation of respondents to challenge the status-quo in agency and to see their roles in the different domains of empowerment evolving. For the production domain, enumerators asked to which extent respondents would like to have more inputs in decision making for each of the agricultural activities of the a-WEAI questionnaire. Responses followed a Likert scale with four levels: not at all, to a small extent, to a medium extent, and to a high extent. Using the same aggregation of the activities than used in the 5DE method, we build a normalized indicator of the will to have more inputs in agricultural decisions.

For the resources domains, we consider two indicators. First, for each asset, respondents were asked to which extent they would like to have better access to the item. Following the same method as previously described for the production domain, we obtain a normalized indicator of the will to have better access to productive and non-productive capital. Second, for each credit, we asked if the respondents would like to have more inputs in decisions related to credit and on the use of the money borrowed. We similarly construct an indicator of the will to have more inputs in decisions related to credit. For the leadership domain, we use a normalized indicator of the will to have more inputs in group decisions using the responses given for each of the groups. Finally, we aggregate two questions for the time allocation domain: feeling to be overburdened with work and willingness to do less household work and participate in activities outside the home. We obtain a normalized indicator of the will to challenge workload.

In addition, we compare women's will to change for specific production decisions, assets, and groups that are traditionally part of the women and men spheres. For the production, we compare food crop farming (mostly cereals production), which is part of the men's domain, with vegetable farming, which is mostly in the hands of women. For access to assets, we compared land access, as an example of an asset owned by men, and poultry access, as an example of an asset mostly controlled by women. For participation in groups, we considered agricultural and producers' groups, which are mostly men groups, and microfinance and saving groups, which are mostly driven by women in our context.

Descriptive statistics and definitions of all the variables are in Tables 1 and 2.

### 3.5. Data Analysis Methods

This analysis aims to elucidate the relations between the will to change on one side and the visible agency and gender critical consciousness on the other side. The quantitative analysis uses the following empirical models:

$$W_{ij} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 CC_{ij} + \beta_2 A_{ij} + \beta_3 I_{ij} + \varepsilon_{ij} \quad (1)$$

$$W_{ij} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 CC_{ij} + \beta_2 A_{ij} + \beta_3 I_{ij} + \beta_4 H_{ij} + v_j + \varepsilon_{ij} \quad (2)$$

We estimate the model from equation (1) on the entire sample, and we use the sub-sample for which household and village level characteristics are available from the household survey for estimating equation (2).

The dependent variable  $W_{ij}$  is the will to change for the women interviewed in household  $i$  from village  $j$ .  $CC_{ij}$  is a vector of critical consciousness which includes both self-consciousness from the women  $i$  from village  $j$  and the difference between her critical consciousness and one of her male decision maker within her household.  $A_{ij}$  is the visible agency, estimated by a-WEAI binary variables and alternative continuous variables.  $I_{ij}$  is for the individual characteristics of the women respondent, namely her age in our

estimates. The vector of household's characteristics,  $H_{ij}$ , encompasses the age, gender, ethnicity and caste of the head of household, the number of household members, the area of land owned, the number of bedrooms in the dwelling, and a binary variable equal to 1 if the household receives remittances.  $v_j$  is also a binary variable equal to 1 if the village lies in the Tarai-Madhesh region, i.e. in the plains, while villages in the hills take the value 0. Finally,  $\varepsilon_{ij}$  is the term of errors.

We estimate the equations independently for the five components: agricultural decisions, access to assets, decisions over credit, workload, and participation. In these five cases, the dependant and independent variables are aggregated indicators. Besides, we estimate the same models with a non-aggregated indicator for the dependent variable. In those cases,  $W_{ij}$  is the will to have more inputs in the decisions about specific production activities (food crops, vegetables), the will to have better access to specific assets (land, poultry), and the will to have more inputs in the decisions taken by specific groups (agricultural group, microfinance or saving group).

We use Ordinary Least Square Regressions to estimate the empirical models (1) and (2). In model (2), we estimate robust standard errors clustered at the ward level to account for intra-cluster correlation. There are 28 wards used in the analysis. With this relatively small number of clusters, the standard errors can be biased downward. We, therefore, present p-values calculated with the wild cluster bootstrap method to avoid over-rejection of our null hypothesis (Cameron, Gelbach, and Miller, 2008).

We acknowledge that endogeneity of the agency variable through simultaneity bias and unobserved variables correlated with agency and the will to change are theoretically possible. However, we consider the visible agency and the will to change from each domain of WEAI and not the empowerment in general as in Trommlerová et al. (2015). This desegregation reduces the likelihood of endogeneity. Another point is the



sequential order and conditional framing of the questions, which justify our empirical model with visible agency determining the will to change and not the reverse. The will to change was elicited after agency and was conditional on the actual level of agency.

Recognizing this potential caveat, we interpret our results as correlations and not as causal estimates.

The qualitative interview data were coded following the principles of qualitative content analysis (Mayring 2010) and grounded theory elements (Glaser and Strauss 2008) with the software NVivo. The combination of these two analytical methods allowed both inductive coding open to locally meaningful themes and cultural explanations, as well as deductive coding based on the a-WEAI indicators and the concepts of critical consciousness and the will to change. This integrated participatory method documentation and visual data (mappings and photographs).

## **4. Results**

### *4.1. Results on the agricultural production domain*

First, we note that the will to have more inputs in agricultural decisions is positively and significantly correlated with the critical consciousness index (Table 3). The result is robust to the inclusion of control variables and to the reduction of the sample size. As expected, the difference of critical consciousness between the female and male from the same household has a negative sign but is significant in only one of the specifications. The larger the difference among the main female and male decision-makers in the same household, the more constrained is the female's will to change. Second, having already inputs in decision-making is positively correlated with the will to have more inputs in agricultural decisions. However, when we consider the disaggregated indicators, we note that the number of agricultural domains in which women make decisions negatively

influences their will to have more inputs. Contrarily, the direction of the relationship is positive when we consider the number of agricultural domains in which women have inputs in decisions.

