

Contents

<i>Preface</i>	xi
CHAPTER 1. Craft Specialization and the Comparative Advantages of Gender <i>Sophia E. Kelly and Traci Ardren</i>	3
CHAPTER 2. Political, Social, Economic, and Ideological Dimensions in the Late Pre-Hispanic Gendered Division of Labor on the North Coast of Peru <i>Cathy Lynne Costin</i>	27
CHAPTER 3. Crafting Feminine Subjects: A Diachronic Interrogation of Gendered Production in the Andes <i>Pilar Margarita Hernández Escontrías</i>	61
CHAPTER 4. The Artisans of Terminal Classic Xuenkal, Yucatan, Mexico: Gender and Craft during a Time of Economic Change <i>Traci Ardren, Alejandra Alonso Olvera, and T. Kam Manahan</i>	91

CHAPTER 5.		
	Gendered Labor in Pottery and Salt Production in Northeast Thailand	
	<i>Alisha Halliwell, Andrea Yankowski, and Nigel Chang</i>	117
CHAPTER 6.		
	Complementary Crafts: The Dynamics of Multicraft Production in Banda, Ghana	
	<i>Ann Brower Stahl</i>	159
CHAPTER 7.		
	Characterizing the Gendered Division of Labor within a Hohokam Specialized Economy	
	<i>Sophia E. Kelly and James M. Heidke</i>	191
CHAPTER 8.		
	The Mobile Woman: Using Ethnoarchaeology to Build Models of Women's Labor Contribution to Craft Production	
	<i>Laura A. Swantek</i>	239
CHAPTER 9.		
	Observations on Invisible Producers: Engendering Pre-Columbian Maya Ceramic Production	
	<i>Michael G. Callaghan</i>	267
CHAPTER 10.		
	Gender, Craft Production, and the State: Problems with "Workshops"	
	<i>Brigitte Kovacevich</i>	301
CHAPTER 11.		
	From Warp and Weft to Spear and Spindle: Gender Identity and Textile Manufacture in Early Anglo-Saxon England	
	<i>Sue Harrington</i>	339

CHAPTER 12.

A Comparative Perspective on Gender in
Specialized Economies: Craft Specialization,
Kinship, and Technology

<i>Rita P. Wright</i>	369
<i>Contributors</i>	395
<i>Index</i>	397

COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL
NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION

Prehistoric economic relationships are often presented in a genderless manner. Archaeological treatments of gender remain cautious of examining the myriad ways gender is implicated in economies of the ancient world. In recent decades, however, research on the economics of gendered labor in contemporary societies has grown alongside archaeological methods used to delineate the organization of craft production in premodern cultures. Previous research demonstrated that the division of labor along gendered lines is often a fundamental way work was organized in prehistoric societies, and these work habits, in turn, created and maintained gendered ideals (Ardren 2002; Bolger 2008; Brumfiel 1991; Costin 1998; Costin and Wright 1998; Crown 2000; Gilchrist 1999; Hastorf 1991; Hendon 1997; Joyce 2009; Nelson 2007; Sørensen 2000; Watson and Kennedy 1998; Wright 1996). An understanding of how work was structured in ancient communities along such axes as gender or age can provide critical insight on the processes of economic intensification and growth in the past.

This volume combines the study of gender in the archaeological record with the examination of intensified craft production in prehistory. We define gender as the socially recognized ways in which the differences between bodies are understood by cultures. Such ideas are circulated and reinforced through a shared understanding of the behaviors, spaces, and abilities considered appropriate for each gender (Moore 1996). Specialized craft production, which is often defined

*Craft Specialization
and the Comparative
Advantages of Gender*

SOPHIA E. KELLY
AND TRACI ARDREN

DOI: 10.5876/9781607324836.c001

as “production above the needs of the household for purposes of exchange” (Spielmann 1998:1), is a pervasive and powerful mechanism for the circulation and reinforcement of gendered values. Each of the collected chapters presents a reassessment of the connection between craft specialization and the types and amount of work that men and women performed in ancient communities. These studies consider how changes to the gendered division of labor in craft manufacture impacted other types of production, or resulted from changes to the organization of production elsewhere in the economic system.

Gendered Labor in Specialized Economies contributes to an engendered archaeology by focusing on the interplay between gender identity, task division in production activities, and the development of specialized economic systems in ancient societies. While the anthropological literature has explored the relationships between gender identity and gendered tasks and the relationship between gendered tasks, craft specialization, and economic change, these treatments have largely shied away from addressing the implications for the development of specialized economic systems. The contributions in this volume argue that we cannot discuss craft specialization without understanding the gendered dynamics of production that were, or were not, at play in specific historical moments. The approach that we present here builds upon earlier edited volumes that addressed gender or prehistoric economies as separate topics and seeks to advance our understanding of the many ways gender is implicated in the complex economies of the ancient world. By focusing on a diverse range of research topics across cultures—from Africa to Asia—and moving beyond the justification of gender as an important component of ancient societies, this volume interrogates and explains new social phenomena. While for many years researchers had to present the argument that gender was a worthy subject, that women were just as capable as men in performing many productive tasks, and that female work was often “hidden,” we move forward from such foundational contributions to ask new questions (Gero and Conkey 1991; Gilchrist 1999; Nelson 1997; Wright 1996). In particular, these contributions move beyond labeling activities as male or female and focus on how the concept of gender was integral to prehistoric economies. The research presented here explores how understanding social difference through the lens of gender provided advantages to ancient societies, especially in the organization of labor and the development of craft specialization. These case studies provide a detailed and empirical basis for exploring how gender is implicated in the organization of production, but also how work habits or expectations naturalize and perpetuate an understanding of gender. First, we introduce the concept of comparative advantages as a means to frame how gender may have intersected with the development of specialized production.

GOING BEYOND THE DIVISION OF LABOR: COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGES AND CRAFT SPECIALIZATION

Craft specialization represents a critical change in economic relationships among households. Specialization, which is often defined as “production above the needs of the household for purposes of exchange” (Spielmann 1998:1), is one form of economic intensification. The process of intensification occurs when a division of labor reduces the number of craftspeople while the number of craft objects manufactured remains the same or increases (after Hunt 2000; Morrison 1994:115; Turner and Doolittle 1978). The material evidence of intensification, especially craft specialization, has been of great interest to archaeologists as an indication of evolving social complexity.

