

MEASUREMENT GUIDE:
**FOUR INDICATORS FOR ASSESSING
WOMEN'S AND GIRLS' EMPOWERMENT**



Public Disclosure Authorized

Public Disclosure Authorized

Public Disclosure Authorized

Public Disclosure Authorized



© 2023 International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / The World Bank
1818 H Street NW
Washington DC 20433
Telephone: 202-473-1000
Internet: www.worldbank.org

This work is a product of the staff of The World Bank with external contributions. The findings, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in this work do not necessarily reflect the views of The World Bank, its Board of Executive Directors, or the governments they represent.

The World Bank does not guarantee the accuracy, completeness, or currency of the data included in this work and does not assume responsibility for any errors, omissions, or discrepancies in the information, or liability with respect to the use of or failure to use the information, methods, processes, or conclusions set forth. The boundaries, colors, denominations, and other information shown on any map in this work do not imply any judgment on the part of The World Bank concerning the legal status of any territory or the endorsement or acceptance of such boundaries.

Nothing herein shall constitute or be construed or considered to be a limitation upon or waiver of the privileges and immunities of The World Bank, all of which are specifically reserved.

Rights and Permissions

The material in this work is subject to copyright. Because The World Bank encourages dissemination of its knowledge, this work may be reproduced, in whole or in part, for noncommercial purposes as long as full attribution to this work is given.

Any queries on rights and licenses, including subsidiary rights, should be addressed to World Bank Publications, The World Bank Group, 1818 H Street NW, Washington, DC 20433, USA; fax: 202-522-2625; e-mail: pubrights@worldbank.org.

Cover design: Jihane El Khoury Roederer



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS



This paper was written by Ioana Botea, with valuable feedback and input from Wendy Cunningham and Lindsay Mossman. Kathleen Beegle, Aline Coudouel, Alessandra Heinemann, and Maria Beatriz Orlando served as peer reviewers. Iffath Sharif, Dhushyanth Raju, and Camilla Holmemo provided guidance and support throughout the assignment. Fiona Mackintosh edited the paper and Jihane El Khoury Roederer created the graphic design.

The work was financed by a grant from the World Bank's Rapid Social Response and Adaptive and Dynamic Social Protection (RSR-ADSP) Umbrella Trust Fund Program, which was supported by Australia, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom, and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation.





AUTHOR'S NOTE

This guide is part of a package aimed at helping Social Protection and Jobs (SPJ) task teams in the Africa region to incorporate women's and girls' empowerment (WGE) into their operational and analytical work. The package consists of four products:

- 1. Dashboard of Women's and Girls' Empowerment Interventions**
A curated repository of WGE interventions from the SPJ portfolio in Africa, including information on operational details, any impact evaluation results, and implementation arrangements – with various filters enabling users to tailor the information.
- 2. Highlights from Africa: Empowering Women and Girls through Social Protection**
A paper that condenses the information from the dashboard to identify evidence-based types of WGE interventions and draw lessons for moving the WGE agenda forward.
- 3. Measurement Guide: Four Indicators for Assessing Women's and Girls' Empowerment**
A guide proposing a set of essential indicators to track changes in WGE as part of lending operations and providing guidance on how to collect and analyze the data.
- 4. Women's Empowerment in Practice: Lessons from the Ghana Productive Safety Nets Project**
A qualitative case study presenting beneficiary and frontline provider perspectives on the implementation and experience of WGE interventions on the ground.

These materials can be used side-by-side or on their own.

The resources use the operational approach outlined in “**An Operational Approach to Enhancing Women's and Girls' Empowerment in World Bank Operations**” (Cunningham and Gupta, 2022), which is a guide to linking empowerment concepts with intervention areas that can be integrated into World Bank operations.

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	II
AUTHOR'S NOTE	III
ABBREVIATIONS	V
1 INTRODUCTION	1
2 MOTIVATION AND METHODOLOGY	3
3 DESCRIPTION OF THE ESSENTIAL INDICATORS	7
4 MEASUREMENT OF THE ESSENTIAL INDICATORS	14
5 CONCLUSIONS	18
REFERENCES	19
ANNEX 1: WGE Measurement Resources	20





ABBREVIATIONS

DHS	Demographic Health Survey
GIL	Gender Innovation Lab
IFPRI	International Food Policy Research Institute
J-PAL	Abdul Latif Jameel Poverty Action Lab
MAGNET	Measures for Advancing Gender Equality
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
SPJ	Social Protection and Jobs Global Practice
WEAI	Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index
WGE	Women's and Girls' Empowerment





1 INTRODUCTION

Women’s and girls’ empowerment (WGE) is a key priority for the World Bank’s engagement in the Africa region. Gender equality has long been central to the World Bank’s twin goals of ending extreme poverty and boosting shared prosperity.¹ The Bank has made substantial investments aimed at closing gaps between men and women as well as advancing our understanding of what are the most effective ways to close those gaps. However, only recently has the Bank recognized women’s and girls’ empowerment as a policy goal in its own right and a key strategy for human capital development in Africa.² This highlights the need for guidance and tools to help task teams operationalize the WGE agenda in the region.

WGE is a process that rests on three pillars: resources, agency, and context. “Empowerment” is a process of change by which those who have been denied the ability to make strategic life choices acquire such a n ability.³ Concretely, the empowerment process relies on removing barriers in three interrelated pillars: (i) *resources*, mainly physical/financial, human, and social capital; (ii) *agency*, or the ability to make decisions about one’s own life; and (iii) *context*, or formal and informal social norms, relationships, and institutions that affect WGE. While interventions in any single pillar can increase the ability of women and girls to make and realize choices, implementing actions in all three pillars is more likely to achieve transformational change.⁴

The World Bank’s Social Protection and Jobs (SPJ) Global Practice plays a key role in empowering girls and women, particularly the poorest and most disadvantaged. SPJ operations mostly use cash transfers, productive grants, and wages to help women and girls acquire the resources needed to realize their goals. Increasingly, SPJ operations also include accompanying measures aimed at increasing beneficiaries’ agency. Such measures include providing training on self-esteem, goal setting, and negotiation skills as well as setting up mechanisms for them to voice their concerns and preferences. In addition, in the context pillar, SPJ projects are increasingly piloting interventions to promote equal gender norms.⁵

This measurement guide offers practical advice on how to assess changes in WGE in SPJ operations.⁶ The guide aims to provide task teams with a set of essential WGE indicators and with the guidance on how to measure them. The four indicators are “essential” because they represent the minimum needed to measure the different aspects of empowerment; however, project teams are encouraged to supplement them with additional indicators to reflect specific projects and circumstances. The guide fills the gap on

1 World Bank (2015).

2 World Bank (2019).

3 Kabeer (1999).

4 See Cunningham and Gupta (2022) for more detailed information.

5 See Botea et al. (2022) and the Dashboard of WGE Interventions for more details.

6 The indicators can also be applied to operations in other sectors.

outcome, rather than output, indicators to be included in project results frameworks. It distills the rich information on WGE measurement that is already available with the goal of making it accessible to non-research users. It further aims to enable a standardized approach to measuring progress on WGE across the Bank's portfolio. A list of resources for that purpose is provided in Annex 1.