This result may reflect the ambiguous and diverse set of feelings related to increased decision-making in the context of widespread male out-migration in Nepal (Author et al. 2019; Maharjan et al. 2012). With 31 percent of the households receiving remittances<sup>5</sup> and 58 percent of them being headed by women, this situation is particularly common in our study region. During our semi-structured interviews, the majority of women indicated that their husband's absence and the sudden increase in decision-making responsibility leaves them with burdening emotions. Lacking supportive advice from their husbands and their maternal families often living far away, they experience loneliness and worry about their children's education and health, as well as their husband's security abroad. In focus group discussions and interviews, recurring themes were the importance of mental, financial and labor support on everyday matters such as childcare and repaying loans. Stepping into new roles and making decisions alone may create additional pressure and stress. Women may be exposed to derogatory remarks when they challenge existing gender norms of purity (*purdah*) by increasing their mobility, bargaining with men, and speaking up. For example, one outspoken young woman shared that other women would call her derogatorily 'politician' as she does not conform to the gender norms of being submissive and staying at home. However, some women felt differently about their husband's absence; they enjoy greater independence through increased mobility and greater individual decision-making power. This is especially the case when there are no in-laws in the household, as in their presence, patriarchal hierarchies are maintained, and in-laws often take over the role of the absent husband by controlling finances, burdening daughters-in-law with additional work, or restricting their mobility and influence in

decision-making (Author forthcoming). Lastly, women who make decisions not alone but by giving inputs may desire more independence and agency as they might feel that, despite their inputs, their contributions might not always be valued fully as per their intent. These findings highlight the importance of diverse family relations in collaborative intra-household decision-making that are not well captured by the a-WEAI.

In Table 4, we estimate the determinants of the will to have more inputs in decisions related to food crop farming and vegetable farming. Food crop farming relates mainly to cereals' production, mostly dominated by men for decision and labor. On the contrary, vegetable production for self-consumption is mostly in the hands of women. Critical consciousness is positively correlated with the will to have more inputs in the decisions related to cereals' and vegetables' production. As before, the difference between women's and men's critical consciousness is negatively correlated with the willingness to challenge the status quo. In this case of inputs to production decisions, the magnitude of the coefficients is similar for men-dominated activities and women-dominated activities.

#### *4.2. Results on the resource domain*

Higher critical consciousness is again positively and significantly correlated with the will to have better access to productive and non-productive capital (Table 5). The magnitude of the coefficients is comparable between the non-productive capital and the productive capital. As noted earlier, the difference between the critical consciousness of the female and male main decision-makers reduces the woman's will to have better access to capital, but the coefficient is significant in only one out of eight specifications.

The agency measured by the number of assets owned by the respondent is also a significant determinant of the will to have better access to assets. One more asset owned

increases the will to have better access to productive and non-productive capital by respectively 10.4 and 7.7 percentage points.

With the analysis conducted for disaggregated dependant variables in Table 6, critical consciousness is positively correlated with the will to have better access to poultry and land, but the coefficients are larger for land, an asset mostly in the hand of men. Access to land is critical, and in this case, a more developed critical consciousness tends to challenge the social norms and increase the willingness to pervade men's domains.

Regarding credit (Table 7), we note that only the number of decisions already taken to borrow money positively influences the will to contribute more to such decisions. This confirms the virtuous cycle identified before. However, critical consciousness and other visible agency indicators are non-significant. Our qualitative findings show that the availability of loans does not necessarily translate into actual access and financial security. In several cases, we found that women were charged with taking loans from women-specific saving groups by their husbands, whereas the money was spent on repaying their husbands' loans for out-migration rather than their small agricultural enterprises as declared. This practice further worsens women's financial worries when moneylenders pressure left-behind wives and demand their money back. Women being instrumentalized to access credit hence may be the reason why critical consciousness and visible agency indicators do not significantly determine the will to have more inputs in credit-related decisions.

#### *4.3. Results on the time domain*

The critical consciousness is not significantly correlated with the will to reduce workload even if we can still note the negative sign and the small magnitude of the coefficients (Table 8). Women working less than 10.5 hours a day tend to be more prone to challenge

their workload. However, the continuous variable presents a different perspective; the number of working hours is negatively correlated with the will to challenge the workload. These two results are not contradictory and show how the definition of the variable may influence the results. In the context of our study, and as it was defined in the a-WEAI, 'workload' encompasses care work (including domestic tasks such as cooking and cleaning), income-generating tasks, and community and political work. Each of these three workload components is associated differently with the will to reduce workload. It suggests that different types of work hold different degrees of desirability.

In the two villages where we conducted qualitative fieldwork, the workload is not seen as questionable and remains entrenched in social and cultural norms. In our qualitative interviews, we noted that women with a higher workload due to community-related or political work also have a high level of critical consciousness and visible agency. At the same time, women with a high workload due to care work and income-generating activities felt disempowered and lacked both time and energy to challenge the status quo. Finally, agricultural workload underlies high variations throughout seasons and cropping cycles and also across gender.<sup>6</sup> As workload is not a static variable, it is all the more challenging to draw generalizations on the links between workload and the will to challenge the status quo.

#### *4.4. Results on the leadership domain*

At last, Table 9 shows results related to the leadership domain. The critical consciousness indicator, as well as the participation in at least one group, are not significant determinants of the will to have more input in groups' decisions. This is not surprising in the context of Nepal, where 75% of women are members of at least one group, often

created by a development project. In our case study villages, in particular, there has been a significant number of development interventions, which have required almost every woman to be a member of at least one or several groups. However, group membership is, in many cases, token, as many of these groups become not functional once the project stops. Even when they are functioning, most of these groups do not challenge oppressive social norms and can even reinforce them (Author et al., 2018b). Our qualitative data confirm this finding. Women indicated that by participating in groups, they learn about projects and access to schemes and improve their ability to introduce themselves to strangers or a group. Nevertheless, they are often dependent on 'upper' caste (Chhetri) male's decisions, often made in other informal settings, while women are called to group meetings for representational reasons. Experiences of their requests being overheard or starved off have led to disillusionment in community groups, ultimately tending to reinforce exclusion. In addition, the gender, age, and caste composition of the group, as well as kinship ties, are highly influential and can limit or enhance one's desire to have more significant input in groups' decisions. In our case study village, for example, a daughter-in-law covered herself up with her veil as soon as her father-in-law joined a meeting, and she turned mute despite being outspoken earlier. We observed similar accommodating behavior when a group of Dalits slowly dissolved without engaging in any further discussions after an 'upper' caste man joined them. These cultural norms and acceptance of hierarchies might explain why mere group membership is not a significant determinant for the will to have more influence in the decision-making of groups.