Changes to the level of specialization within a society are typically described in the economic literature using the concept of comparative advantage. Recently, archaeologists have employed the concept of comparative advantage to address the emergence and development of specialized craft production within ancient economies (Algaze 2005, 2008:23, 29–30, 35, 63, 148; Earle 2000:49; Rouse and Weeks 2011; Rowlands 1998:219; Scheidel 2010; Shennan 1999; 2011:207; Smith 2007; Tibbett 2004; Watts 2011). Here, we explore the utility of comparative advantage as an economic concept that may inform our thinking on the role of gendered ideals in the development of specialized production in archaeological cases. By examining the concept of comparative advantage, we are not discounting traditional anthropological approaches to the study of economic systems as social systems that produce goods, relationships, and social identities. We do not advance this theory in lieu of anthropological explanations, or counter to it, or even as a complete model; we present a suggestion about one possible factor in the development of a gendered division of labor. The intention is to offer the concept of comparative advantage as a perspective that can be incorporated along with other approaches into treatments of economic systems. One benefit to addressing economic development using this concept is that it might contribute to synthetic and cross-cultural examinations of gender as a fundamental structuring principle of economies. While the social embeddedness of economic systems is clearly documented, certain guiding principles structure economic relationships. Comparative advantage may possibly be one of these features that might help expand models beyond regionally, temporally, and situation-specific conditions.

Comparative advantages to specialization are the ability of one person to produce an item at a lower overall marginal or opportunity cost than another person (Ricardo 1817). The “cost” incurred by devoting time to specialized

production is measured in terms of the other activities to which a person would have devoted their efforts and attention. By investing more of their time to a specialized activity than to a range of different activities, someone could maximize their comparative advantage and incur a lower opportunity cost in the production of a particular good. By specializing in pottery production, for instance, a person may be able to produce more pots per unit time than they would be able to produce a range of other items. Greater time investment in a particular productive activity, however, requires that the specialist rely on others for goods that they are not producing. At a low level, this might simply mean relying on other members of an extended household for items. At a larger scale, the specialist must obtain goods through exchange with others. This arrangement is risky if these goods are necessary for daily domestic functions, exchange networks are irregular, or transport and transaction costs are high.

INTERNAL COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGES: ECONOMIES OF SPECIALIZATION

Comparative advantage can be divided into external and internal, or exogenously and endogenously derived, advantages. Most modern economists argue that internal comparative advantages are the main cause of changes to the division of labor within societies (Yang 2001). Internal comparative advantages are a result of economies of specialization, where an increase in the level of specialization results in increasing returns or productivity. In contrast to economies of specialization, productivity increases when economies of scale are determined by the number of producers rather than the division of labor within a society or the levels of specialization of the producers. In economies of specialization, as an individual chooses a higher level of specialization, their output per unit time, or productivity, will increase. In other words, when an individual focuses more of their time and attention to a particular production task and less or no time to other production tasks, they will be able to generate more goods in a shorter period of time.

Internal comparative advantages explain production increases with specialization even if all individuals have identical access to resources or aptitudes. The level of division of labor in a society is the “aggregate outcome” of individual choices regarding (1) specific activities (occupation), (2) time devoted to particular activities (level of specialization), and (3) allocation of resources to these activities (Yang 2001:8–9).

An increase in production with an increase in specialization (economies of specialization) is a result of an individual’s ability to increase returns through

learning while doing. Under these circumstances, individuals who specialize in a particular productive activity will become more proficient and skillful than individuals who engage in this activity less frequently (Blau 1977:188). Prehistorians have argued that specialists can produce more items with less labor by capitalizing on efficiencies in the production process (Blanton et al. 1982; Brumfiel et al. 1980; Lees and Bates 1974). Specialists conserve time and effort because they do not switch between different tasks (Maxwell 1721:33; Rashid 1986; Tucker 1755, 1774). Specialization also increases productivity by reducing fixed learning costs associated with redundant training and learning (Babbage 1977:170–74; Yang 2001:10) and by increasing the usability of fixed training and learning investments (Arrow 1979:154; Barzel and Yu 1984; Becker 1981). The division of labor along gender or other social categories encourages the development and use of different materials, machinery, and tools that can significantly boost production efficiency (Rae 1964:164–65, 352–57). Finally, the division of labor can allow a society to accumulate knowledge more quickly and contributes to a faster rate of innovation, as individuals perfect particular skills associated with their production activities (Ehn 2011:20; Yang and Ng 1993).

EXTERNAL COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGES: THE ROLE OF GENDER IN SPECIALIZED PRODUCTION

In the development of specialized economic systems where individuals devote more of their time to production for the purpose of exchange, gender becomes an important factor in the comparative advantages held by one person over another for specialized production of a particular item because gendered ideals naturalize skill and ability. Often, gender is deployed to explain different capacities and the comparative advantages one person holds over another are, in turn, used to create an understanding and experience of gender. External comparative advantages are differences in the productivity of two individuals in a particular activity that are caused by exogenous factors unrelated to their decisions regarding their activities or level of specialization (Yang 2003:59). These external factors (termed *ex ante* factors) may include age, gender, or access to particular resources and may contribute unequal benefits to certain individuals based on additional time investment in specialized production. Both internal comparative advantages, such as the cultural practice of gendered pottery production, and external comparative advantages, such as access to clay, may combine to generate further economic inequalities.

COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGES BASED ON SOCIETAL FACTORS

The status and identities of individuals associated with particular productive tasks provide the greatest external comparative advantages to the gendered division of labor in specialized production. In most cases, there is no physical or biological reason why either a man or a woman would perform particular craft production activities more efficiently or skillfully than the opposite sex (Crowley 1968:431–32). There are very few activities that men can perform more efficiently than women due to physical strength. In fact, women in traditional societies often perform some of the most strenuous tasks (Jasienska and Ellison 2004; Kramer and McMillan 1999; Kristof and McDonald 2010; Tinker 1982; Wisner 1981). Those activities that require extreme physical strength likely exclude many males as well as females. Craft production activities rarely involve heavy exertion but are characterized by punctuated periods of activity that require unique skill sets. Pregnancy, nursing, and child care may reduce the tasks that women perform during certain periods, and this sporadic inability to participate in some activities may contribute to a higher comparative advantage for women to take part in certain types of tasks (Watson and Kennedy 1998). Pottery production, for instance, involves bulky materials and multistage processing that requires intermittent attention over long periods of time. This type of work can coordinate well with domestic responsibilities. As a result, some women would have a greater comparative advantage than men to devote their time and attention to specialized pottery production if the locus of manufacture is in the home. In contrast, in societies where masculinity is understood to predispose men to nondomestic responsibilities, men would have to sacrifice work on other activities in order to accommodate the production cycle of ceramic manufacture. Thus, we can see that comparative advantages are often related to the identity of the person who would obtain the most credit for particular productive tasks based on the gendered values held within a culture. Gender is often an important criterion in organizing production, and craft producers are key agents in the reproduction of gendered ideals.

In most traditional and modern societies, either men or women are associated with particular productive tasks irrespective of whether or not both genders participate in different aspects of the manufacturing process (Kramer 1998; Neff 2002:39). For instance, although Navajo potters are traditionally women, men often help them with various facets of ceramic production (Tschochik 1941:45). While silversmithing is associated with men in Navajo culture, women participate in various stages of the production process (Adair 1944). Therefore, the official authorship of a bowl or a silver ring is assigned

to a woman or a man, respectively, despite the fact that other members of the household devote time and attention to helping the producer.

The perceived or idealized authorship of craft items provides comparative advantages to specialization in particular manufacturing tasks. If women receive official recognition for ceramic manufacture irrespective of whether or not men also participate, women will be more likely to devote more time to ceramic manufacture than men. Participation in ceramic manufacture, therefore, would contribute to the construction of a particular identity or status for female potters but would not confer any type of societal benefit to men who participate in the same activity. Similarly, women's participation in silversmithing, which is not considered a female task, would not confer advantages to specialized production by women. A woman who invested more time or attention to silversmithing would not receive the same societal recognition or credit as a man who engages in the same tasks because her actions fall outside idealized gendered expectations.

Comparative advantages to production by men or women are also often dictated by the locus of production. For instance, women in many societies receive greater comparative advantages than men to production within the home because their identities are often more closely tied to the domestic sphere. Conversely, women's work outside the domestic sphere is sometimes devalued because it does not relate to, or is in conflict with, their gendered identity (Federici 2004; Fortmann and Bruce 1988; Schroeder 1999). This is particularly evident in the production of items that have high economic importance, which are often associated with blurring in the sexual division of labor (Parezo 1982:127). In these cases, the equal participation of both men and women does not always translate to equal credit to both men and women. Martha C. Howell (1986) presents a convincing case that the increased role of female labor during economic expansion in medieval Europe did not confer to women the same higher statuses associated with that work. Women's status and identity was directly linked to their role in the family and as part of household productive activities. Therefore, for European women of this period, work outside the home, no matter how economically important, was not perceived as a significant contribution. In addition, work outside the home did not lessen the expectations for female work to be completed within the home.

There is no universal, inherent, or fixed advantage to the association of domestic activities and women's labor. On the contrary, the case studies in this volume document how gendered ideals and spatial arrangements of production are locked in a system of mutual reinforcement. Especially in the development of intensification, the ability of gender to naturalize

productive activities and make them seem inevitable is a powerful example of how comparative advantage arises from socially and historically specific cultural features.

KINSHIP, COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGE, AND GENDERED LABOR

Kinship systems often structure the gendered division of labor within a society and the comparative advantages to specialized production by influencing (1) incentives to the development of human capital, (2) residence patterns that enable knowledge transmission, and (3) inheritance rules that allow the amassing of goods and items. Each of these factors contributes to or reduces the comparative advantages to specialized production of particular goods by men, women, or other gender identities.

Human Capital

Kinship systems often affect the gendered division of labor in a society by emphasizing the human capital of members in particular social units. For instance, unilateral descent systems tend to incentivize the development of human capital through either the male or the female lineage because these investments represent resources that remain within the lineage (see Gneezy, Leonard, and List 2009; Wallaert-Pêtre 2008, 2012). While matrilineal matrilocal households have a conferred interest in developing economically valuable, high-skill tasks of girls because the woman's labor represents a resource that will remain within the household throughout her life, the human capital of women in patrilineal patrilocal descent and residence systems is often set in the context of her desirability in a marriage arrangement (e.g., bride price or dowry). The girl's labor will ultimately belong to the household of her husband and not to the household in which she is raised (Gneezy, Leonard, and List 2009:1640).

The connection between the development of human capital, kinship relationships, and craft production is demonstrated by when, how, and *if* men and women are trained in craft production techniques. In many cases, training in socially and economically valuable skills is conducted or refined by the household that ultimately benefits from a person's labor (e.g., Hunt 1962:199; Wallaert-Pêtre 2012). Michael Dietler and Ingrid Herbich (1994) note that among the exogamous, polygamous, patrilineal, and patrilocal Luo of Kenya, young girls assisted their mothers with unskilled tasks associated with ceramic production but were actively discouraged from learning pottery manufacturing techniques before marriage. It was only after marriage that the mother-in-law

trained a woman in pottery production techniques. In his ethnographic work in Mexico, Robert C. Hunt (1962:199) records that women who move to pottery producing villages after marriage learn ceramic techniques from their mother-in-law. In these cases, training by the husband's household on craft production indoctrinates the new wife to her economic and social role within the family.

Residence

Residence patterns dictated by the structure of descent systems may also play a large role in the comparative advantages to specialized production of particular goods by men or women. Specialized production often involves specific skills that require time and attention to learn (Wendrich 2006, 2012). Craft traditions often rely on informal or formal instruction in these techniques, and for this reason, specialized craft production is often organized around communities of practice (Lave 1991; Wallaert-Pêtre 1999; Wenger 1998). Knowledge of productive techniques is often restricted and taught to members of a particular group (Dilley 1989; Holdaway and Allen 2012). As Willeke Wendrich (2012:15–16) notes, “the family lineage that forms the core of the most common informal apprentice-tutor relations is a powerful stimulant for keeping the knowledge within and limited to the group.” Marriage practices that formalize a relationship between different households, particularly exogamous marriages between members of different social groups, influence the movement of men or women into new social units. A shift between the social group the person was born into to another social unit affects when and how men or women are trained in production techniques and can incentivize or limit opportunities for men or women to participate in the production of particular crafts.

