DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 224 680   RC 013 739

AUTHOR   Sharma, Satish; Anstey, Eleanor
TITLE   Self-Help, Community Development and Rural Women: A
                Conceptual and Investigative Analysis of Some of the
                Social Welfare Issues.
PUB DATE   Jul 81
NOTE   34p.; Paper presented at the National Institute on
                Social Work in Rural Areas (6th, Beaufort County, SC,
                July 26-29, 1981).
PUB TYPE   Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   Community Action; *Community Development; Comparative
                Analysis; Developed Nations; Developing Nations;
                *Females; Futures (of Society); Interpersonal
                Competence; *Quality of Life; *Rural Population;
                *Self Help Programs; Social Development; *Social
                Services
IDENTIFIERS   *Rural Women; Third World; United States

ABSTRACT
                Using the perspective of sociology and social
welfare, the report focuses on issues and concerns by considering the
concepts and underpinnings of personal development, social
development, community development, women's issues, rural social
welfare, and self-help. Contexts are the social development and
social welfare of total societies as well as of local rural
communities. Philosophical and theoretical perspectives adopted for
conceptualization and analyses are Western Utilitarian and Sarvodaya.
Materials are both conceptual and factual and relate specifically to
the major thrust of the paper: the interrelated topics of women's
issues, community development, and self-help in organizing and
bringing about all rural social development/welfare activities. For
observation and insights, the major societal contexts used are that
of the Third World and the United States. The last portion of the
report considers some future issues and concerns of rural women's
issues, community development, and self-help in their local,
national, and global contexts. (Author/AH)

SELF-HELP, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND RURAL WOMEN:

A CONCEPTUAL AND INVESTIGATIVE ANALYSIS OF SOME OF

THE SOCIAL WELFARE ISSUES

by

SATISH SHARMA

Department of Social Work
University of Nevada-Las Vegas
4505 Maryland Parkway
Las Vegas, Nevada   89154

and

ELEANOR ANSTEY
School of Social Work
The University of Iowa
308 North Hall
Iowa City, Iowa   52242

2

ABSTRACT

SELF-HELP, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND RURAL WOMEN:

A CONCEPTUAL AND INVESTIGATIVE ANALYSIS OF SOME OF THE

SOCIAL WELFARE ISSUES

Self-help in personal, social and community development,
a preferred motto since prehistorical times, is still rele-
vant in the modern era. Nation states which profess a
strong belief in centralized planning and regulation of all
developmental and social welfare activities, as well as those
societies which profess a belief in decentralization of poli-
tical power and responsibility, adhere to the principle of
self-help.

This paper considers the above concerns by focusing on
the concepts and underpinnings of self-help, personal develop-
ment, social development, community development and rural
women's issues.

SELF-HELP, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND RURAL WOMEN: A CONCEPTUAL AND INVESTIGATIVE ANALYSIS OF SOME OF THE SOCIAL WELFARE ISSUES

"As with men, so with women: Salvation lies in
their own hands."

M.K. Gandhi[1]

Self-help in personal, social and community development
has been a preferred motto of people from prehistoric times
through the preindustrial and postindustrial eras. Even in
those nation-states which profess a strong belief in cen-
tralized governmental planning and regulation of all social
welfare activities, self-help in various aspects of life is
not a totally neglected subject. The principle, however, is
more strongly adhered to in societies which profess and
practice a strong belief in decentralization of political
power and responsibilities at different levels and a firm
faith in human initiative and creativity. In recent years,
the ideology of personal and social rights, self-determination
and self-help has been gaining momentum all over the world.
To some extent, the idea of self-help has also been focused

by the relatively harsher times ahead for all nations and
by the evergrowing inability of many state, national and
international development/social welfare agencies to cater
properly to local, regional, national and international
social welfare needs.