Beyond membership only, the level of participation and influence on the group decision may be more strongly correlated with the will to change. In our two case study villages, women who experience some form of success in groups, through their literacy skills for

accounting, or their horticulture successes, or their ability to sell their produce, gained recognition in the village. From there, they are more likely to be asked and to accept to join other groups as well. This may explain that the number of groups in which women are members is a positive and significant determinant of the will to have more input in group decisions. Participation in an additional group increases by 11 percent the will to change indicator.

We finally consider disaggregated participation in specific groups in Table 10 to confirm the qualitative observations. Higher critical consciousness is negatively correlated with the will to have more inputs in decisions made by agricultural groups. These groups can be farmers' groups, forest community user groups, or water users' committees. It indicates that women with higher critical consciousness are reluctant to be involved in such men-dominated groups. They might not consider these groups as efficient use of their time and energy.

## **5. Summary and concluding remarks**

This study aims to contribute empirically and theoretically to efforts targeting women's empowerment in the development sector in locally meaningful ways. We explored the pertinence of using an under-recognized concept, the will to change, to assess women's empowerment through a household survey and qualitative data collected in Nepal between 2015 and 2020. We analyzed the influence of several potential determinants of the will to change, namely critical consciousness, existing levels of agency, and social and economic determinants.

Our results are twofold. On the one hand, we empirically advance our understanding of empowerment processes in the context of rural Western Nepal. Importantly, our findings

highlight that agency and critical consciousness are positively correlated with the will to change across several domains. Gaining agency expands the perceived domain of possibility, and women with higher critical consciousness are likely to be willing to have more agency. These results indicate the presence of a virtuous circle. But this also means a vicious circle for women who cannot outreach the social norms, have less agency, and lower realization of oppressive gender norms and relations.

Furthermore, we show that what is commonly defined as a higher level of empowerment is not necessarily perceived as desirable for women, even for those with high critical consciousness scores. This is true notably in the context of male out-migration in Nepal, where women see themselves assigned new decision-making responsibilities but might hold different feelings about this increased agency, depending on their personal situation but also on how this individual agency operates within (still) oppressive patriarchal structures. These results, hence, question often binary discourses on the feminization of agriculture, which claim either women's empowerment or vulnerability in the agricultural sector as a result of male out-migration. Similarly, our findings also question the aim of increasing women's participation in agricultural groups without addressing patriarchal structures, which is followed by numerous development projects in Nepal (Leder, Clement and Karki 2017).

On the other hand, we advance the current conceptualizations of empowerment processes. First, we establish the relevance of considering the will to change as a pertinent empowerment indicator and its complementarity with critical consciousness and visible agency. The will to change is strongly associated with the critical consciousness index across several domains. Jointly assessing critical consciousness and the will to change supports revealing when hegemonic values and socially-accepted gender norms are key



constraining factors to empowerment, e.g., when both critical consciousness and the will to change have low values. This has significant implications for policy and development interventions as it might help identify where and when gaps in critical consciousness most restrain women's empowerment. In such situations, we recommend agricultural development programs to develop interventions promoting gender critical consciousness and creating spaces to rethink social norms and practices collectively rather than technical interventions for the promotion of visible agency (horticulture training, seed provision, etc.). Following the central role of dialogue in Freire's conscientization process, broader transformative engagements with gender relations in agriculture and natural resource governance could encompass reforms in the formal educational sector (cf. Leder 2018), participatory gender training (Author et al. 2019), as well as promoting a culture of dialogue on gender, masculinities, and social inclusion issues within development organizations (Cornwall, Edström and Greig 2011, Shrestha and Clement 2019, Malapit et al. 2020). It would mean designing programs with outcomes that are not only measurable but also transformative (Cornwall and Rivas 2015).

Second, considering the will to change might help to move away from essentialized assumptions about women towards a more nuanced consideration of the diversity of meanings associated with empowerment. The will to change is such an indicator that it offers valuable insights into the dynamic, relational, and political nature of women's empowerment. This is particularly prominent in our analysis of the influence of socio-economic variables on women's will to change. Migration status, caste, and ethnicity do shape one's willingness to challenge the status quo across different domains, either by restraining the horizon of possibilities or by shifting core identity or life-related aspirations. It also promotes a feminist and politicized understanding of empowerment

by uncovering aspirations and the workings of oppressive gender norms and structures. This calls for identifying differentiated pathways of alternative development practices and policies for gender-transformative change.

To conclude, these findings open new avenues for research as they call for more carefully linking the measurement of women empowerment to local meanings and contexts. Similarly, disaggregated indicators and continuous variables have more explanatory power than composite indicators commonly used. Heterogeneity is not only between the empowerment domains but also within. While these composite indicators are essential for external validity studies, we recommend not generalizing their use and carefully choosing culturally and context-specific indicators for internal validity.

**Acknowledgments:** This work received initial funding from UK Aid Building Resilience and Adaptation to Climate Extremes and Disasters (BRACED) program under the project 'Anukulan' (grant iDE Ref. NP 1147 and KPMG Ref. B11) and DFID [NP1147/B11] as well as support from FORMAS mobility grant (2018-00574). Finally, this article was supported by the International Water Management Institute and the CGIAR Research Program on Water, Land and Ecosystems.