Residence patterns often dictate household size. Household size has a large impact on the comparative advantages to specialized craft production by men and women. For instance, large households, where women from multiple generations reside and interact, can capitalize on this larger labor force when allocating tasks. In many traditional societies, older women who do not have child care responsibilities or work extensively outside of the residence area often conduct more sedentary, time-intensive craft production (Fontana et al. 1962:20; Underhill 1969:61). Karen Harry and Fred Huntington contend that large, multigenerational households that enabled women to coordinate tasks and create strong bonds with each other may have been critical to the household's capacity to participate in specialized ceramic production (Harry and Huntington 2010). These large households

would have been able to increase production of particular craft goods beyond the needs of the immediate family through a coordinated gendered division of labor (Huntington 1986).

Property Ownership

Finally, inheritance rules that govern the ownership and transfer of property can reflect, or have a strong influence over, the gendered division of labor within a household. Inheritance and property transfer are often endemically connected to the structure of kinship systems (Deere et al. 2012; La Ferrara 2006; Yngstrom 2002). Specialized production, which is the surplus production of goods for exchange outside of the household, is often directly tied to the household's economic participation in the greater community. As noted above, depending on the kinship structure, the skills and resources necessary to generate goods for exchange may be disproportionately controlled or allocated by kinship relations of a particular gender. For instance, in a patrilineal-descent system, the authority of the male relations in a lineage often structure household labor both within and external to the domestic area. H  l  ne Wallaert-P  tre (2012:31) notes that women in the patrilineal Dowayo society of Cameroon learn ceramic manufacturing techniques as girls; they must relearn pottery production from their mother-in-law after marriage in order to make and market wares. She notes that "this second apprenticeship aims at testing the social qualities and the submission of the wives to the authority of the new household. As long as the newcomer does not conform, she will not be allowed to sell her products." In this case, the control of property and access to economic opportunities by members of the male lineage affects the organization of ceramic production among female members of the household. Shifts to the organization of production that involve an increase in intensity or scale of production may encourage a gendered division of labor that emphasizes work by either men or women in a community.

Descent Systems

By structuring the development of human capital, residence, and resource ownership and inheritance, descent systems are an important factor in understanding the organization of production in past societies. Kinship shapes the opportunities that are made available to men and women, how they are socialized, how they are trained, the authority that they command, and their relationships with other members of their household. For instance, comparative research indicates that women are less competitive than men in patriarchal societies but more competitive than men in matriarchal societies (Gneezy,

Leonard, and List 2009). Productive tasks completed by men and women, even in social situations lacking asymmetry or hierarchy in gender relationships, are often complementary instead of overlapping (after Kent 1998; Sweely 1999).

Comparative advantages exist in the gendered division of labor by specialty even in contemporary American society. These comparative advantages are partially structured on a latent patrilineal kinship system. Although women and men are given equal opportunities and rights to pursue whatever professions they choose, large disparities exist in the representation of each gender within some occupations. For instance, many more women pursue degrees in elementary education than men. The percentage of male teachers in primary and secondary schools decreases relative to the age of the students. In 2011 secondary schools had the highest percentage of male teachers (42 percent). This percentage drops to 18 percent for elementary or primary schools and to only 2 percent for preschools and kindergartens (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics 2011). The high percentage of female teachers in early childhood education is linked to the much higher comparative advantages women receive in working with young children in comparison to men. Female gender identities in the United States are still linked closely with child care, and young women are given many opportunities to learn child care skills through the expectation that they are predisposed to such work. Therefore, working professionally with small children is a form of specialization that falls within the female gender ideal. This idealization is confirmed each time a woman chooses to pursue a degree in elementary education and enters a classroom full of other women.

In summary, comparative advantages to male or female specialization in particular craft production tasks in prehistory may provide the root explanation for why a gendered division of labor develops. The appearance of craft specialization in ancient economies most likely indicates a greater division of labor by gender in the completion of particular manufacturing tasks. Specialization requires a reorganization of effort, often with a spatial dimension, and gendered identity groups are one common mechanism for accomplishing this development. Ethnographic and modern examples indicate that societies with a highly structured gendered division of labor often include work where men and women assist one another with specialized tasks, but only credit the “authorship” of the manufactured item to one gender. The author receives public credit for their work, and their labor as a specialist contributes to their status or identity construction. In contrast, people of the opposite gender who assist the specialist receive little or no credit for their role. As a result, there are low comparative advantages to investing more time in this type of production.

CONSIDERING GENDERED LABOR IN SPECIALIZED ECONOMIES

The chapters in this volume are structured around four interrelated themes. Each theme was selected for its relevance to current engendered research in anthropology and its promise for providing significant contributions to the study of specialized economies. These themes build upon earlier research that made an argument for the primacy of gender as an organizing principle within ancient cultures and regionally specific studies of gendered relations (di Zerega 1994; Gero and Conkey 1991; Gilchrist 1999; Harrington 2008; Joyce 2009; Kent 1998; Nelson 1997; Owen 2005; Rothschild 1990; Sørensen 2000; Wright 1996). Through the exploration of a common subject—the economic role of gendered labor—the research presented in *Gendered Labor in Specialized Economies* makes theoretical and methodological connections that will be widely applicable to many time periods and regions of the world. While many of the chapters in the volume focus on ancient cultures of the New World, the composition of the volume is thematically based around topics that are broadly applicable to other geographic regions. These themes include craft specialization and economic development, multicrafting and connections between industries, the hidden producer, and gendered space. While a wide breadth of topics has been explored in the literature on ancient gendered relations, economic questions and analyses have been largely overlooked. Likewise, much current research on ancient economic systems does not sufficiently take into account the central role of gender in many prehistoric economies. A particularly important aspect of current research on gendered social identities is how such identities intersect with other social categories. We present a variety of detailed case studies that look carefully at how economic activities, especially craft production and specialization, shape and are shaped by gendered identities.