The present paper attempts to focus on some of the
above issues and concerns by considering the concepts and
underpinnings of personal development, social development,
community development, women's issues, rural social welfare
and self-help. The focus on issues and concerns is from the
perspective of sociology and social welfare. The contexts
are the social development and social welfare of total
societies as well as of local rural communities. The phil-
osophical and theoretical perspectives adopted for concep-
tualization and analyses are Western Utilitarian and Sar-
vodaya. The materials presented are both conceptual and
factual and relate specifically to the major thrust of the
paper: the interrelated topics of women's issues, community
development and self-help in organizing and bringing about
all rural social development/welfare activities. For obser-
vation and insights, the major societal contexts used are
that of the Third World and United States. The last part

of the paper is speculative and projective in that it con-
siders some future issues and concerns of rural women's iss-
ues, community development and self-help in their local,
national and global contexts.

The Concepts and Their Underpinnings

Self-Help

Self-help is a rather self-explanatory concept meaning
that it has been defined by Webster's International Dic-
tionary as "an act or instance of providing for or helping
oneself without dependence on others."[2] "Without dependence
on others" seems to be the key part of this definition. Yet
outside help is not totally denied in the processes of self-
help if it is welcomed willingly, with good intentions and
without any attached strings of overt or covert motives.
However, becoming physically, psychologically or emotionally
dependent on such outside help at any time is what is totally
contrary to the tenet and spirit of self-help.[3]

Personal and Social Development

Personal, social and community development are diffi-
cult to define without the consideration of economic and
social progress. Distinct from economic and social progress,
the concepts are need-specific, resource-specific, context-

specific, culture-specific, tradition-specific, multidimensional, multi-level and are determined to some extent by the prevalent political and religious philosophies in societies. Primarily, however, the concepts refer to: 1) a higher level optimal cultivation and use of available resources and potentials at different levels, 2) toward a fuller, more complete and more satisfying quality of life at personal, social and community levels, 3) through achievement of a higher level personal and social awareness, concern and functioning. In this sense, therefore, development represents a sense of awareness, an attitude of concern and "an act, process and product achieved through the process of developing."[4]

In terms of its dynamics, the concept of development refers to achieving a higher degree of control over the processes and directions of personal, social and community changes and being able to achieve desired "transformations" at these levels. Development may involve a new recognition of various strengths and resources at many levels, and a reassessment of the problem areas. A new understanding of resources are needed to combat problems, and a re-evaluation of attitudes, behavior, relationships, structural and/or

institutional changes are required to accomplish the task.[5]
At the personal and social levels it means creation of new
attitudes, self-discipline, behavioral patterns, knowledge,
communication channels and modes of living toward a com-
plete and harmonious development of various qualities, facul-
ties and resources of the people and the establishment of a
new healthy, peaceful, cooperative and satisfying social
order for everybody. The goal is improved social welfare
and a higher quality of living of all members in the social
order. The Western Utilitarian philosophy, in this regard,
emphasizes "the greatest good of greatest number of people."
The Sarvodaya philosophy emphasizes "greatest good of all
without any exception."[6] Another important difference in
the conception of development at personal, social and
community levels, and the stratégies to implement it, lies
in the degree of emphasis upon self-determination. In case
of most democratic-liberal societies, this seems to be a
backbone principle of development. Many socialistic and
communistic societies on the other hand, prefer a governmental
control and intervention in the various processes of
development.