*Authors confirm that they have no conflicts of interest to disclose.*

## References

- ADB (Asian Development Bank). 2013. Gender Equality and Food Security— Women's empowerment as a tool against hunger. Mandaluyong City, Philippines: ADB.
- Alkire, S., R. Meinzen-Dick, A. Peterman, A. R. Quisumbing, G. Seymour & A. Vaz (2013) The Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index. *World Development*, 52, 71-91.
- Allen, A. 2016. Feminist Perspectives on Power. In *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2016 Edition), ed. E. N. Zalta.

<<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2016/entries/feminist-power/>>.

Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University.

Author et al. (2017) Details withheld to preserve blind review

Author et al. (2018a) Details withheld to preserve blind review

Author et al. (2018b) Details withheld to preserve blind review

Author et al. (2019) Details withheld to preserve blind review

Author (forthcoming) Details withheld to preserve blind review

Bachrach, P. & M. S. Baratz (1962) Two Faces of Power. *The American Political Science Review*, 56, 947-952.

Batliwala, S. 1994. The Meaning of Women's Empowerment: New concepts from action. In Population policies reconsidered: health, empowerment, and rights, eds. G. Sen, A. Germain & L. C. Chen, 127-38. Boston, MA: Harvard University, Harvard Center for Population and Development Studies.

--- (2007) Taking the Power out of Empowerment - An experiential account. *Development in Practice*, 17, 557-565.

Batliwala, S. & D. Dhanraj (2004) Gender Myths that Instrumentalise Women: A View from the Indian Frontline. *IDS Bulletin*, 35, 11-18.

Bernard, T., C. Doss, M. Hidrobo, J. Hoel & C. Kieran (2020) Ask me why: Patterns of intrahousehold decision-making. *World Development*, 125, 104671.

Bourdieu, P. 1977. Outline of a Theory of Practice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cameron, A. C., Gelbach, J. B., & Miller, D. L. (2008). Bootstrap-based improvements for inference with clustered errors. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 90(3), 414-427.

- Chakravarti, U. (2008) Beyond the Mantra of Empowerment: Time to Return to Poverty, Violence and Struggle. *IDS Bulletin*, 39, 10-17.
- Charmes, J. & S. Wieringa (2003) Measuring Women's Empowerment: An assessment of the Gender-related Development Index and the Gender Empowerment Measure. *Journal of Human Development*, 4, 419-435.
- Cornwall, A. (2016) Women's Empowerment: What works? *Journal of International Development*, 28, 342-359.
- Cornwall, A., J. Edström & A. Greig. 2011. Introduction. Politicizing masculinities in development. In *Men and Development: Politicizing Masculinities*, eds. A. Cornwall, J. Edström & A. Greig. London and New York: Zed Books.
- Cornwall, A. & A.-M. Rivas (2015) From 'gender equality and 'women's empowerment' to global justice: reclaiming a transformative agenda for gender and development. *Third World Quarterly*, 36, 396-415.
- Eyben, R., N. Kabeer & A. Cornwall. 2008. Conceptualising empowerment and the implications for pro poor growth: a paper for the DAC Poverty Network. Brighton: IDS.
- FAO. 2011. The State of Food and Agriculture: Women in Agriculture: Closing the Gender Gap for Development. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
- . 2018. Empowering Rural Women, Powering Agriculture. FAO's work on gender. ed. FAO. Rome, Italy.
- Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). 2018. Empowering rural women, powering agriculture: FAO's work on gender. Rome, Italy: FAO.
- Foucault, M. 1975. *Surveiller et Punir. Naissance de la prison*. Paris: Gallimard.
- . 1978. *Dispositives of Power*.

- . 1980. Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Freire. 1970. Cultural Action for Freedom. Middlesex, England, Penguin Books
- . 1996. Pedagogy of the oppressed. London: Penguin Books Ltd.
- Gellner, D. N. (2007) Caste, Ethnicity and Inequality in Nepal. *Economic and Political Weekly*, May, 19, 1823-1828.
- Glaser, B. & A. Strauss. 2008. Grounded Theory: Strategien qualitativer Forschung. Bern: Huber.
- Kabeer, N. (1999) Resources, Agency, Achievements: Reflections on the measurement of women's empowerment. *Development and Change*, 30, 435-464.
- (2005) Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment. A critical analysis of the third Millenium Development Goal. *Gender and Development*, 13, 13-24.
- . 2008. Paid Work, Women's Empowerment and Gender Justice: Critical pathways of social change. In Pathways of Empowerment working papers. Brighton, UK: Institute of Development Studies.
- Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1982). The psychology of preferences. *Scientific American*, 246(1), 160-173.
- Leder, S. 2018. Transformative pedagogic practice. Education for Sustainable Development in Indian Geography Education on Water Conflicts. Singapore: Springer.
- Leder, S., F. Clement & E. Karki (2017) Reframing women's empowerment in water security programmes in Western Nepal. *Gender & Development*, 25, 235-251.
- Leder, S. & C. Sachs. 2019. Intersectionality on the Gender - Agriculture Nexus: Relational life histories and additive sex-disaggregated indices. In *Gender, Agriculture and*