CRAFT SPECIALIZATION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The chapters in this theme explore economic intensification in the form of specialized craft production within societies defined by relatively rapid economic development. In many cases, the development of economic complexity is associated with the rise of social and political stratification. In these contexts, a gendered division of labor in the manufacture of particular goods can mimic power relationships expressed elsewhere in the community. The organization of male and female labor can be used by elites to control production, amass surpluses, and exercise control over the material symbols of power. Profound changes to the gendered division of labor can also occur with economic development in societies that lack overt hierarchical structures.

Cathy Lynne Costin focuses her analysis on Inka textile producers—the *aqllakuna*. Through close control over the *aqllakuna* the Inka established control over cloth as a means of production and reproduction of state control. Although textile production was both intensified and decentralized in the Inka conquest of the north coast of South America, cloth production remained tightly managed. The Inka may have incorporated the traditional concept of *aqllakuna* with the Chimú control over cloth production into a hybrid strategy that involved some melding of Inka and local culture. Even though the Inka ruled indirectly, the Inka state co-opted the ability for local people to “produce” their identity through cloth. The Inka reorganization of textile production essentially controlled the means for social reproduction.

Pilar Margarita Hernández Escontrías uses spatial analysis to address fundamental differences in workshop spaces used by specialists in Moche and Inka settlements of Peru. She argues for a connection between the social and ceremonial value of a produced item, elite control over the production and distribution of these items, and the control that elites exerted over specialists who manufactured these goods. Specifically, she contends that female Moche cloth producers enjoyed many more freedoms than Inka cloth weavers, even more so than male Moche metal workers.

Traci Ardren, Alejandra Alonso Olvera, and T. Kam Manahan explore the role of craft intensification among elite family groups during the economic development of Terminal Classic Chichen Itza and its environs. Women manufactured textiles and other items that were regularly circulated between the settlement of Xuenkal, Chichen Itza, a port, and surrounding settlements. As the regional political economy grew, the products of elite women played a critical role in economic intensification throughout the region.

MULTICRAFTING AND CONNECTIONS BETWEEN INDUSTRIES

The chapters under this theme address the interdependent economic relationships that exist among craft specialists. Specialized production of several different items is often located within a single household or a group of related households. A division of labor in one economic activity often serves as a catalyst for economic intensification in other areas. For instance, households that participate in specialized production are reliant on the goods provided by other specialists. Specialized production of several different items is often located within a single household or related households. These interactions form the basis of economic complexity at a large scale.

A. Halliwell, Andrea Yankowski, and Nigel Chang argue for a connection between specialized pottery production and salt manufacture in prehistoric communities in northeastern Thailand. The economic link between these two industries also feeds into the division of labor within the ancient society. Women who manufacture pottery likely generated some of these wares for use in salt production, which was typically performed by men. In this case, the products of women were directly used in a production process associated with men.

Ann Brower Stahl's chapter explores the combination of the products of male production within goods manufactured by women. In this case, crushed iron slag from metallurgical production was incorporated within ceramic fabrics made by women in the Banda area of Ghana. Highly gender-specific craft activity was coordinated into a broader productive sequence.

THE HIDDEN PRODUCER

Often several people participate in manufacturing tasks associated with the production of a single item or a suite of craft items. Men and women may concentrate their efforts on different stages of the production process and thus create a division of labor in the construction of a single type of item. Although objects are created by a variety of people, a single gender may be identified with the entire production process. Some manufacturing tasks, particularly those requiring more advanced skill, may influence which gender is associated with the manufacture of particular craft items. In addition, a gendered division of labor may also extend into the distribution of certain craft goods.

Sophia E. Kelly and James M. Heidke argue that marked increases to the scale and intensity of prehistoric Hohokam pottery production in central Arizona during the mid-eleventh century imply dramatic shifts to male and female labor roles. Although pottery production in the prehistoric American Southwest is closely associated with women, the scale of pottery production in the Hohokam culture region during the eleventh century may indicate that both men and women were participating in ceramic manufacture at this time. This chapter uses ethnographic and ceramic sourcing data to model changes to the gendered division of labor in Phoenix Basin pottery production and employs a cross-cultural ethnographic analysis of specialized economies to construct scenarios for a gendered division of labor in craft production.

Laura A. Swantek argues that women's mobility in past societies may have been just as high as men's. The lack of material evidence for some female activities, such as providing food to work crews, may contribute to the pervasive notion that women did not travel far from domestic sites. She identifies

women's mobility in ethnographic cases and then compares these data to her archaeological study of ground stone manufacture on Cyprus during the Bronze Age.

Michael G. Callaghan's analysis of ceramics from Preclassic period caches in the Holmul region of Guatemala highlights the role of Maya women in regional pottery production, exchange, and consumption. Callaghan's analysis suggests that, although ethnoarchaeological data highlights the role that men play in pottery production, prehistoric women would have been the primary authors of ceramic vessels. His data indicate that the role that women played in the regional economy may have been much greater than previously imagined.

GENDERED SPACE

The location of craft production situates the producer in a particular social space. Often these spaces are highly gendered. In particular, the position of productive spaces within or outside of the domestic context is often closely tied to whether or not men or women participate in an activity and which gender receives the public credit for the work. With economic development in ancient societies, shifts to the scale of production and the locus for craft manufacture often affect the gendered division of labor in production. This shift can drastically alter the way that the economy functions as a whole and is critical to understanding economic change.

Brigitte Kovacevich argues that prehistorians often assume that the locus of specialized production shifts to workshop spaces with state development. She provides evidence that production in the domestic sphere remains in place with the rise of statehood in ancient Mesoamerica. Economic and sociopolitical development can become more complex without requiring a shift in specialized production to external workshop spaces. Her findings challenge archaeological assumptions that craft specialization must move to controlled and managed spaces as social and political complexity increases. In her example from the Maya region, the rise of the state does not necessarily imply shifts to the organization of production.

Sue Harrington explores how women's identities may have been affected when cloth production shifted from the domestic sphere to workshops external to the home in fifth- and sixth-century southern England. Using funerary objects in female burials, Harrington examines how the association between high-status women and cloth production changes as the locus of cloth production alters. She sets this transition in a context of broader social and political

changes in Anglo-Saxon period England, and explores how exogenous marriage practices involved the transfer of women's cloth production skills to different areas.