The remainder of the guide focuses on the four essential indicators for measuring progress on WGE.

Section 2 presents the methodology that was used to select these particular indicators, while Section 3 describes each indicator. Section 4 provides detailed guidance on how to collect and analyze the resulting data, and Section 5 concludes.



2 MOTIVATION AND METHODOLOGY

There is a striking lack of WGE indicators in current SPJ operations. An internal review of the SPJ portfolio conducted found that 63 percent of SPJ projects at the global level included “gender-relevant indicators” at the Project Development Objective level.⁷ However, in all but one of these projects, this consisted only of sex-disaggregated indicators aimed at tracking participation in the interventions. Only a cash transfer project in the Republic of Djibouti included an indicator measuring outcomes specific to women⁸ and was arguably included more to record children’s outcomes than those of the mothers themselves. A more in-depth review of the results frameworks used in the 12 SPJ projects included in the WGE dashboard revealed a similar pattern.⁹ Ten of the projects included sex-disaggregated indicator(s) related to participation in project activities. A subset further included indicators aimed at measuring satisfaction with the project or use of grievance and redress mechanisms by sex. None of the projects set out to collect indicators on WGE outcomes.¹⁰

WGE is a multifaceted concept, which makes it challenging to measure it in a standardized way. It encompasses many dimensions of women’s economic and social lives and can manifest differently in different cultures and settings. For example, while employment is often used as an indicator of women’s empowerment, not all employment is empowering. Female labor force participation rates in Africa are the highest in the world,¹¹ but African women are often relegated to the lowest paid, most precarious jobs. They work in these kinds of jobs because it is the most viable option for those who are burdened by homecare responsibilities and by social and economic structures that limit their options. Similarly, asking about who decides how the family budget is spent can provide insight into women’s level of decision-making power relative to their partners in many but not in all contexts. In Africa, making everyday decisions about household purchases is usually considered part of women’s traditional role as caretakers and is not necessarily a sign of empowerment.

In addition to conceptual complexity, there are several practical challenges to measuring WGE. Measuring people’s ability to set, make, and negotiate important life choices is challenging because decision-making is rarely observed directly. Many aspects of empowerment are susceptible to reporting bias, especially social desirability bias.¹² Similarly, measuring women’s preferences is challenging in contexts where women have internalized society’s views. While it is essential to capture women’s own

7 Heinemann (2020).

8 Percentage of women with a child aged 0-6 months practicing exclusive breastfeeding.

9 Botea et al (2022).

10 The Sahel Women’s Empowerment and Demographic Dividend (SWEDD) project includes an outcome-level indicator on the “Percentage of participating girls and women (aged 10 to 19) with improved knowledge of reproductive, maternal, newborn, and child health, and nutrition.”

11 In 2020, the female labor force participation rate was 60 percent in Sub-Saharan Africa, 59 percent in East Asia and the Pacific, 56 percent in North America, 50 percent in Europe and Central Asia, 46 percent in Latin America and the Caribbean, 21 percent in South Asia, and 18 percent in the Middle East and North Africa according to ILOSTAT 2020 (<https://ilostat.ilo.org/>).

12 Social desirability bias is one type of reporting bias that is particularly challenging to mitigate when measuring empowerment. It occurs when respondents give answers that they think the surveyor wants to hear or that are in line with generally accepted social norms rather than their own perceptions.

views and desires, their preferences may reflect social norms and expectations rather than their own true preferences. Also, when women lack power and a voice, it can be more difficult to collect data about their aspirations, opinions, and desires. See [A Practical Guide to Measuring Women's and Girls' Empowerment in Impact Evaluations](#) for a more in-depth discussion of these challenges and how to overcome them.¹³

BOX 1. Reasons for Using Monitoring and Evaluation to Measure Women's and Girls' Empowerment

Why measure empowerment?

SPJ projects frequently target women beneficiaries and measure indicators disaggregated by sex – isn't this enough? The answer depends on the specific project and context. The guide recommends that projects with WGE as either a main or secondary objective should measure empowerment, as should projects with a risk of disempowering or having negative consequences for women (such as increasing time poverty or leading to possible backlash and violence). It can also be useful to measure empowerment if progress on the project's main objectives may be influenced by the extent to which women/girls can make their own goals and act on them. For example, making free contraception available may only lead to increased take-up if women have the ability to negotiate an agreement with their partners about using it.

The most commonly used indicators are indirect measures of empowerment such as women's employment status or education level, but these can be misleading if used on their own. For instance, women may work either because they are empowered or because they are not. Also, although women's schooling attainment is usually correlated with greater decision-making power and better economic outcomes, it can also be associated with increased exposure to violence or can fail to lead to the desired knock-on benefits. Therefore, it is preferable wherever possible to use direct measures such as the indicators in this guide. Ideally, both direct and indirect measures would be used together and complement each other.

Why measure empowerment as part of project monitoring and evaluation?

Impact evaluations are often used to measure the various direct and indirect indicators associated with WGE so why incorporate the indicators into project monitoring and evaluation (M&E)? Notwithstanding the important role played by impact evaluations in establishing causality, empowerment should also be measured through the project's M&E as a way of tracking progress towards the project's objectives. Routine collection of M&E data is critical for measuring changes in key indicators among project beneficiaries and informing project teams of the need to adapt how the project is being implemented to alleviate any potential negative effects. This is particularly important in the case of those projects or interventions that are not accompanied by impact evaluations.