- Agrarian Transformations. Changing relations in Africal, Latin America, and Asia.* , ed. C. Sachs, 75. Routledge.
- Lukes, S. 2005. Power: A radical view. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Maharajan, A., Bauer, S., & Knerr, B. (2012). Do Rural Women Who Stay Behind Benefit from Male Out-migration? A Case Study in the Hills of Nepal. *Gender, Technology and Development*, 16(1), 95-123.
- Malapit, H. J., C. Kovarik, K. Sproule, R. Meinzen-Dick & A. Quisumbing. 2020. Instructional guide on the abbreviated Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index (A-WEAI). Washington, D.C.: International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI).
- Malapit, H., A. Quisumbing, R. Meinzen-Dick, G. Seymour, E. M. Martinez, J. Heckert, D. Rubin, A. Vaz, K. M. Yount & Gender Agriculture Assets Project Phase 2 (GAAP2) Study Team (2019a) Development of the Project-Level Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index (pro-WEAI). *World Development*, 122, 675-692.
- Malapit, H., Ragasa, C., Martinez, E. M., Rubin, D., Seymour, G., & Quisumbing, A. (2020). Empowerment in agricultural value chains: mixed methods evidence from the Philippines. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 76, 240-253.
- Mayring, P. 2010. Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse: Grundlagen und Techniken. Weinheim: Beltz Verlag.
- Mukhopadhyay, M. (2004) Mainstreaming Gender or "Streaming" Gender Away: Feminists marooned in the development business. *IDS Bulletin*, 35, 95-103.
- O'Hara, C. & F. Clement (2018) Power as Agency: A critical reflection on the measurement of women's empowerment in the development sector. *World Development*, 106, 111-123.
- Parpart, J. L. (1993) Who is the 'Other'? A postmodern feminist critique of women and development theory and practice. *Development and Change*, 24, 439-464.

- Rahman, A. 1999. Women and Microcredit in Rural Bangladesh. An anthropological study of Grameen Bank lending. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Rowlands, J. (1995) Empowerment examined. *Development in Practice*, 5, 101-107.
- . 1998. A Word of the Times, but What Does it Mean? Empowerment in the discourse and practice of development. In *Women and Empowerment. Illustrations from the Third World*, ed. H. Afshar, 11-34. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Samuelson, W., & Zeckhauser, R. (1988). Status quo bias in decision making. *Journal of risk and uncertainty*, 1(1), 7-59.
- Selinger, E. (2008) Does Microcredit "Empower"? Reflections on the Grameen Bank Debate. *Human Studies*, 31, 27-41.
- Shrestha, G. & F. Clement (2019) Unravelling Gendered Practices in the Public Water Sector in Nepal. *Water Policy*, 21, 1017–1033.
- Trommlerová, S. K., S. Klasen & O. Leßmann (2015) Determinants of Empowerment in a Capability-Based Poverty Approach: Evidence from The Gambia. *World Development*, 66, 1-15.
- Vercillo, S. (2020). The complicated gendering of farming and household food responsibilities in northern Ghana. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 79, 235-245.
- Völker, M., & Doneys, P. (2020). Empowerment as one sees it: assessment of empowerment by women participants of development projects. *Development in Practice*, 1-14.
- World Bank. 2014. Levelling the playing field: Improving opportunities for women farmers in Africa. Washington DC: The World Bank Group.
- Young, I. M. 1990. Justice and the Politics of Difference. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Zwarteveen, M. Z. & N. Neupane. 1996. Free-Riders or Victims: Women's nonparticipation in irrigation management in Nepal's Chhattis Mauja irrigation scheme. Colombo: International Irrigation Management Institute.



**Table 1 – Descriptive statistics**

|                        | DOMAIN           | Type of indicator | Description  | Obs | Mean  | Std. Dev. | Min   | Max  |
|------------------------|------------------|-------------------|--|-----|-------|-----------|-------|------|
| WILL TO CHANGE         | Production       | Composite         | Normalized indicator of will to have more inputs in agricultural decisions.                                | 566 | 0.40  | 0.18      | 0     | 0.93 |
|                        | Production       | Disaggregated     | Normalized indicator of will to have more inputs in food crop farming decisions.                           | 513 | 0.73  | 0.21      | 0     | 1    |
|                        | Production       | Disaggregated     | Normalized indicator of will to have more inputs in vegetable farming decisions.                           | 502 | 0.74  | 0.21      | 0     | 1    |
|                        | Resources        | Composite         | Normalized indicator of will to have better access to productive capital.                                  | 593 | 0.37  | 0.17      | 0     | 1    |
|                        | Resources        | Composite         | Normalized indicator of will to have better access to non-productive capital.                              | 595 | 0.40  | 0.23      | 0     | 1    |
|                        | Resources        | Disaggregated     | Normalized indicator of will to have better access to land.  | 560 | 0.72  | 0.22      | 0     | 1    |
|                        | Resources        | Disaggregated     | Normalized indicator of will to have better access to poultry.   | 380 | 0.75  | 0.24      | 0     | 1    |
|                        | Resources/Credit | Composite         | Normalized indicator of will to have more inputs in decisions related to credit                            | 325 | 0.20  | 0.15      | 0     | 0.74 |
|                        | Time             | Composite         | Normalized indicator of will to challenge workload   | 598 | 0.67  | 0.15      | 0     | 1    |
|                        | Leadership       | Composite         | Normalized indicator of will to have more inputs in group decisions  | 498 | 0.23  | 0.16      | 0     | 0.92 |
|                        | Leadership       | Disaggregated     | Normalized indicator of wills to have more inputs in agricultural groups.                                  | 318 | 0.70  | 0.27      | 0     | 1    |
|                        | Leadership       | Disaggregated     | Normalized indicator of will to have more inputs in saving groups.   | 279 | 0.66  | 0.27      | 1     | 1    |
| CRITICAL CONSCIOUSNESS |                  |                   | Normalized indicator of critical consciousness   | 584 | 0.81  | 0.17      | 0     | 1    |
|                        |                  |                   | Difference critical consciousness between main female and male decision-maker in the household             | 522 | 0.03  | 0.18      | -0.67 | 0.67 |
| VISIBLE AGENCY         | Production       | WEAI              | Individual has some input in decisions or feels can make decisions in at least two agricultural activities | 574 | 0.86  | 0.34      | 0     | 1    |
|                        | Production       | Alternative       | Number of agricultural domains in which individual <u>makes</u> decisions.                                 | 586 | 0.82  | 1.35      | 0     | 7    |
|                        | Production       | Alternative       | Number of agricultural domains individual has <u>some inputs</u> in decisions.                             | 587 | 4.56  | 1.20      | 1     | 8    |
|                        | Resources        | WEAI              | Personal or joint ownership of at least two small assets or one large asset.                               | 600 | 1.00  | 0.04      | 0     | 1    |
|                        | Resources        | Alternative       | Number of agricultural assets individual owns solely or jointly.   | 594 | 4.20  | 1.21      | 1     | 7    |
|                        | Resources        | Alternative       | Number of assets individual owns solely or jointly.  | 599 | 7.52  | 2.30      | 1     | 14   |
|                        | Resources/Credit | WEAI              | Individual makes at least one decision regarding at least one source of credit.                            | 600 | 0.25  | 0.43      | 0     | 1    |
|                        | Resources/Credit | Alternative       | Number of decisions of the individual to <u>borrow</u> money.  | 600 | 0.38  | 0.81      | 0     | 6    |
|                        | Time             | WEAI              | Individual worked less than 10.5 hours the previous day  | 600 | 0.47  | 0.50      | 0     | 1    |
|                        | Time             | Alternative       | Number of hours worked the previous day  | 600 | 10.26 | 2.45      | 0     | 16   |
|                        | Leadership       | WEAI              | Individual is a member of AT LEAST ONE group   | 600 | 0.83  | 0.38      | 0     | 1    |
|                        | Leadership       | Alternative       | Number of groups with membership   | 600 | 1.80  | 1.30      | 0     | 6    |