Community Development

The concept of community development generally refers
to a society, a territory, a locality, or a group of people.
An interactional setting, some common interests, to a degree
a common fate and a sense of belongingness are some of the
central elements of the concept of community.[7] Originally
conceived as a response to a series of problems since World
War II, the concept of community development is different
from the former organized charities approach to social
betterment in which the more fortunate had a special re-
sponsibility to those who were less fortunate.[8] The communi-
ty development represents a different approach to social
betterment and deals with the problems of rural and urban
areas alike. At the beginning, the concept was introduced
primarily in the context of giving developmental aid to
countries in Asia. Soon, however, it became clear that the
problem of development was not of economics alone and that
development depended more on modification and reorganization
plus, in some cases, revigorization of the old institutional
structures.[9] People and domestic leaders had to discover
that development could not occur solely with outside help,
and that they must use their own indigeneous resources.[10]

With the passage of time, community development became more
than an approach to bringing about desired social change.
Rather, it began to be viewed as a motivation, a method,
a plan and a process of improving living conditions in rural
communities, and in urban areas, by "breaking the cake of
custom," promoting agricultural and industrial revolutions,
and converting relatively static communities into scenes
of dynamic creativity.[11]

Substantively, and in terms of process, community
development represents an effort toward desired economic,
social, cultural and political changes, embodying an assess-
ment of the problem areas and a plan of action, and directed
toward self-determination, self-help, wide community parti-
cipation, a community organization and delivery of appropriate
community services.[12] In democratic societies, local ini-
tiative and reliance on local community resources are greatly
encouraged in the various processes of community develop-
ment to meet people's basic needs. However, most totali-
tarian regimes do not consider these strategies as politically
realistic or even ideologically desirable. Even for non-
totalitarian regimes, there are some real dilemmas with
regard to accepting the total spirit of community

development. For example, how long should authorities de-
siring rapid economic and social changes wait for positive
results from a slow educational campaign? How much pri-
ority should be given to local felt needs vis-a-vis national
needs and priorities? How much reliance should be there on
local leadership and developmental projects initiated or to
be initiated by them? These are some of the questions which
no democratic society is able to answer satisfactorily.
Though mostly noncoercive, community development even in
these societies operates within certain social controls.[13]

Analytically, community development could be conceived
along the systematic dimensions of a community. Community
is a place of shared living, generally based on some sort
of common locality. It is a meeting place of the individual
and the larger society and it is characteristically here
that the individual experiences and confronts most of his/
her society's institutions.[14] Therefore, when seen in such
analytical terms, community represents: 1) a spatial eco-
logical system, 2) a demographic system of people, 3) an
institutional system of shared beliefs, values and prac-
tices, 4) a behavioral system of social interaction, 5) a
power system generating, distributing and utilizing personal

and social power, and 6) a socio-cultural system connecting
the local community with the larger society and culture.[15]
Community development, in this sense, becomes a project of
developing all these systematic aspects of the community.

Women and Rural Community Development

The application of community development concepts and
the position of women in the community is a complex pro-
cess. Basically, it refers to the systematic exposure of
the long-standing legal, political, psychological and eco-
nomic injustices perpetrated upon women, and to re-orienting
the social institutions in a way that promotes women's
rights and privileges equal to those of men.[16] This is most
effectively achieved within the context of changing sociali-
zation, the role and functions of family (which is a ma[jor]
emphasis of feminist movements in many parts of the Third
World), by establishing policies which secure political
rights, access to education and employment opportunities.[17]

The total context and problems of social welfare in rural
areas are somewhat different from those of urban centers.
Rural areas are characterized by a predominantly agricultur-
ally based economy, lack of diversity of employment

possibilities, relative isolation from larger urban and

commercial centers, and the low population density. These

factors, therefore, need to be considered in various pro-

cesses and strategies of community development and the

resolution of women's issues.[18]

Community Development as Welfare Planning:

Given the above underpinnings, regardless of the level,

focus and concern, community development can be regarded as

a process of social welfare planning designed to meet the

assessed needs of a society, a territory, a locality, or a

group of people on a short or long-term basis. The in-

herent ideas involved in this sort of planning are that of

resolution of current problems and tensions, achieving pro-

gress and equality, a better quality of living, and an

improved level of social welfare of all involved in the

process.[19] The nature of these goals, and how they are

accomplished, depends to a large extent on the social and

political values of people and societies.[20] Sometimes

societies stress self-help, self-determination and wide

community participation. At other times, the goals are

established and achieved with substantial state intervention.[21]