Incorporating empowerment indicators into projects can also improve awareness of WGE objectives and build local capacity. The essential indicators proposed in this guide correspond to the resources, agency, and context pillars and aim to make relatively complex empowerment objectives seem more tangible and relevant in the context of a results framework. The adoption of the essential indicators as part of project M&E can also develop a sense of local ownership and build a common understanding and vision of the importance of WGE.

¹³ Glennerster et al., 2018.

The guide identifies four essential indicators to measure empowerment across the three pillars of resources, agency, and context. Measuring indicators related to each of the pillars is a practical way to track the process of empowerment and determine whether project interventions are achieving the expected WGE results. The four essential indicators largely come from the Africa Gender Innovation Lab's (GIL) work on measuring empowerment, which in turn is based on a host of existing measurement tools and frameworks developed by other leading organizations (see Box 2).

Within each pillar, the essential indicators were selected based on the following criteria:

- *Validity:* All of the selected indicators are commonly used to measure different dimensions of WGE and have been validated in multiple contexts. The specific phrasing of the data collection tools was adopted from trusted sources, such as the [Africa GIL's](#) or [IFPRI's](#) measurement tools. While the indicators included in the guide represent current best practice, it is important to recognize the rapidly evolving and innovative work that is currently being done on measuring WGE.¹⁴ Updates or adaptations, particularly for girls, may be needed as new evidence and tools emerge.
- *Applicability:* Within each pillar, the guide prioritizes the indicators most likely to change as a result of an SPJ intervention in the Africa region. For example, measuring freedom of movement was not included because it is not much of a binding constraint for most African women. Neither was an indicator of attitudes towards domestic violence included since violence prevention interventions are not commonly implemented as part of SPJ projects (although this is changing).
- *Feasibility:* Empowerment is a complex, multifaceted concept that cannot be measured easily. There is a trade-off between including a comprehensive set of indicators and keeping data collection and analysis manageable. If too many indicators are selected, this will increase data collection costs and demand more of the respondents' time. Therefore, the guide prioritizes a few indicators that should be possible to collect and measure in most projects and contexts.

¹⁴ The World Bank's [Measures for Advancing Gender Equality \(MAGNET\)](#) initiative, for instance, aims to broaden and deepen the measurement of women's agency by developing a range of new tools.

BOX 2. Toolkits of Indicators and Scales for Measuring Empowerment

World Bank, 2022. [Measuring Women's Economic Empowerment in Payment Projects: A Short Module to Complement Context-Specific Measures](#). A brief providing actionable advice on measurement for project teams working on digital government-to-person (G2P) payments and cash transfer projects more broadly.

Center for Global Development, 2020. [Measuring Women's Economic Empowerment: A Compendium of Selected Tools](#). A collection of tools for measuring women's economic empowerment (or disempowerment) grouped into 20 population monitoring tools and 15 monitoring and evaluation tools.

World Bank, 2020. [The Africa Gender Innovation Lab's Core Empowerment Indicators: Developing a Cross-Country Module to Complement Context-Specific Measures](#). A list of indicators and survey questions to measure key elements of women's economic empowerment in the countries of Sub-Saharan Africa.

J-PAL, 2018. [A Practical Guide to Measuring Women's and Girls' Empowerment in Impact Evaluations](#). Diverse survey content used in J-PAL impact evaluation studies with indicators that cover economic and social factors, intimate partners and family, political and civic life, psychology, education, and health.

Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, 2018. [What Gets Measured Matters: A Methods Note for Measuring Women and Girls' Empowerment](#). Practical guidance on how to integrate measures of empowerment into investments that aim to achieve gender equality and women and girls' empowerment.

C-Change, 2011. [Compendium of Gender Scales](#). An online collection of scales measuring adherence to gender norms that have been used to measure the success of interventions in changing these norms.

See Annex 1 for additional resources.






3 DESCRIPTION OF THE ESSENTIAL INDICATORS

The guide proposes four essential WGE indicators to be integrated into the results frameworks of SPJ projects in the Africa region. The indicators relate to individual-level outcomes and can be measured by interviewing a random sample of female beneficiaries.¹⁵ Two of the indicators fall under the “agency” pillar, while the “resources” and “context” pillars account for one each. The indicators can be measured using a concise set of survey questions that can be deployed in any context to measure the key elements of WGE. They are complementary and not designed to be combined into a single index.

TABLE 1. Measuring WGE Across the Three Pillars

WGE PILLARS	DEFINITION	INDICATORS
RESOURCES	The financial, physical, human, and social capital that enhances the ability to exercise choice	Asset ownership: Whether the respondent has the ability to sell, rent out, or give away durable assets possessed by the household, either alone or jointly.
AGENCY	The capacity to make decisions about one’s own life and act on them to achieve a desired outcome, free of violence, retribution, or fear	<p>Input into decisions: The extent to which respondents have input into key decisions (for example, on earned income, household income, major household expenses, childbearing, and children’s education) and whether they can make personal decisions if they want to do so.</p> <p>Self-efficacy: The belief in one’s ability to act effectively towards a goal.</p>
CONTEXT	The social arrangements, mainly norms and institutions, that shape and influence women and girls’ ability to express agency and assert control over resources	Sharing of housework: The extent to which the respondent and her spouse/partner share responsibility for preparing food, cleaning the house and washing clothes, and taking care of children.

¹⁵ It is recommended that the sampling be stratified by key socio-demographic characteristics such as education, age, or marital status to capture heterogeneity among project beneficiaries.

INDICATOR 1: Asset Ownership (Resources)

Assets are frequently used as a proxy for resources and are closely associated with women's empowerment. The ownership, control, and use of assets is necessary for generating income, providing collateral for credit, and alleviating liquidity constraints after the occurrence of shocks. Ownership of assets can also confer social status and increase the voice of the owner within the household and community.¹⁶ Asset ownership is often associated with bargaining power and can be a protective factor for women, against either domestic violence¹⁷ or forced dispossession following a partner's death, a divorce, or a separation.¹⁸ As such, access to assets is critical in enabling women and girls to exercise choice and achieve their goals.