**Table 2 – Descriptive statistics, individual and household variables**

| <b>Description</b>               | <b>Obs</b> | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Std. Dev.</b> | <b>Min</b> | <b>Max</b> |
|----------------------------------|------------|-------------|------------------|------------|------------|
| Age of the respondent            | 597        | 34.13       | 12.02            | 18         | 73         |
| Age of the head of household     | 233        | 41.85       | 12.80            | 19         | 77         |
| Female headed household          | 233        | 0.37        | 0.48             | 0          | 1          |
| Dalit household                  | 233        | 0.18        | 0.38             | 0          | 1          |
| Janajati household               | 233        | 0.45        | 0.50             | 0          | 1          |
| Number of household members      | 233        | 5.45        | 2.34             | 1          | 20         |
| Area of land owned (in heactare) | 233        | 0.34        | 0.24             | 0          | 1.08       |
| Number of bedrooms in the house  | 233        | 7.06        | 3.23             | 0          | 11         |
| Household receiving remittance   | 233        | 0.30        | 0.46             | 0          | 1          |
| Tarai region                     | 233        | 0.55        | 0.50             | 0          | 1          |

**Table 3 – Production**

| VARIABLES              |  | (1)  | (2)                              | (3)                     | (4)                             |
|------------------------|--|--|----------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|
|                        |  | Will to have more inputs in agricultural decisions |                                  |                         |                                 |
| Critical consciousness | Critical consciousness                                       | 0.182***<br>(0.0509)                               | 0.470***<br>(0.000)<br>[0.000]   | 0.100**<br>(0.0396)     | 0.349***<br>(0.125)<br>[0.000]  |
|                        | Difference critical consciousness self - male decision-maker | -0.0506<br>(0.0484)                                | -0.144<br>(0.0977)<br>[0.144]    | -0.0233<br>(0.0378)     | -0.140*<br>(0.0766)<br>[0.070]  |
|                        | WEAI indicator - Input in decisions                          | 0.112***<br>(0.0222)                               | 0.0999***<br>(0.0359)<br>[0.014] |                         |                                 |
|                        | Nb agricultural domains 'makes decision'                     |  |                                  | -0.0319***<br>(0.00535) | -0.0126<br>(0.0286)<br>[0.620]  |
| Visible Agency         | Nb agricultural domains 'has inputs in decision'             |  |                                  | 0.0983***<br>(0.00513)  | 0.0964***<br>(0.000)<br>[0.000] |
|                        | Age of the respondent  | 0.000296<br>(0.000644)                             | 0.000416<br>(0.00115)            | 8.18e-05<br>(0.000488)  | 0.000291<br>(0.000818)          |
|                        | Age of the head of household                                 |  | 0.000356<br>(0.000770)           |                         | 0.000145<br>(0.000634)          |
|                        | Female headed household                                      |  | -0.00418<br>(0.0209)             |                         | 0.0103<br>(0.0217)              |
|                        | Dalit household  |  | -0.0750**<br>(0.0314)            |                         | -0.0259<br>(0.0229)             |
|                        | Janajati household   |  | 0.0440<br>(0.0432)               |                         | 0.0310<br>(0.0411)              |
|                        | Number of household members                                  |  | 0.00741<br>(0.00600)             |                         | 0.00572<br>(0.00530)            |
|                        | Area of land owned   |  | -0.0180<br>(0.0615)              |                         | 0.0163<br>(0.0352)              |
|                        | Number of bedrooms in the house                              |  | 0.00157<br>(0.00573)             |                         | -0.00157<br>(0.00314)           |
|                        | Household receiving remittance                               |  | -0.0638**<br>(0.0272)            |                         | -0.0724***<br>(0.0231)          |
|                        | Tarai region   |  | -0.0714<br>(0.0501)              |                         | -0.00884<br>(0.0384)            |
|                        | Constant   | 0.147***<br>(0.0493)                               | -0.0928***<br>(0.0295)           | -0.118***<br>(0.0412)   | -0.343***<br>(0.109)            |
|                        | Observations   | 486  | 176                              | 493                     | 182                             |
|                        | R-squared  | 0.080  | 0.346                            | 0.451                   | 0.608                           |

Notes: Robust standard errors clustered at the VDC level in parentheses. Wild VDC-level cluster bootstrap p-values in brackets. \*\*\* significant at the 1 percent level, \*\* significant at the 5 percent level, \* significant at the 10 percent level.