Whatever the nature and process of welfare planning, community development generally represents some sort of collective action for the advancement of social welfare of a maximum possible number of people (according to the Western Utilitarian philosophy,) or of everybody without any exception (according to the Sarvodaya philosophy.)[22]

Another important distinction in the goals and processes of welfare planning is developed according to the adopted political view of providing personal, occupational, fiscal and social welfare services to people. In some cases, welfare planning is taken as a residual function of government, of private organizations or of philanthropy. Where social welfare services are defined as "collective interventions to meet certain needs of the individual and/or to serve the wider interests of society,"[23] it is taken as a basic right of people. It is interesting to note that most of the Third World nations and communistic nations lean more toward collective intervention while many of the Western developed nations still lean more toward the residual position.

The way in which physical, economic and social planning fit together also varies according to the perceived function

of social planning. Four different views are prevalent in
this regard where social planning is identified as: 1) a
burden, 2) a handmaiden, 3) a complementarity and 4) a
means of social control. According to the first view, wel-
fare spending is seen as having depressing effects on pri-
vate enterprise and initiative and therefore bad for
economic growth. The suggestion, accordingly, is that wel-
fare spending should be undertaken in such a way so as to
have minimum discouragement on private enterprise.[24] Even
in the case of developing societies, some people have ar-
gued that funds expended for social welfare sector disrupt
the maximum growth of the economy.[25] In case of the second
view, welfare as a burden to economic growth is replaced
by the view that both physical and economic planning advance
best by an investment in the social sector. In other words,
the best possible investment is investment in "human
capital."[26] In this strategy, appropriate development
and delivery of social welfare services for people (school-
ing, health, on-the-job training, etc.) become very impor-
tant.[27] The third view is a sort of middle-ground view that
investment in social planning should proceed in conjunction'
with greater economic growth. In other words, efforts to

redistribute limited resources result only in the redis-
tribution of poverty.[28] The fourth view holds that funds
earmarked for social welfare programs are intended largely
to reduce social deviancy and thereby to protect the
political, economic and social stability of local communi-
ties.[29]

The Role and Relationship of Women to Welfare Planning:

Whatever the focus, concern, view or philosophy of wel-
fare planning, women have to be an intimate and integral
part of it at all levels. Unfortunately, however, this has
not been the case, and too often women have not been pro-
perly taken into account in the economic, social and poli-
tical planning processes. They have often been treated as
marginal actors in development, both in terms of their con-
tribution to welfare planning and the welfare programs helping
and serving their needs.[30] In part, this has occurred due to
some erroneous assumptions about the role and status of
women in developing and developed societies.[31] This has also
happened because of multiple factors of sex, age, race,
marital status, and poverty which have forced women to live
with double, triple and quadruple binds and prejudices.[32]

The erroneous assumptions about women by planners and policy-
makers have been: 1) men are the principal laborers in any
society, 2) men are the heads of households, 3) men are
primary breadwinners, 4) men's wages constitute family in-
comes, 5) women and men have equal access to education and
occupational training opportunities, 6) women and men have
equal access to credit opportunities, when required, and
7) women and men eat the same kind of food and other nu-
trients. Women as a collective have been recognized as a
disadvantaged group, systematically excluded from full and
equal participation in society. They have been victims of
discriminative socialization at home and school, they have
been stigmatized as inferior to men in occupations and they
have felt a general sense of powerlessness. Too often and
for too long women have accepted a second-class citizenship
in societies and they have generally re-routed their careers
and options to accomodate the needs of their families.[33]
The awareness of this accommodation presents us with the
special problems and unique service needs of women, to
which, among other helping professions, Social Work bears
a special responsibility.[34] This responsibility of the
Social Work profession is much greater toward rural women

due to their relative isolation and invisibility as a
social service category, their special needs due to rural
ecological and social-cultural contexts, and the much
greater demands of farm, occupational and home labor.[35]