There are two main challenges involved in measuring asset ownership.¹⁹ First, data on asset ownership is typically collected at the household level, even though most assets are owned by individuals, either solely or jointly. This makes it difficult to determine individual ownership of assets as part of the measurement of WGE. Second, ownership can imply a different set of rights in different contexts. It can include all or a combination of the right to transfer the asset (through sales or bequests), the right to access and use the asset, the right to manage the asset, the right to exclude or control the access of others to the asset, the right to modify or invest in the asset, or the right to obtain economic benefits from the asset.²⁰ The definition of ownership in each specific context has implications for measuring empowerment.

The guide proposes asking two questions to measure asset ownership. First, the respondent is asked whether anyone in the household possesses each of six common durable assets (mats or beds, bicycles, a motorcycle/scooter, a mobile phone, a radio, and a television). This circumvents the need for a uniform ownership definition at the household level. Second, the respondent is asked whether she owns any of the assets alone, jointly with her spouse, or jointly with other household members. These questions are taken from Africa GIL's list of core empowerment indicators.

¹⁶ Doss et al (2020).

¹⁷ Peterman et al (2017).

¹⁸ This applies particularly to land. In many parts of Sub-Saharan Africa, tradition says that, when a man dies, his property passes to his adult sons or brothers (Cattell, 2003). The widow, who often lacks any legal claim to the land, and her children are often evicted.

¹⁹ See [Measuring Women's Control Over Assets](#) for more information on knowledge gaps on women's ownership and rights over assets and for details of how the World Bank's Measures for Advancing Gender Equality (MAGNET) initiative plans to fill them.

²⁰ Doss et al (2020).

TABLE 2. Measuring Asset Ownership (Resources)

Asset ownership	
Measures women's use and control of resources, demonstrating changes in their ability to control what happens to physical and financial resources.	
Q4. Does anyone in your household currently have [ITEM]?	Response categories:
a. Mats or bed	1= Yes
b. Bicycle	2= No
c. Motorcycle/scooter	
d. Mobile phone	
e. Radio	
f. Television	
Q5. (If 'yes' to Q4) Do you own any of these items (in other words, can sell, rent out, give away, or purchase new)?	Response categories:
<i>Asked separately for each of the asset categories with a 'Yes' response in Q4.</i>	1= Yes, alone
	2= Yes, jointly with the spouse
	3= Yes, jointly with other household member(s)
	4= No

INDICATOR 2: Input into Decisions (Agency)

Decision-making power is the most commonly used indicator to measure women's agency. Studies and surveys aimed at measuring agency or even empowerment more broadly have tended to focus on capturing decision-making power within the household over different domains such as family planning, employment, agriculture, health, consumption, and education. In the economics literature, decision-making is often associated with bargaining power or the relative ability of parties to exert influence over each other—with the key difference being that bargaining power is relational by definition. Decision-making power has usually been measured using [standardized intra-household indicators](#) such as those used by the Demographic Health Survey (DHS).

However, traditional decision-making questions suffer from a series of limitations. They may not be specific enough in the face of cultural differences and fail to reveal true preferences of the individual when couples disagree or are liable to social desirability bias.²¹ They may also not take into account whether the respondent wants to be involved in specific decisions. For example, in a household where the woman is running a business and her husband is in charge of farming, she may not want to be involved in agricultural decisions. This would be an indication that she is able to act on her goals rather than a sign of disempowerment. A recent study has shown that even small tweaks in decision-making questions can substantially change the assessment of women's empowerment.²²

Another common challenge relates to interpreting the answers. Despite relying on standard questions, studies often measure and rank women's participation in household decision-making differently and this

²¹ Glennerster et al (2018).

²² Peterman et al (2021).

tends to be because of how studies handle joint decision-making. It is unclear whether women making decisions alone is a sign of their empowerment or if joint decision-making is preferable since it is a sign of an equitable, inclusive, and communicative relationship.²³ Thus, “jointness” may reflect either cooperation within the couple or the imposition of the dominant partner’s views and preferences.²⁴ Generally, joint decision-making is considered to be appropriate for productive decisions or those involving household assets and expenditures, while independent decision-making is more appropriate for personal decisions, such as the use of family planning or the free expression of religious beliefs.²⁵

Based on these considerations, the guide proposes two questions to measure input into decisions as an essential WGE indicator. The proposed questions are adapted from the [Women’s Empowerment in Agriculture Index \(WEAI\)](#)²⁶ by collapsing a series of four questions into two and, following the Africa GIL example, adding reproductive rights as a decision-making domain. The resulting questions ask the respondents who in the household normally makes decisions in different domains as well as the extent to which the respondents feel that they could make their own decisions in each domain if that was what they wanted. Thus, the questions focus on the extent of input that respondents have, not just on the identity of the decision-maker.

TABLE 3. Measuring Input into Household Decisions (Agency)

Input into decisions	
Measures women’s household decision-making ability, demonstrating changes in their ability to make choices and decisions over important aspects of their lives.	
<p>Q1. How much input do you have in making decisions about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. How income you earn is spent? b. How household income is spent? c. Major household expenses? d. Childbearing?* e. Children’s education? 	<p>Response categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1= Makes decision alone 2= Has no input or has input into only a few decisions 3= Has input into some decisions 4= Has input into most or all decisions 5= Not applicable/no decision made
<p>Q2. (If 2, 3, or 4 to Q1) To what extent do you feel you can make your own decisions regarding [ITEM] if you want(ed) to?</p> <p><i>Asked separately for each of the five decision types (a-e) in Q1 where the respondent selected a response of 2, 3, or 4.</i></p>	<p>Response categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1= Not at all 2= Small extent 3= Medium extent 4= To a high extent

Note: * This relates to decisions around whether or not to have children, the number of children, and the timing of their births.

23 If it is possible to interview both spouses in the household, this would shed light on their decision-making dynamics. Decision-making questions are usually only administered to women. However, available evidence (particularly in the field of reproductive health) suggests that valuable knowledge can be gleaned from interviewing both spouses in a household, since men’s own perceptions are likely to play a critical role in women’s agency.

24 Donald et al (2017).

25 See [Measuring Women’s Goal Setting and Decision-Making](#) for a more in-depth discussion of knowledge gaps in the measurement of women’s goal setting and decision-making, both within and outside the household, and how the World Bank’s Measures for Advancing Gender Equality (MAGNET) initiative plans to fill them.

26 Launched in 2012 by the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI), the Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative (OPHI), and USAID.