CONCLUSIONS

The central themes of this volume focus discussion on four major issues that are crucial for understanding the implications of gender in the organization of specialized craft production. The chapters strike a balance between theoretical and methodological approaches and present case studies from all around the world. The chapters within each section, however, often span more than one theme and illustrate how deeply implicated gender can be to all aspects of ancient craft production. The themes that emerge in this volume offer a guide to the major issues that might frame future research on the gendered division of labor in specialized economies. As the tools used to identify the organization of production in ancient societies are refined, archaeologists will generate new data that can be usefully applied to the study of how work was organized in prehistory. The most important contribution that the chapters in this volume make to our understanding of ancient economies is to highlight the crucial role that the gendered division of labor plays in economic development. Gender is often the fundamental means by which tasks are allocated, and the performance of those tasks creates and maintains shared notions of gender. As economies become more specialized, the division of labor (more often than not) merely intensifies along those same gendered lines.

The identified authorship of craft items to individuals of a particular gender—whether or not these people complete the manufacturing process without assistance from members of other genders—reveals the social construction of both gender and craft production. Here, we have introduced the concept of comparative advantages to specialized production as a lens for assessing the role that gender plays in perceived authorship. The social construction of the comparative advantages to specialized craft production is structured by many factors including, as we have noted, the configuration of kinship systems. Frustratingly, these conditions are often difficult to address using material evidence from the archaeological record. As prehistorians, we are faced with the challenge of not only identifying the range of factors that may have influenced the role that gender played in economic development but assembling creative solutions to identify which of these factors explains patterning detectable in archaeological remains.

REFERENCES

- Adair, John. 1944. *The Navajo and Pueblo Silversmiths*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Algaze, Guillermo. 2005. "The Sumerian Takeoff." *Structure and Dynamics* 1 (1): 1–41.
- Algaze, Guillermo. 2008. *Ancient Mesopotamia at the Dawn of Civilization: The Evolution of an Urban Landscape*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226013787.001.0001>.
- Arden, Traci. 2002. *Ancient Maya Women*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira.
- Arrow, Kenneth J. 1979. "The Division of Labor in the Economy, the Polity, and Society." In *Adam Smith and Modern Political Economy*, edited by G. O'Driscoll, Jr., 153–64. Ames: Iowa State University Press.
- Babbage, C. (1832) 1977. *On the Economy of Machinery and Manufactures*. New York: M. Kelly.
- Barzel, Yoram, and B. T. Yu. 1984. "The Effect of the Utilization Rate on the Division of Labor." *Economic Inquiry* 22 (1): 18–27. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1465-7295.1984.tb00662.x>.
- Becker, Gary S. 1981. *A Treatise on the Family*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Blanton, Richard E. with Stephen A. Kowalewski, Gary M. Feinman, and Jill Appel. 1982. *Monte Alban's Hinterland, Part I: The Prehispanic Settlement Patterns of the Central and Southern Parts of the Valley of Oaxaca, Mexico*. Museum of Anthropology Memoir No. 15. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
- Blau, P. 1977. *Inequality and Heterogeneity*. New York: Free Press.
- Bolger, Diane. 2008. *Gender Through Time in the Ancient Near East*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira.
- Brumfiel, Elizabeth M., Kenneth L. Brown, Pedro Carrasco, Robert Chadwick, Thomas H. Charlton, Tom D. Dillehay, Connie L. Gordon, Roger D. Mason, Dennis E. Lewarch, Hattula Moholy-Nagy, et al. 1980. "Specialization, Market Exchange, and the Aztec State: A View from Huexotla." *Current Anthropology* 21 (4): 459–78. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/202494>.
- Brumfiel, Elizabeth M. 1991. "Weaving and Cooking: Women's Production in Aztec Mexico." In *Engendering Archaeology: Women and Prehistory*, edited by Joan M. Gero and Margaret W. Conkey, 224–54. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Costin, Cathy Lynne 1998. "Housewives, Chosen Women, Skilled Men: Cloth Production and Social Identity in the Late Prehispanic Andes." In *Craft and Social Identity*, edited by Cathy Lynne Costin and Rita P. Wright, 123–41. Archaeological Papers of the American Anthropological Association No. 8. Arlington, VA: American Anthropological Association. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1525/ap3a.1998.8.1.123>.

- Costin, Cathy Lynne, and Rita P. Wright, eds. 1998. *Craft and Social Identity*. Archaeological Papers of the American Anthropological Association No. 8. Arlington, VA: American Anthropological Association.
- Crowley, Daniel J. 1968. "Crafts." In vol. 3, *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, edited by Edward L. Sils, 430–34. New York: Macmillan.
- Crown, Patricia L., ed. 2000. *Women and Men in the Prehispanic Southwest: Labor, Power and Prestige*. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.
- Deere, Carmen Diana. With Abena D. Oduro, Hema Swaminathan, and Cheryl Doss. 2012. "Property Rights and the Gender Distribution of Wealth in Ecuador, Ghana and India." Gender Asset Gap Project Working Paper Series No. 13.
- Dietler, Michael, and Ingrid Herbich. 1994. "Ceramic and Ethnic Identity: Ethnoarchaeological Observations on the Distribution of Pottery Styles and the Relationship Between the Social Contexts of Production and Consumption." In *Terre cuite et sociéti: La Céramique, document technique, iconornique, culture 1*, edited by F. Audouze and D. Binder, 459–72. Juan-les-Pins: APDCA.
- Dilley, R. M. 1989. "Secrets and Skills: Apprenticeship among Tukolor Weavers." In *Apprenticeship from Theory to Method and Back Again*, edited by M. W. Coy, 181–98. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- di Zerega, Diana. 1994. *The Archaeology of Gender: Separating the Spheres in Urban America. Interdisciplinary Contributions to Archaeology*. New York: Plenum.
- Earle, Timothy K. 2000. "Archaeology, Property, and Prehistory." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 29 (1): 39–60. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anthro.29.1.39>.
- Ehn, Micael. 2011. "Modeling Specialization and Division of Labor in Cultural Evolution." PhD diss., Malardalen University, Västerås, Switzerland.
- Federici, Silvia. 2004. *Caliban and the Witch: Women, the Body, and Primitive Accumulation*. New York: Autonomedia.
- Fontana, Bernard L. With William J. Robinson, Charles W. Cormack, and Earnest E. Leavitt. 1962. *Papago Indian Pottery*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Fortmann, Louise, and John B. Bruce, eds. 1988. *Whose Trees? Proprietary Dimensions of Forestry*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Gero, Joan M., and Margaret W. Conkey, eds. 1991. *Engendering Archaeology: Women and Prehistory*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Gilchrist, R. 1999. *Gender and Archaeology: Contesting the Past*. London: Routledge.
- Gneezy, Uri, Kenneth L. Leonard, and John A. List. 2009. "Gender Differences in Competition: Evidence from a Matrilineal and a Patriarchal Society." *Econometrica* 77 (5): 1637–64. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3982/ECTA6690>.
- Harrington, Sue. 2008. *Aspects of Gender Identity and Craft Production in the European Migration Period: Iron Weaving Beaters and Associated Textile Making Tools from*