The planning and community development strategies,
therefore, have to recognize that women in rural areas, in
developing and developed worlds, have tremendous amounts of
frustrations, feelings of inadequacy and helplessness and
they are currently coping with many problems never before
recognized or faced by them. Traditional tasks performed
by women have been relegated to a second place. For the new
tasks required or expected of them, they are neither fully
trained nor equipped. More and more, female labor has been
subordinated to male control, and huge gaps have occurred
in the economic, social and political status of the two
sexes, with men progressively enjoying a greater edge over
women. In homes and in communities many sources of stress
have appeared in women's familial and extra-familial roles.
By and large, their traditional areas of informal/indirect
influence and power have disappeared, and they have not been
replaced by new sources of influence and power. Increasing-
ly women have become aware that they currently have neither

the skills nor the personal freedom and power to participate on a equal footing with men in the changing economic, social and political structures of the modern times.[35]

Implications for Social Welfare Planning

The international, national, regional and local differences necessitate social welfare planning and strategies to be different for contemporary situations and circumstances. Nevertheless, with regard to welfare planning around the focus of women's issues and problems, there are some basic similarities in that most of women's issues and problems concentrate in the areas of: 1) early socialization, 2) formal education, 3) training for employment, 4) discrimination in hiring, 5) inequities in employment, 5) access to social services, 7) political participation, 8) legal rights and 9) stigmatization as inferior to men in society. These problem areas for women remain the same irrespective of national, cultural, social or regional contexts.[36]

What the women in rural and urban areas need most at the present time are new modes of socialization at home, a stigma-free image in society, equal access to education,

training, employment structure and social services, sharing
of familial roles and responsibilities by men, and freedom
from the binds of sex, age, race, marital status and pover-
ty. Only as and when welfare planning focuses on these
issues, can women become meaningful and effective actors in
family and society and contribute optimally to the develop-
ment of their communities.[37] While these factors are im-
portant, they are not enough. What women need is to be in-
volved in the power structure of society at the decision-
making level. So-called "women's issues" are not for women
alone. They represent an important challenge to be met by
men and women alike in the overall strategy of social and
economic development.[38]

Women also have to play a major role in the resolution
of their own issues. As Mahatma Gandhi had said:

"Men could help the cause of women. But, there was a
limit to what they could do since men could never under-
stand the deepest feelings of women. Only women could
achieve greatest results among women. The freedom and up-
lift of women, therefore was in their own hands and ulti-
mately they themselves had to determine with authority what
they wanted."[39]

The women and women's organizations, therefore, have to play a major role in resolving women's issues, overcoming their special disadvantages and planning of the welfare services for women in rural and urban areas. In this regard, special attention has to be paid to: 1) education and training of women to strengthen their income-generating skills, 2) enhancing the productive roles of women and ameliorating their unreasonably heavy home and work loads, 3) overcoming any disadvantages to women in access to modern technology, skills and credit facilities, 4) giving them more training in managerial and other leadership roles, 5) resolving their problems in the areas of housing, health, employment, child care and domestic violence and 6) re-establishing their dignity and respect in home and society. What women seek is to be more, not to have more, yet to have a chance to learn, to participate and to keep up with the times.[40]

A distinction exists between the needs of women in developed and developing countries, yet there are many similiarities. What appears insignificant in one area of the world might have demanded much cooperation, sacrifice and the overcoming of many obstacles in the other. In order for community developers to work in particular regions,

the person must be aware of several things: 1) a new under-
standing of resources, 2) re-evaluation of attitudes, 3)
felt-needs of the people, 4) initiative and reliance on
local community resources and 5) the ability to convert
communities into scenes of dynamic creativity. All of these
points are crucial to understanding and working with rural
women.