INDICATOR 3: Self-efficacy (Agency)

Measuring changes in agency should also capture a woman’s perceived ability to achieve her goals.²⁷

To understand how women arrive at decisions based on their own goals and preferences, it is important to assess their sense of control. This is typically measured using two indicators: (i) the locus of control, defined as the degree to which individuals believe that events are caused by their own behavior rather than external factors; and (ii) self-efficacy, or the belief in one’s ability to act effectively towards a goal.²⁸ The key difference, and reason for prioritizing self-efficacy as an essential indicator, is that even if individuals believe that outcomes can be influenced by their behavior or responses (internal locus of control), they will not attempt to exert control unless they also believe that they themselves can produce the requisite responses (high self-efficacy).

Self-efficacy can be measured using either domain-specific or generalized approaches. In the domain-specific definition, self-efficacy is measured by asking respondents about their confidence in their ability to complete specific actions in a specific context. The generalized definition measures self-efficacy by assessing people’s overall confidence that they can succeed at tasks and in situations, without specifying the details of these tasks or situations. Measures of generalized self-efficacy, using either the original 20-point General Self-Efficacy Scale²⁹ or newer and shorter variants,³⁰ have been shown to yield high internal consistencies and are commonly used in research across the world.

Few domain-specific self-efficacy tools have been validated in the Africa region. There is a strong case to be made in favor of using task- or activity-specific measures of perceived self-efficacy when evaluating the effects of a specific program.³¹ The versions of these tools that have so far been used in developing countries have focused on entrepreneurship and health. For instance, a 10-point scale has been developed to measure entrepreneurial self-efficacy in Kenya.³² Similarly, the Condom Use Self-Efficacy Scale is frequently used in health psychology studies in HIV-affected areas across the continent. However, there are no self-efficacy scales specific to agriculture, self-employment in the informal sector, or other economic activities in which SPJ beneficiaries typically engage that have been validated for use in African contexts. Innovative research to develop and test new scales to capture the sense of personal agency is underway.³³

The guide, therefore, proposes an eight-point generalized self-efficacy scale. One of the guide’s key goals is to facilitate comparisons across the SPJ Africa portfolio, making a generalized self-efficacy scale that has been validated in the African context the most appropriate measurement tool. Specifically, the guide proposes that projects adopt the [New General Self-Efficacy Scale](#), which uses a shorter list of items

27 A more complete measurement of agency requires complementary indicators. There are three crucial elements of women’s and girls’ agency that should be measured: (i) their ability to set goals in accordance with their values regarding a particular issue or decision; (ii) whether they perceive themselves as being able to achieve these goals; and (iii) whether they are able to act towards achieving these goals. See Donald et al (2017) for a more detailed analysis and a proposed framework for the variables needed to measure agency.

28 Bandura (1982).

29 Schwarzer and Jerusalem (1995).

30 Chen et al (2001).

31 Pajares (1996).

32 It includes questions on the business owner’s confidence in their ability to perform key business activities, such as coming up with ideas for new products, selling a product to a customer they are meeting for the first time, and persuading a bank to lend them money for their business (McKenzie and Puerto, 2017).

33 See [Measuring Women’s Sense of Control and Efficacy](#) for a more in-depth discussion of knowledge gaps in the measurement of women’s sense of control over their economic lives, control over time allocation, and collective agency and how the World Bank’s Measures for Advancing Gender Equality (MAGNET) initiative plans to fill them.

than used in the original scale.³⁴ It includes eight statements, and respondents rate the extent to which they agree with each one.

TABLE 4. Measuring Self-efficacy (Agency)

Self-efficacy	
Measures women's and girls' self-efficacy, or their belief in their ability to produce the relevant actions to act effectively towards their goals.	
<p>Q3. Please listen to each of the following statements. Think about how each statement relates to your life, and then tell me how much you agree or disagree with the statement on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 means you “strongly disagree” and 5 means you “strongly agree.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. I will be able to achieve most of the goals that I set for myself. b. When facing difficult tasks, I am certain that I will accomplish them. c. In general, I think that I can obtain outcomes that are important to me. d. I believe I can succeed at almost any endeavor to which I set my mind. e. I will be able to successfully overcome many challenges. f. I am confident that I can perform many different tasks effectively. g. Compared to other people, I can do most tasks very well. h. Even when things are tough, I can perform quite well. 	<p>Response categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1= Strongly disagree 2= Disagree 3= Neither agree nor disagree 4= Agree 5= Strongly agree

INDICATOR 4: Sharing of Housework (Context)

The division of household tasks is one of the main predictors of social norms as they relate to WGE.

Girls and women tend to be responsible for household chores and for taking care of children and the elderly. Their ability to achieve their goals is often restricted by the burden of this care work. Encouraging a more equitable distribution of care and housework between men and women is, therefore, critical for changing household power dynamics and achieving WGE. While the context pillar has many dimensions, the sharing of housework is one of the aspects most likely to be influenced by SPJ interventions, which are increasingly including activities to engage men and encourage a more equal division of both productive and care work.

The indicator proposed by the guide measures the sharing of housework between spouses. A simple question, also used by the Africa GIL, probes the extent to which the respondent and her spouse/partner share responsibility for preparing food, cleaning the house, washing clothes, and taking care of children. Since the indicator focuses on unequal gender relations at the household level, it is not applicable to female-headed households or households with only one adult or parent.³⁵

³⁴ The scale has also been adopted by IFPRI's project-level WEAI (pro-WEAI) tool.

³⁵ Projects targeting female-headed households or that include a large share of female-headed households should consider alternative ways to measure changes in gendered social norms and institutions. These could involve adding indicators of social stigma or discrimination against widows, unmarried women, or single mothers. Depending on the context and the specific activities, projects could also involve indicators that measure restrictions on mobility or access to services.

TABLE 5. Measuring the Sharing of Housework (Context)

Sharing of housework

Measures the sharing of household tasks, demonstrating changes in household relationships and shifts in gendered roles and responsibilities.

Q6. If you disregard the help that you receive from other household members, how do you and your spouse/partner divide the following tasks?