**Table 4 – Production, disaggregated**

| VARIABLES   | (1)   | (2)                            | (3)                      | (4)                            |
|---|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
|   | Will to have more inputs in agricultural decisions... |                                |                          |                                |
|   | for food crop<br>farming                              | for food crop<br>farming       | for vegetable<br>farming | for vegetable<br>farming       |
| <b>Critical consciousness</b>   | 0.164**<br>(0.0684)                                   | 0.592***<br>(0.208)<br>[0.05]  | 0.170**<br>(0.0693)      | 0.631***<br>(0.235)<br>[0.008] |
| <b>Difference critical consciousness self - male<br/>decision-maker</b> | -0.109*<br>(0.0659)                                   | -0.299**<br>(0.116)<br>[0.011] | 0.00558<br>(0.0665)      | -0.245*<br>(0.126)<br>[0.054]  |
| Observations  | 449   | 162                            | 437                      | 163                            |
| R-squared   | 0.015   | 0.155                          | 0.020                    | 0.204                          |

Notes: Robust standard errors clustered at the VDC level in parentheses. Wild VDC-level cluster bootstrap p-values in brackets. All estimations include a constant and the age of the women as control variables; in addition, estimations in columns (2) and (4) include household level control variables. \*\*\* significant at the 1 percent level, \*\* significant at the 5 percent level, \* significant at the 10 percent level.

**Table 5 – Resources, capital**

|                        |   | (1)  | (2)                            | (3)                   | (4)                            | (5)  | (6)                            | (7)                    | (8)                             |
|------------------------|---|--|--------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| VARIABLES              |   | Will to have better access to productive capital |                                |                       |                                | Will to have better access to <u>non</u> -productive capital |                                |                        |                                 |
| Critical consciousness | <b>Critical consciousness</b>                 | 0.130***<br>(0.0483)                             | 0.292**<br>(0.138)<br>[0.030]  | 0.114***<br>(0.0313)  | 0.271***<br>(0.000)<br>[0.000] | 0.127*<br>(0.0691)   | 0.576***<br>(0.215)<br>[0.006] | 0.106**<br>(0.0454)    | 0.390**<br>(0.185)<br>[0.042]   |
|                        | <b>Difference CC self-male decision-maker</b> | -0.0490<br>(0.0466)                              | -0.0937<br>(0.0883)<br>[0.302] | -0.0671**<br>(0.0302) | -0.110<br>(0.0760)<br>[0.138]  | -0.00818<br>(0.0662)   | -0.133<br>(0.115)<br>[0.244]   | -0.0344<br>(0.0435)    | -0.0873<br>(0.119)<br>[0.442]   |
|                        | <b>Number of agricultural assets owned</b>    |  |                                | 0.104***<br>(0.00392) | 0.102***<br>(0.000)<br>[0.000] |  |                                |                        |                                 |
|                        | <b>Number of assets owned</b>                 |  |                                |                       |                                |  |                                | 0.0772***<br>(0.00296) | 0.0574***<br>(0.000)<br>[0.000] |
| Visible Agency         | Observations                                  | 515  | 188                            | 515                   | 188                            | 517  | 190                            | 517                    | 190                             |
|                        | R-squared                                     | 0.014  | 0.152                          | 0.586                 | 0.611                          | 0.008  | 0.441                          | 0.573                  | 0.655                           |

Notes: Robust standard errors clustered at the VDC level in parentheses. Wild VDC-level cluster bootstrap p-values in brackets. All estimations include a constant and the age of the women as control variables; in addition, estimations in columns (2), (4), (6) and (8) include household level control variables. \*\*\* significant at the 1 percent level, \*\* significant at the 5 percent level, \* significant at the 10 percent level.

**Table 6 – Resources, disaggregated**

| VARIABLES   | (1)                               | (2)                            | (3)                 | (4)                           |
|---|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|
|   | Will to have better access to ... |                                |                     |                               |
|   | Land                              | Land                           | Poultry             | Poultry                       |
| <b>Critical consciousness</b>                                       | 0.319***<br>(0.0658)              | 0.646***<br>(0.214)<br>[0.003] | 0.197**<br>(0.0868) | 0.435**<br>(0.178)<br>[0.016] |
| <b>Difference critical consciousness self - male decision-maker</b> | -0.172***<br>(0.0631)             | -0.284*<br>(0.153)<br>[0.065]  | -0.0343<br>(0.0847) | -0.0615<br>(0.325)<br>[0.850] |
| Observations  | 493                               | 176                            | 329                 | 137                           |
| R-squared   | 0.046                             | 0.173                          | 0.019               | 0.143                         |

Notes: Robust standard errors clustered at the VDC level in parentheses. Wild VDC-level cluster bootstrap p-values in brackets. All estimations include a constant and the age of the women as control variables; in addition, estimations in columns (2) and (4) include household level control variables. \*\*\* significant at the 1 percent level, \*\* significant at the 5 percent level, \* significant at the 10 percent level.

**Table 7 – Resources, credit**

| VARIABLES                 |   | (1)   | (2)                            | (3)                    | (4)                            |
|---------------------------|---|---|--------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------|
|                           |   | Will to have more inputs in decisions for credits |                                |                        |                                |
| Critical<br>Consciousness | Critical consciousness  | 0.0104<br>(0.0567)                                | -0.0303<br>(0.0768)<br>[0.690] | 0.0146<br>(0.0535)     | -0.0184<br>(0.0662)<br>[0.744] |
|                           | Difference critical consciousness self - male<br>decision-maker | 0.0536<br>(0.0535)                                | 0.0863<br>(0.122)<br>[0.530]   | 0.0717<br>(0.0506)     | 0.111<br>(0.127)<br>[0.364]    |
|                           | WEAI indicator – Decisions related to credit                    | 0.0252<br>(0.0175)                                | 0.0148<br>(0.0377)<br>[0.678]  |                        |                                |
|                           | Number of decisions to borrow money                             |   |                                | 0.0531***<br>(0.00883) | 0.0518<br>(0.0328)<br>[0.132]  |
|                           | Observations  | 280   | 99                             | 280                    | 99                             |
| Visible Agency            | R-squared   | 0.018   | 0.119                          | 0.125                  | 0.236                          |

Notes: Robust standard errors clustered at the VDC level in parentheses. Wild VDC-level cluster bootstrap p-values in brackets. All estimations include a constant and the age of the women as control variables; in addition, estimations in columns (2) and (4) include household level control variables. \*\*\* significant at the 1 percent level, \*\* significant at the 5 percent level, \* significant at the 10 percent level.