Education for Third World women where illiteracy rates
are high might mean locating resources of books, buildings,
teachers and equipment. In developed countries, the women
will be attempting to increase the number of females in
medicine, engineering, administration and higher education.
Health issues for a Third World woman revolve around the
existence of a hospital, available doctors, medicine and
scarcity of food. Women in developed countries are con-
cerned about the equality of care.

Economically, women in developed countries will work for
equality of wage while their counterparts in the developing
country will be laboring in fields, carrying fuel and water
long distances, grinding meal, without the benefit of any
labor saving devices. In developing countries, most of the

legislation pertaining to women's working conditions applies to the public and modern sectors and not to agricultural sectors.

In many countries of the world, both developed and less developed and particularly agrarian ones, the role of women has not significantly improved in recent decades. The daily struggle against poverty is so demanding that change in many cases is an abstract ideal. Yet the increased awareness of the rights, status and role of women is deeply affecting most societies. As women demand, they assume a greater role in economic, political and social life, they not only reflect the forces that are changing contemporary cultures but also become a force themselves.

One area reflecting the new role of women is law. The laws and constitutions of many countries now guarantee the political and civil rights of women, yet many countries have become increasingly aware that changes in the law do not necessarily cause changes in practice.

Despite increased access to education, the fields of study and jobs open to them continue to reinforce traditional sex roles. The overall picture of women's involvement in economic development at the world level is mixed.

Women constitute the major bulk of the agricultural
labor force in developing countries. They are the food
providers yet efforts to modernize agriculture appear to
have an ambiguous effect on their role. Community devel-
opment has traditionally emphasized the organization of women's
groups as a way of strengthening their role in society. In
spite of new approaches to community development, the
traditional roles of women have not changed. For example,
subsistence crops are rarely included in the development of
cooperatives. When women do hold a decision-making position,
their participation is often contingent on their marital
status.

The process of rural development has more often than
not caused a loss in economic authority and status in less
developed countries for women. In Africa where women play
an extensive and significant role in agricultural production,
efforts at increasing productivity favor men in positions of
control. Credit, seeds, irrigation facilities and marketing
outlets are often offered to men only. Labor-saving methods
of cultivation are appropriated by men while labor-intensive
tasks are left to women, adding to their already heavy load
of work. New methods of production have failed to

accommodate rural women's traditional responsibilities of homemaking, child care, growing food for a family or their work in the fields.

The needs for rural women in developing countries are not only to eliminate wide-spread illiteracy but to raise consciousness of the resources possessed by women; not only to train in-home crafts but to train for agriculture; to help women to increase their productivity by training them technically; to provide simple forms of transportation to water supplies in order to alleviate that strain on women, thus improving their health; to begin at the village level to free men and women; and to encourage women to participate together.

Women in rural areas in developed countries face their own challenges; holding on to family farms, health care, public services, unemployment, domestic violence, economic handicaps, child care, control of energy development in communities and education.

A central tenet in the women's movement is to help women to make decisions about their own lives. Women in rural countries are starting to use their talents to help each other. Women are beginning to turn negative stereotypes

about themselves into dynamic potential for community organization. As a result of their cultural schooling, women organizers tend to be more oriented to group process and are more conscious of the importance of building the group rather than their own individual power. While working with the community, women are not perceived as threatening and people seem more comfortable taking a woman into their home and speaking openly. The natural ability of women to "get personal" with people also helps them gain the trust and loyalty of people they contact as an organizer. Establishing a personal relationship with members of the community plays a crucial role in maintaining a successful organization. If people relate to an organization only on a "professional" level, there will be nothing left to hold them to the group once the original cause for which they joined has been addressed.[41]

Both nationally and internationally, women are forming cooperatives, becoming community organizers, learning marketing techniques and training locally to help solve their own problems.

Even if the desired political, economic or social result does not occur as planned, the process of organizing is

valuable in itself since it allows women to realize their power and their humanity.

Summary

Self-help, personal and social development and community development are integral parts of the conceptual nature of social welfare. Though there seems to be much diversification, all these aspects are interrelated because the ultimate goal of social welfare planning is to improve the quality of human life.

This paper has explored the underpinnings of self-help, community development and issues of rural women with regard to the philosophical and theoretical perspective.

NOTES

1. From: A Letter to Kamla Satthianadhan, February 11, 1929.
   Also in: Government of India (Ed.), The Collected
   Works of Mahatma Gandhi, Vol. 39. New Delhi: The
   Publications Division, 1970, p. 451.

2. Webster's Third New International Dictionary. Springfield,
   Massachusetts: G. & C. Merrian Company, 1971.

3. The reader may notice here close resemblance of the defi-
   nition to the Gandhian concepts of self-help, village
   and Swadeshi mentalities. See: S. Sharma, Gandhi,
   Women and Social Development: In Search of Peaceful
   Developmental Planning in the Indian and Global Con-
   tents. Hong Kong: Asian Research Service (in press).

4. See: Webster's Third New International Dictionary,
   op. cit., 1971.

4. J.F.X. Paiva, "A Conception of Social Development." A
   paper presented at the Council on Social Work Educa-
   tion annual program meeting in Chicago, March 1975.

6. See: Sharma, op.cit., in press. M.K. Gandhi, Sarvodaya.
   Ahmedabad: Navjivan Publishing House, 1954. V.
   Bhane, Sarvodaya. Tanjore: Sarvodaya Prachuralayam,
   1957. J.P. Narian, Toward A New Society. Bombay:
   Indian Congress for Cultural Freedom, 1958.

7. George A. Hillery, for example, reviewed ninety-four definitions of community in which sixteen different concepts had been employed. Most students of community, however, were in agreement that community consisted of persons in social interaction, within a geographical area and having one or more additional common ties. See: G.A. Hillery, Jr., "Definitions of Community: Areas of Agreement." Rural Sociology, Vol. 20, June 1955. Also see: Meaning of community in Webster's Third New International Dictionary, op. cit., 1971.

8. See: Y.T. Sanders, "The Concept of Community Development." In: Lee J. Cary (Ed.), Community Development as a Process. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1970.

9. R. Bilinski, "A Description and Assessment of Community Development." In: L.T. Wallace, D. Hobbs, and R.D. Vlasin (Eds.), Selected Perspectives for Community Resource Development. Raleigh: North Carolina State University, 1969. United Nations, Social Progress through Community Development. New York: United Nations Publications, 1955. G. Hendricks, Community Organization. The Hague, Netherland: Ministry of Social Work, 1964.

10. L. Miniclear, "Community Development in the World Today,"
    Community Development Review, Vol. 7, No. 1, 1962 and
    Bilinski, op. cit., 1969. T. Sherrard, "Community
    Organization and Community Development: Similarities
    and Differences." Community Development Review, Vol.
    7, No. 1, 1962. A. Dunham, "Community Development."
    In: Social Work Yearbook (1960). New York: National
    Association of Social Workers, 1960.

11. It should be noted that the underlying philosophy, prac-
    tice and methods of community development had been ob-
    served in many earlier social reform and social better-
    ment movements like that of missionary-sponsored rural
    development projects, freedom movement of Mahatma
    Gandhi in India and the frontier practices of mutual
    aid and public programs in the United States. However,
    such community organization practices did not reflect
    the total philosophy and methods of community develop-
    ment. Particularly, in many cases they lacked the wider
    popular participation of people and an inherent right
    of people to self-determination and self-help. See:
    Bilinski, op. cit., 1969. Sanders, op. cit., 1970.
    Sherrard, op. cit., Harper and Brothers, 1955.

W. Goodenough, <u>Cooperation in Change</u>. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1963. R. Poston, <u>Democracy Speaks Many Tongues</u>. New York: Harper and Row, 1962.