- a. Preparing food
- b. Cleaning the house and washing clothes
- c. Taking care of children

Response categories:

- 1= I do everything
- 2= I usually do it
- 3= It is shared equally or done together
- 4= My partner usually does it
- 5= My partner does everything





4 MEASUREMENT OF THE ESSENTIAL INDICATORS

This section provides practical guidance on the collection and analysis of the data needed to measure the essential WGE indicators. Table 6 below describes how each indicator is defined based on the specific questions discussed in Section 3. Two measures are proposed for each indicator: (i) a continuous measure to indicate the extent to which the respondent is empowered in each particular dimension, and (ii) a binary measure to indicate whether the respondent meets a pre-determined empowerment threshold. The two measures are complementary, expressing change along either the intensive or extensive margin (such as how much say do women with input into household decisions have versus how many additional women have any input into household decisions). The data collected from the proposed questions can be used to construct other measures that may be relevant to the specific project.³⁶ The guidance given here on how to construct the variables is meant to facilitate measurement and should not be seen as exhaustive.

The questions associated with the essential WGE indicators should be administered to female project beneficiaries. The data should be collected from a sample of beneficiaries through a survey as opposed to being included on M&E forms applied to all project beneficiaries (such as attendance lists). Ideally, the respondents should be randomly selected from multiple locations to make the exercise objective and representative. Information on respondents' socio-demographic characteristics, such as their age, education level, and marital status, should be collected for heterogeneity analysis. If it is also possible to administer the questions to male respondents, the sex of the respondent should be recorded. This would make it possible to identify gender gaps in the context of the project.

To track progress towards WGE, the essential indicators should be measured through surveys both before and after respondents have participated in the project. While the proposed set of questions are less demanding to implement than the household surveys carried out for impact evaluations, they would still involve additional time and data collection capacity than most routine M&E processes.³⁷ Given the relatively low marginal cost of adding questions to a survey, the WGE essential indicators could be combined with surveys designed to capture beneficiary feedback or to collect other information directly from beneficiaries. Finally, it is important to collect at least baseline and endline data (i.e., before and after participation in project activities) from the same respondents to capture any possible shifts in the measured aspects of empowerment related to the project.³⁸

³⁶ The question on asset ownership has the potential to yield information not only on access to resources overall but also on, for example, the share of beneficiaries who own mobile phones if the project is transitioning to digital payments and this piece of information is of interest.

³⁷ The estimated time needed to administer the four proposed questions is 15 to 20 minutes per respondent.

³⁸ The analysis should recognize that empowerment is a complex and dynamic process that may take longer than the duration of the project to fully materialize.

When using the essential WGE indicators, it is crucial to keep key stakeholders in the country engaged throughout the process. Client ownership of the WGE agenda is necessary to generate support for the collection of necessary data and to minimize any challenges if the results do not yield a positive picture of the state of WGE in the country. Ensuring that project implementers are clear about the indicators in terms of the data required, the tools to be used, and the analysis for which they are being collected is paramount. This may involve a need to build the capacity of local teams, particularly those with little experience of quantitative methods of data collection.

TABLE 6. Constructing the Indicators

Definition	Construction
Input into decisions	
<p>Q1. How much input do you have in making decisions about:</p> <p>(a) How the income you earn is spent? (b) How household income is spent? (c) Major household expenses? (d) Childbearing? (e) Children's education?</p> <p>1= Make decision alone. 2= Have No input or input into only a few decisions 3= Have input into some decisions 4= Have input into most or all decisions 5= Not applicable/no decision made</p> <p>Q2. (If 2, 3, or 4 to Q1) To what extent do you feel you can make your own personal decisions regarding [ITEM] if you want(ed) to?</p> <p>1= Not at all 2= To a limited extent 3= To a medium extent 4= To a considerable extent</p>	<p><u>Step 1: Map the responses to binary values:</u> For each of the five decisions (a-e), construct a variable that takes the value 1 if Q1 = 1 (solely) or 3-4 (at least some input) OR Q2 = 3-4 (to at least a medium extent). Set the variable to 0 if Q1=2 (no input) and set the variable to missing if the decision is not applicable to the household (Q1 = 5).</p> <p><u>Step 2: Convert the five binary variables into one value:</u> Sum the five (a-e) decision-specific variables to obtain an index of the total <i>number of decisions</i> into which the respondent has input. Count the number of <i>applicable decisions</i> for the household, namely the number of times that the response to Q1 is different from "5."</p> <p><u>Step 3: Create the monitoring indicator</u> <i>Continuous:</i> Compute the <i>ratio</i> between the <i>number of decisions</i> into which the respondent has input and the total number of <i>applicable decisions</i>.</p> <p><i>Binary:</i> If the <i>ratio</i> is 1, the respondent is considered as having input into decisions, and the binary variable takes a value of 1. If the ratio is less than one, the respondent is considered to not have full input into all decisions, and the binary variable takes a value of 0.</p>

Definition	Construction
Self-efficacy	
<p>Q3. Please listen to each of the following statements. Think about how each statement relates to your life, and then tell me how much you agree or disagree with the statement on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 means you “strongly disagree” and 5 means you “strongly agree.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. I will be able to achieve most of the goals that I set for myself. b. When facing difficult tasks, I am certain that I will accomplish them. c. In general, I think that I can obtain outcomes that are important to me. d. I believe I can succeed at almost any endeavor to which I set my mind. e. I will be able to successfully overcome many challenges. f. I am confident that I can perform many different tasks effectively. g. Compared to other people, I can do most tasks very well. h. Even when things are tough, I can perform quite well. <p>1= Strongly disagree 2= Disagree 3= Neither agree nor disagree 4= Agree 5= Strongly agree</p>	<p><i>Continuous:</i> Sum all eight items (Q3 a-h). The resulting score will range between 8 and 40, with a higher score indicating more self-efficacy.</p> <p><i>Binary:</i> The respondent is considered to have high self-efficacy if they “agree” or “strongly agree” on average with the self-efficacy statements. Thus, their self-efficacy score will be greater than or equal to 32.</p>