**Table 8 – Time**

|                        |   | (1)                        | (2)                           | (3)                     | (4)                              |
|------------------------|---|----------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------|
| VARIABLES              |   | Will to challenge workload |                               |                         |                                  |
| Critical Consciousness | <b>Critical consciousness</b>                                       | -0.0326<br>(0.0441)        | 0.0221<br>(0.117)<br>[0.880]  | -0.0315<br>(0.0442)     | 0.0217<br>(0.0776)<br>[0.890]    |
|                        | <b>Difference critical consciousness self - male decision-maker</b> | -0.0410<br>(0.0424)        | -0.0365<br>(0.109)<br>[0.748] | -0.0462<br>(0.0424)     | -0.0445<br>(0.102)<br>[0.692]    |
| Visible Agency         | <b>WEAI indicator - Work less than 10.5 hours</b>                   | 0.0335**<br>(0.0132)       | 0.0471<br>(0.0306)<br>[0.132] |                         |                                  |
|                        | <b>Number of working hours</b>                                      |                            |                               | -0.00665**<br>(0.00276) | -0.00961<br>(0.00645)<br>[0.116] |
| Observations           |   | 519                        | 190                           | 519                     | 190                              |
| R-squared              |   | 0.018                      | 0.072                         | 0.017                   | 0.069                            |

Notes: Robust standard errors clustered at the VDC level in parentheses. Wild VDC-level cluster bootstrap p-values in brackets. All estimations include a constant and the age of the women as control variables; in addition, estimations in columns (2) and (4) include household level control variables. \*\*\* significant at the 1 percent level, \*\* significant at the 5 percent level, \* significant at the 10 percent level.

**Table 9 – Leadership**

|                        |   | (1)   | (2)                           | (3)                   | (4)                             |
|------------------------|---|---|-------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|
| VARIABLES              |   | Will to have more inputs in group decisions |                               |                       |                                 |
| Critical Consciousness | <b>Critical consciousness</b>                                       | -0.0381<br>(0.0520)                         | -0.0883<br>(0.106)<br>[0.430] | -0.0413<br>(0.0273)   | -0.00182<br>(0.0219)<br>[0.976] |
|                        | <b>Difference critical consciousness self - male decision-maker</b> | 0.0417<br>(0.0485)                          | 0.0406<br>(0.128)<br>[0.724]  | 0.0369<br>(0.0253)    | 0.0324<br>(0.0575)<br>[0.526]   |
|                        | <b>WEAI indicator - Member of at least 1 group</b>                  | 0.0880<br>(0.0707)                          | 0.0368<br>(0.138)<br>[0.740]  |                       |                                 |
|                        | <b>Number of groups with membership</b>                             |   |                               | 0.120***<br>(0.00357) | 0.113***<br>(0.000)<br>[0.000]  |
| Visible Agency         | Observations  | 431   | 154                           | 431                   | 154                             |
|                        | R-squared   | 0.005                                       | 0.037                         | 0.725                 | 0.698                           |

Notes: Robust standard errors clustered at the VDC level in parentheses. Wild VDC-level cluster bootstrap p-values in brackets. All estimations include a constant and the age of the women as control variables; in addition, estimations in columns (2) and (4) include household level control variables. \*\*\* significant at the 1 percent level, \*\* significant at the 5 percent level, \* significant at the 10 percent level.

**Table 10 – Leadership, disaggregated**

|                        |   | (1)   | (2)                           | (3)                           | (4)                           |
|------------------------|---|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| VARIABLES              |   | Will to have more input in decisions in ... |                               |                               |                               |
|                        |   | Agricultural groups                         | Agricultural groups           | Microcredit and saving groups | Microcredit and saving groups |
| Critical Consciousness | <b>Critical consciousness</b>                                       | -0.215*<br>(0.113)                          | 0.312<br>(0.399)<br>[0.437]   | 0.00692<br>(0.116)            | 0.280<br>(0.315)<br>[0.376]   |
|                        | <b>Difference critical consciousness self - male decision-maker</b> | 0.170<br>(0.105)                            | -0.0413<br>(0.353)<br>[0.907] | -0.0621<br>(0.111)            | -0.0607<br>(0.174)<br>[0.728] |
|                        | Observations  | 273   | 98                            | 238                           | 100                           |
|                        | R-squared   | 0.036                                       | 0.184                         | 0.034                         | 0.132                         |

Notes: Robust standard errors clustered at the VDC level in parentheses. Wild VDC-level cluster bootstrap p-values in brackets. All estimations include a constant and the age of the women as control variables; in addition, estimations in columns (2) and (4) include household level control variables. \*\*\* significant at the 1 percent level, \*\* significant at the 5 percent level, \* significant at the 10 percent level.



---

<sup>1</sup> Yet, as noticed in Deveaux (1994), several feminist philosophers and political theorists have also criticized Foucault's lack of attention to gendered relations, lack of normative engagement and early neglect of agency.

<sup>2</sup> VDC was then the lowest administrative unit in Nepal, before the federalist structure was set-up.

<sup>3</sup> 37% of the respondents from the baseline are present in the follow-up survey.

<sup>4</sup> Chhetris are a 'high' caste group in Nepal, whereas Dalits, formerly known as the untouchable, are the 'lowest' group in the social hierarchy, located outside of the caste system

<sup>5</sup> Nepal is one of the highest remittances receiving economies in the world with 31.3 % of the GDP (World Bank 2016).

<sup>6</sup> Gender-specific workload varies with seasonality due to the contextual gender division of labor, e.g. men's responsibilities for ploughing and women's responsibility for more time-intensive tasks such as transplanting, weeding and harvesting (Author et al. 2019).