12. Bilinski, op. cit., 1969. Sanders, op. cit., 1970.

13. I.T. Sanders, "Community Development." In: <u>Interna-tional Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences</u>. New York: The Macmillan Co. and The Free Press, 1968, pp. 170-171.

14. R.L. Warren, <u>The Community in America</u>. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1978, pp. 21-25.

15. <u>Ibid</u>.

16. For an interesting reading on the subject, see: M.K. Whyte, <u>The Status of Women in Preindustrial Societies</u>. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1978.

17. E. Norman and A. Mancuso, <u>Women's Issues and Social Work Practice</u>. Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock, 1980.

18. O.F. Larson, "Rural Society." In: <u>International En-cyclopedia of the Social Sciences</u>, op. cit., 1968, pp. 580-87.

19. C. Midge, "Social Planning - Introduction." In: <u>Inter-national Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences</u>, op. cit., 1968, pp. 125-28.

20. G. Myrdal, "The Theoretical Assumptions of Social

     Planning." In: Transactions (Vol. 2). London:

     International Sociological Association, 1959. P.

     Diesing, Reason in Society: Five Types of Decisions

     and Their Social Conditions. Urbana, Illinois:

     University of Illinois Press, 1962.

21. Sanders, "Community Development." op. cit., 1970.

22. E.V. Donnison, "Social Work and Social Change." British

     Journal of Psychiatric Social Work, Vol. 8, No. 4,

     1966.

23. R.M. Titmuss, "The Role of Redistribution in Social

     Policy." Social Security Bulletin, Vol. 28, No. 6,

     1965, p. 45.

24. E.M. Burns, "The Financing of Social Welfare." In:

     C. Kasius (Ed.), New Directions in Social Work.

     New York: Harper and Row, 1954.

25. M. Rein, "Welfare Planning." In: International

     Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, op. cit., 1968,

     pp. 144-45.

26. T.W. Schultz, "Reflections on Investment in Man."

     Journal of Political Economy, Vol. 70 (Supplement),

     1962.

27. <u>Ibid</u>.

28. Rein, <u>op. cit</u>.

29. <u>Ibid</u>.

30. M. Rihani, <u>Development As If Women Mattered</u>. Washington, D.C.: Overseas Development Council, 1978.

31. The erroneous assumptions about women by planners and policy makers have been: 1) men are the principal laborers in any society, 2) men are the heads of households, 3) men are primary breadwinners, 4) men's wages constitute family incomes, 5) women and men have equal access to education and occupational training opportunities, 6) women and men have equal access to credit opportunities, when required and 7) women and men eat the same kind of food and other nutrients. All of these assumptions have been proven to be erroneous by many studies. See: Rihani, <u>op. cit</u>., 1978. S. Sharma and H. Ormsby, "Poverty, Female-headed Households and Social Policy." In: W. Frese (Ed.), <u>Rural Sociology in the South</u>. Hot Springs, Arkansas: SAAS, 1980, E. Boserup, <u>Women's Role in Economic Development</u>. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1970.

32. Norman and Mancuso, op. cit., 1980.

33. Ibid.

34. Ibid.

35. Rihani, op. cit., 1978.

36. P. Huston, Third World Women Speak Out. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1979. Rihani, op. cit., 1978. I. Palmer, "The Role of Rural Women in a New Economic Order." In: K. Haq (Ed.), Equality of Opportunity Within and Among Nations. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1977. I. Tinker, "The Adverse Impact of Development on Women. In: I. Tinker and M.B. Bramsen (Eds.), Women and World Development. Washington, D.C.: Overseas Development Council, 1976.

37. Rihani, op. cit., 1978. Huston, op. cit., 1979.

38. Ibid.

39. From: Harijan, June 27, 1936.

40. Huston, op. cit., 1979.

41. Peggy Mathews, "The Ideal Organizer in a Woman?" Ruralamerica, December 1980-January 1981, p. 27.