Definition	Construction
Asset ownership	
<p>Q4. Does anyone in your household currently have [ITEM]?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Mats or bed b. Bicycle c. Motorcycle/scooter d. Mobile phone e. Radio f. Television. <p>1= Yes 2= No</p> <p>Q5. Do you own any of these items (in other words, can sell, rent out, give away, purchase new)? Asked separately for each of the six asset categories with 'Yes' responses in Q4.</p> <p>1= Yes, alone 2= Yes, jointly with spouse 3= Yes, jointly with other household member(s) 4= No</p>	<p><i>Continuous:</i> For each asset owned by the household (Q4 = 1), count the number of assets owned alone, jointly with the spouse, or jointly with other household members (Q5 = 1, 2, or 3). The index will range between 0 and the number of assets owned (6 maximum).</p> <p><i>Binary:</i> The asset index is greater than 0, indicating that the respondent owns at least one asset.</p>
Sharing of housework	
<p>Q6. If you disregard the help that you receive from other household members, how do you and your spouse/partner divide the following tasks?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Preparing food b. Cleaning the house and washing clothes c. Taking care of children. <p>1= I do everything. 2= I usually do it. 3= It is shared equally or done together. 4= My partner usually does it. 5= My partner does everything</p>	<p><i>Continuous:</i> Sum the answers for the three tasks. The score will range between 3 and 15, with a higher score indicating greater involvement by the spouse or partner.</p> <p><i>Binary:</i> The sharing of housework is considered equal if the score ranges between 6 and 12.</p>

5 CONCLUSIONS



The list of essential indicators presented in this guide is designed to simplify and standardize how WGE can be conceptualized and measured in World Bank SPJ operations. Systematically measuring the same indicators across projects can provide a broader understanding of the extent to which SPJ interventions promote WGE. However, the essential indicators should be considered to be the minimum needed to measure changes in WGE among beneficiaries, and project teams are encouraged to add other intervention- and country-specific indicators. The essential indicators were selected in accordance with measurement best practice as well as with reference to typical SPJ interventions and target populations. Thus, the indicators should be applicable to most SPJ operations in the Africa region that aim to empower girls and women.

While M&E plays a critical role in ensuring the quality of project implementation and in monitoring outcomes over time, impact evaluations are needed to establish causality. Routine measurements taken by the project team can yield information on any changes in resources, agency, and context simply by comparing the project's baseline and endline values (for example, the value of the assets owned and controlled by women beneficiaries). However, impact evaluations are also needed to attribute the observed changes to the specific intervention or project activity. By randomly assigning participants in a specific intervention into groups, impact evaluations can compare groups of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries that were statistically identical at the baseline. Any differences observed over time can thus be attributed to the intervention. Therefore, while the essential WGE indicators proposed in the guide should be integrated into routine M&E processes, the project may also want to commission an independent impact evaluation.

Empowerment is a dynamic process that takes time. Unlike with other indicators, such as the number of beneficiaries receiving cash transfers or the share who report that their consumption has increased, assessing progress towards WGE is complicated by the multitude of factors that can influence it. Capturing changes across the three pillars of resources, agency, and context is thus essential even when project activities focus on just one or two of the pillars. Moreover, empowerment is a dynamic process that may not follow a linear trajectory or be achieved within the project timeframe. This does not undermine the importance of measuring progress but highlights the need to set realistic and measurable targets.

REFERENCES

- Bandura, Albert, 1982. "Self-Efficacy Mechanism in Human Agency." *American Psychologist*, 37, 122-147.
- Botea, Ioana, Wendy Cunningham, and Lindsay Mossman, 2022. "Empowering Women and Girls through Social Protection: Highlights from Africa SPJ." World Bank, Washington, D.C. *Mimeo*
- Cattell, Maria G., 2003. "African Widows: Anthropological and Historical Perspectives," *Journal of Women & Aging*, 15:2-3, 49-66.
- Chen, G., S.M. Gully, and D. Eden, 2001. "New General Self-Efficacy Scale (NGSE)." APA PsycTests, American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C.
- Cunningham, Wendy and Sarika Gupta, 2022. "An Operational Approach to Enhancing Women's and Girls' Empowerment in World Bank Operations," World Bank, Washington, D.C. *Mimeo*
- Donald, Aletheia, Gayatri Koolwal, Jeannie Annan, Kathryn Falb, and Markus Goldstein, 2017. "Measuring Women's Agency." Policy Research Working Paper No. 8148. World Bank, Washington, DC.
- Doss, Cheryl, Caitlin Kieran, and Talip Kilic, 2020. "Measuring Ownership, Control, and Use of Assets." *Feminist Economics*, 26:3, 144-168
- Glennerster, Rachel, Claire Walsh, and Lucia Diaz-Martin, 2018. "A Practical Guide to Measuring Women's and Girls' Empowerment in Impact Evaluations." J-PAL, Cambridge, MA.
- Heinemann, Alessandra, 2020. "Social Safety Nets and Gender: Portfolio Review." World Bank, Washington, D.C. *Mimeo*
- Kabeer, Naila, 1999. "Resources, Agency, Achievements: Reflections on the Measurement of Women's Empowerment." *Development and Change*, 30: 435-464.
- McKenzie, David and Susana Puerto, 2017. "Growing Markets Through Business Training for Female Entrepreneurs: A Market-Level Randomized Experiment in Kenya." *Sustainability at Work eJournal*.
- Pajares, Frank, 1996. "Self-Efficacy Beliefs in Academic Settings." *Review of Educational Research*. 66(4):543-578.
- Peterman, Amber, Audrey Pereira, Jennifer Bleck, Tia M. Palermo, and Kathryn M. Yount, 2017. "Women's Individual Asset Ownership and Experience of Intimate Partner Violence: Evidence From 28 International Surveys." *American Journal of Public Health*, 107(5), 747-755.
- Peterman, Amber, Benjamin Schwab, Shalini Roy, Melissa Hidrobo, and Daniel O. Gilligan, 2021. "Measuring Women's Decision-Making: Indicator Choice and Survey Design Experiments from Cash and Food Transfer Evaluations in Ecuador, Uganda, and Yemen." *World Development*, Volume 141.
- Schwarzer, R., and M. Jerusalem, 1995. "Generalized Self-Efficacy Scale." In J. Weinman, S. Wright, & M. Johnston (Eds.), *Measures in Health Psychology: A User's Portfolio. Causal and Control Beliefs* (pp. 35-37).
- World Bank, 2015. "World Bank Group Gender Strategy (FY16-23): Gender Equality, Poverty Reduction and Inclusive Growth." Washington, D.C.
- World Bank, 2019. "Africa Human Capital Plan." Washington, D.C. [Access here](#).