- England, Norway and Alamannia*. BAR International Series S1797. London: Archaeopress.
- Harry, Karen, and Fred Huntington. 2010. "Households, Gender, and Specialized Pottery Production: Exploring the Nature, Causes, and Consequences of a Prehistoric Cottage Industry for Women at the West Branch Settlement." In *Engendering Households in the Prehistoric Southwest*, edited by Barbara J. Roth, 76–97. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Hastorf, C. 1991. "Gender, Space, and Food in Prehistory." In *Engendering Archaeology: Women and Prehistory*, edited by Joan M. Gero and Margaret W. Conkey, 132–62. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Hendon, Julia A. 1997. "Women's Work, Women's Space, and Women's Status among the Classic-Period Maya Elite of the Copan Valley, Honduras." In *Women in Prehistory: North America and Mesoamerica*, edited by C. Claassen and R. A. Joyce, 33–46. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Holdaway, Simon, and Harry Allen. 2012. "Placing Ideas in the Land: Practical and Ritual Training among the Australian Aborigines." In *Body Knowledge, Identity, and Communities of Practice*, edited by Willeke Wendrich, 79–98. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Howell, Martha C. 1986. *Women, Production, and Patriarchy in Late Medieval Cities*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226355061.001.0001>.
- Hunt, Muriel Eva Verbitsky. 1962. "The Dynamics of the Domestic Groups in Two Tzeltal Villages: A Contrastive Comparison." PhD diss., University of Chicago.
- Hunt, Robert C. 2000. "Labor Productivity and Agricultural Development: Boserup Revisited." *Human Ecology* 28 (2): 251–77. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1007072120891>.
- Huntington, Frederick W. 1986. *Archaeological Investigations at the West Branch Site: Early and Middle Rincon Occupation in the Southern Tucson Basin*. Anthropological Papers No. 5. Tucson: Institute for American Research.
- Jasienska, G., and P. T. Ellison. 2004. "Energetic Factors and Seasonal Changes in Ovarian Function in Women from Rural Poland." *American Journal of Human Biology* 16 (5): 563–80. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ajhb.20063>.
- Joyce, Rosemary. 2009. *Ancient Bodies, Ancient Lives: Sex, Gender, and Archaeology*. New York: Thames and Hudson.
- Kent, Susan, ed. 1998. *Gender in African Prehistory*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira.
- Kramer, Karen L. 1998. "Variation in Children's Work among Modern Maya Subsistence Agriculturalists." PhD diss., University of New Mexico.
- Kramer, Karen L., and Garnett P. McMillan. 1999. "Women's Labor, Fertility, and the Introduction of Modern Technology in a Rural Maya Village." *Journal of Anthropological Research* 55 (4): 499–520. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/jar.55.4.3631612>.

- Kristof, Nicholas D., and Brent McDonald. 2010. "What Are You Carrying?" *New York Times*, March 8.
- La Ferrara, Eliana. 2006. "Descent Rules and Strategic Transfers: Evidence from Matrilineal Groups in Ghana." Bureau for Research and Economic Analysis of Development, Working Paper No. 129.
- Lave, Jean. 1991. "Situating Learning in Communities of Practice." In *Perspectives on Socially Shared Cognition*, edited by Lauren B. Resnick, John M. Levine, and Stephanie D. Teasley, 63–82. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/10096-003>.
- Lees, Susan H., and Daniel G. Bates. 1974. "The Origins of Specialized Nomadic Pastoralism: A Systemic Model." *American Antiquity* 39 (2): 187–93. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/279581>.
- Maxwell, Henry. 1721. *Reasons Offered for Erecting a Bank in Ireland*. 2nd ed. Dublin: Aaron Rhames.
- Moore, Henrieta L. 1996. *Space, Text, and Gender*. New York: Guilford.
- Morrison, Kathleen D. 1994. "Intensification of Production: Archaeological Approaches." *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 1 (2): 111–59. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF02231414>.
- Neff, Linda Stephen. 2002. "Gender Divisions of Labor and Lowland Terrace Agriculture." In *Ancient Maya Women*, edited by Traci Ardren, 31–51. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira.
- Nelson, Sarah Milledge. 1997. *Gender in Archaeology: Analyzing Power and Prestige*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira.
- Nelson, Sarah, ed. 2007. *Identity and Subsistence: Gender Strategies for Archaeology*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira.
- Owen, L. R. 2005. *Distorting the Past: Gender and the Division of Labor in the European Upper Paleolithic*. Tübingen: Kerns Verlag.
- Parezo, Nancy J. 1982. "Navajo Sandpaintings: The Importance of Sex Roles in Craft Production." *American Indian Quarterly* 6 (1/2): 125–48. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1183600>.
- Rae, J. (1834) 1964. *Statement of Some New Principles on the Subject of Political Economy*. New York: Augustus M. Kelly.
- Rashid, Salim. 1986. "Adam Smith and the Division of Labor: A Historical View." *Scottish Journal of Political Economy* 33 (3): 292–97. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9485.1986.tb00832.x>.
- Ricardo, David. 1817. *On the Principles of Political Economy and Taxation*. London: John Murray.