ANNEX 1:



WGE MEASUREMENT RESOURCES

Measurement

- Alsop, Ruth and Nina Heinsohn, 2005. “Measuring Empowerment in Practice: Structuring Analysis and Framing Indicators.” World Bank, Washington, D.C.
- Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, 2018. “What Gets Measured Matters: A Methods Note for Measuring Women and Girls’ Empowerment.” Seattle, WA.
- Bloom, S. S. and S. Negroustoueva, 2014. “Compendium of Gender Equality and HIV Indicators.” UNAIDS, UN Women, USAID, PEPFAR, and MEASURE Evaluation.
- Buvinic, Mayra, Megan O’Donnell, James Knowles, and Shelby Bourgault, 2020. “Measuring Women’s Economic Empowerment; A Compendium of Selected Tools,” Data2X & Center for Global Development.
- Donald, Aletheia, and Markus Goldstein, 2020. “The Africa Gender Innovation Lab’s Core Empowerment Indicators: Developing a Cross-Country Module to Complement Context-Specific Measures.” Gender Innovation Lab, World Bank, Washington, D.C.
- Glennerster, Rachel, Claire Walsh, and Lucia Diaz-Martin, 2018. “A Practical Guide to Measuring Women’s and Girls’ Empowerment in Impact Evaluations.” J-PAL, Cambridge, MA.
- Knowles, James, 2015. “Monitoring and Evaluation Guidelines for Women’s Economic Empowerment Programs.” Prepared as a companion to the report, “Measuring Women’s Economic Empowerment”, published by the United Nations Foundation and the ExxonMobil Foundation.
- Laszlo, Sonia and Kate Grantham, 2017. “Measurement of Women’s Economic Empowerment in GrOW Projects: Inventory and User Guide.” GrOW Working Paper Series GWP-2017-08- Research Report, Growth and Opportunity for Women program, Institute for the Study of International Development (ISID), McGill University, Montreal, Canada.
- Lombardini Simone, Kimberly Bowman, and Rosa Garwood, 2017. “A ‘How To’ Guide for Measuring Women’s Empowerment: Sharing Experiences from Oxfam’s Impact Evaluations.” Methodological Paper. Oxfam GB.
- Malapit, Hazel J., Chiara Kovarik, Kathryn Sproule, Ruth Suseela Meinzen-Dick, and Agnes R. Quisumbing, 2020. “Instructional Guide on the Abbreviated Women’s Empowerment in Agriculture Index (A-WEAI).” International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI), Washington, D.C.
- Peterman, Amber, 2015. “Women’s Economic Empowerment: Indicators and Survey Design.” Presented at the Poppov Annual Conference: Methods Workshop, Addis Ababa.

Agency

- Bandura, Albert, 1982. “Self-Efficacy Mechanism in Human Agency.” *American Psychologist*, 37, 122-147.
- Chen, G., S.M. Gully, and D. Eden, 2001. “New General Self-Efficacy Scale (NGSE).” APA PsycTests, American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C.

- 
- 
- Donald, Aletheia, Gayatri Koolwal, Jeannie Annan, Kathryn Falb, and Markus Goldstein, 2017. "Measuring Women's Agency." Policy Research Working Paper No. 8148. World Bank, Washington, DC.
- Ibrahim, Solava and Sabina Alkire, 2007. "Agency and Empowerment: A Proposal for Internationally Comparable Indicators." OPHI Working Paper Series, The Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative, Oxford Department of International Development, University of Oxford, UK.
- McKenzie, David and Susana Puerto, 2017. "Growing Markets Through Business Training for Female Entrepreneurs: A Market-Level Randomized Experiment in Kenya." *Sustainability at Work eJournal*.
- Pajares, Frank, 1996. "Self-Efficacy Beliefs in Academic Settings." *Review of Educational Research*. 66(4):543-578.
- Peterman, Amber, Benjamin Schwab, Shalini Roy, Melissa Hidrobo, and Daniel O. Gilligan, 2021. "Measuring Women's Decision-Making: Indicator Choice and Survey Design Experiments from Cash and Food Transfer Evaluations in Ecuador, Uganda, and Yemen." *World Development*, Volume 141.
- Schwarzer, R., and M. Jerusalem, 1995. "Generalized Self-Efficacy Scale" in J. Weinman, S. Wright, and M. Johnston, *Measures in health psychology: A user's portfolio. Causal and control beliefs* (pp. 35-37). NFER-Nelson, Windsor, UK.
- Wales, Joseph, 2016. "Women and Power: What Can the Numbers Tell Us About Women's Voice, Leadership, and Decision-Making?" Overseas Development Institute (ODI), London, UK.

Resources

- Doss, Cheryl, Caitlin Kieran, and Talip Kilic, 2020. "Measuring Ownership, Control, and Use of Assets." *Feminist Economics*, 26:3, 144-168
- Peterman, Amber, Audrey Pereira, Jennifer Bleck, Tia M. Palermo, and Kathryn M. Yount, 2017. "Women's Individual Asset Ownership and Experience of Intimate Partner Violence: Evidence From 28 International Surveys." *American Journal of Public Health*, 107(5), 747-755.
- Rao, Smirti, 2016. "Indicators of Gendered Control Over Agricultural Resources: A Guide for Agricultural Policy and Research." CGIAR GENDER Platform and Agriculture Research Network, Montpellier, France.
- Seymour, Greg, Hazel J. Malapit, and Agnes R. Quisumbing, 2017. "Measuring Time Use in Development Settings." World Bank, Washington, D.C.

Context

- Bicchieri, Cristina, and Penn Social Norms Training and Consulting Group, 2015. "Why People Do What They Do?: A Social Norms Manual for Zimbabwe and Swaziland." UNICEF Innocenti, Florence, Italy.
- CARE, 2017. "Applying Theory to Practice: CARE's Journey Piloting Social Norms Measures for Gender Programming." CARE International, Geneva, Switzerland.
- Mackie, Gerry, Francesca Moneti, Holly Shakya, and Elaine Denny, 2015. "What Are Social Norms and How Are They Measured?" Center on Global Justice, UNICEF/University of California, San Diego, CA.
- Malhotra, Anju, 2003. "Conceptualizing and Measuring Women's Empowerment as a Variable in International Development." International Centre for Research on Women (ICRW) and the World Bank Group, Washington, D.C.