- Rothschild, Nan A. 1990. *Prehistoric Dimensions of Status: Gender and Age in Eastern North America*. New York: Garland.
- Rouse, Lynne M., and Lloyd Weeks. 2011. "Specialization and Social Inequality in Bronze Age SE Arabia: Analyzing the Development of Production Strategies and Economic Networks Using Agent-Based Modeling." *Journal of Archaeological Science* 38 (7): 1583–90. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jas.2011.02.023>.
- Rowlands, Michael J. 1998. "Centre and Periphery: A Review of a Concept." Edited by Kristian Kristiansen and Michael J. Rowlands, 214–35. New York: Routledge.
- Scheidel, Walter. 2010. "Approaching the Roman Economy." Princeton/Stanford Working Papers in Classics. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1663560>.
- Schroeder, Richard A. 1999. *Shady Practices: Agroforestry and Gender Politics in The Gambia*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Shennan, Stephen. 1999. "Cost, Benefit and Value in the Organization of Early European Copper Production." *Antiquity* 73 (280): 352–63.
- Shennan, Stephen. 2011. "Social Evolution Today." *Journal of World Prehistory* 24 (2–3): 201–12. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10963-011-9048-4>.
- Smith, Ronald F. 2007. "An Individual-based Comparative Advantage Model: Did Economic Specialization Mediate the Fluctuating Climate of the Late Pleistocene During the Transition from Neanderthals to Modern Humans?" PhD diss., Rutgers University.
- Sørensen, M.L.S. 2000. *Gender Archaeology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Spielmann, Katherine A. 1998. "Ritual Craft Specialists in Middle Range Societies." In *Craft and Social Identity*, edited by Cathy Lynne Costin and Rita P. Wright, 153–59. Archaeological Papers of the American Anthropological Association No. 8. Arlington, VA: American Anthropological Association. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1525/ap3a.1998.8.1.153>.
- Sweely, Tracy L., ed. 1999. *Manifesting Power: Gender and the Interpretation of Power in Archaeology*. London: Routledge. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9780203279663>.
- Tibbett, Kevin. 2004. "Risk and Economic Reciprocity: An Analysis of Three Regional Aboriginal Food-sharing Systems in Late Holocene Australia." *Australian Archaeology* 58 (June):7–10.
- Tinker, I. 1982. *Women, Energy and Development*. Washington, DC: Equity Policy Center.
- Tschopik, H., Jr. 1941. "Navajo Pottery Making: An Inquiry into the Affinities of Navajo Painted Pottery." Papers of the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology 17. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.
- Tucker, Josiah. 1755. *The Elements of Commerce and Theory of Taxes*. London: Privately printed.

- Tucker, Josiah. 1774. *Four Tracts on Political and Commercial Subjects*. Gloucester, UK: R. Taikes.
- Turner, Bill L., II, and William E. Doolittle. 1978. "The Concept and Measure of Agricultural Intensity." *Professional Geographer* 30 (3): 297–301. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.0033-0124.1978.00297.x>.
- Underhill, Ruth M. (1939) 1969. *Social Organization of the Papago Indians*. New York: AMS Press.
- U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2011. *Labor Force Statistics from the Current Population Survey*. Washington, DC: US Department of Labor.
- Wallaert-Pêtre, Hélène. 1999. "Manual Laterality Apprenticeship as the First Learning Rule Prescribed to Potters." In *Ethno-Analogy and the Reconstruction of Prehistoric Artefact Use and Production*, edited by L. R. Owen and M. Porr, 185–206. Tübingen: Mo Vince Verlag.
- Wallaert-Pêtre, Hélène. 2008. "The Way of the Potter's Mother: Apprenticeship Strategies among Dii Potters from Cameroon, West Africa." In *Cultural Transmission and Material Culture: Breaking Down Boundaries*, edited by Miriam T. Start, Brenda J. Bowser, and Lee Horne, 178–98. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Wallaert-Pêtre, Hélène. 2012. "Apprenticeship and the Confirmation of Social Boundaries." In *Body Knowledge, Identity, and Communities of Practice*, edited by Willeke Wendrich, 20–42. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Watson, Patty Jo, and Mary C. Kennedy. 1998. "The Development of Horticulture in the Eastern Woodlands of North American: Women's Role." In *Reader in Gender Archaeology*, edited by Kelley Hays-Gilpin and David S. Whitley, 173–92. New York: Routledge.
- Watts, Joshua. 2011. "Agriculture and Specialized Production: A View from the Desert." Unpublished manuscript on file at School of Human Evolution and Social Change, Arizona State University, Tempe.
- Wendrich, Willeke. 2006. "Body Knowledge: Ethnoarchaeological Learning and the Interpretation of Ancient Technology." In *L'apport de l'Égypte à l'histoire des techniques*, edited by Bernard Mathieu, Dimitri Meeks, and Myriam Wissa, 267–75. Cairo: Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale.
- Wendrich, Willeke. 2012. "Archaeology and Apprenticeship: Body Knowledge, Identity and Communities of Practice." In *Archaeology and Apprenticeship: Body Knowledge, Identity and Communities of Practice*, edited by Willeke Wendrich, 1–19. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Wenger, Etienne. 1998. *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511803932>.

- Wisner, B. 1981. *Social Factors Affecting Fuelwood Planning in Kenya: Basic Needs in Conflict*. Nairobi: Beijer (Ministry of Energy Fuelwood Project).
- Wright, Rita P., ed. 1996. *Gender and Archaeology*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Yang, Xiaokai. 2001. *Economics: New Classical Versus Neoclassical Frameworks*. Boston: Blackwell.
- Yang, Xiaokai, ed. 2003. *Economic Development and the Division of Labor*. Malden, MA: Blackwell. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/9780470752036>.
- Yang, Xiaokai, and Yew-Kwang Ng. 1993. *Specialization and Economic Organization: A New Classical Microeconomic Framework*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Yngstrom, Ingrid. 2002. "Women, Wives and Land Rights in Africa: Situating Gender Beyond the Household in the Debate Over Land Policy and Changing Tenure Systems." *Oxford Development Studies* 30 (1): 21–40. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/136008101200114886>.

COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL
NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION