

The Two Faces of Globalization: the Case of Women in Asia

Jennifer Murray
Mercer University

Despite having three years of engineering training, Rowena Bautista works as a full-time nanny, living in the basement of her employer. She is married and has two children of her own, although her children live in a small farming village in the Philippines and her husband works abroad in Korea. Rowena's children live with their grandmother and have their own nanny, Anna de la Cruz. Rowena has not seen her children in years, but dutifully sends \$450 each month of her \$750 pay check back to the Philippines to pay for school, food, clothing, and her children's nanny (Hochschild 2002).

Rowena is one of millions of women who are emigrating from the global South to the global North to close the ever increasing gap between the world's rich and poor citizens. This global trend in emigration is evidenced by the fact that over half of the world's migrants are women. Ten percent of Sri Lankan citizens work abroad, most of whom are female domestic employees. Thirty percent of Filipino children have a parent working abroad (Hochschild 2002). Despite the hardships of leaving a family, the financial benefits are enticing. Arlie Hochschild found that a Filipina woman working in a skilled position as a nurse, administrative worker, or teacher would earn on average \$176 a month. As a caregiver in the global North, these women could earn "\$410 a month in Hong Kong, \$700 a month in Italy, or \$1,400 a month in Los Angeles" (Hochschild 2002).

The demand for this migrant domestic labor is driven by First World families and working women who require childcare for their own children. Seventy-two percent of all American women work, while sixty-five percent of American mothers who have children under age six work, a figure that was fifty percent less in 1950 (Ehrenreich 2002).

The forces of globalization propel this trend in emigration, demonstrating the dualistic nature of globalization in its impact on women. Globalization has both advanced and marginalized women. While globalization does create better jobs and new economic opportunities, it also has negative impacts on women in terms of personal lives. This paper examines the double edge of globalization, its advancement and marginalization of women. Although proponents of globalization argue that it brings economic progress for all those involved, empirical studies on the situation of women have shown otherwise, especially for women in Asia. This paper will focus on the experiences of Asian women with globalization and attempt to draw conclusions about the impacts of their experiences.

The paper begins with an overview of globalization, reviews major arguments in the literature on globalization's impact on women in Asia, and evaluates these arguments from the evidence provided by quantitative and

qualitative statistical indicators in an attempt to evaluate the overall impact of globalization on women in Asia.

Globalization: a Brief Overview

To fully understand the literature concerning globalization, one must have an understanding of what the word means. Proponents of globalization in the early 1990's called it the "end of history" and the beginning of the "new world order" (Lechner and Boli 2000). Some authors such as Martin Wolf (2000), use a primarily economic definition of globalization as "the growing economic interdependence of countries worldwide through the increasing volume and variety of cross-border transactions in goods and services and of international capital flows, and also through the more rapid and widespread diffusion of technology."

Alison M. Jagger notes globalization is not only the "rapidly accelerating integration of many local and national economies into a single global market," but also includes the "political and cultural corollaries of this process (2001)." Lechner and Boli (2000) subdivided globalization in to five general processes: economic globalization, political globalization, cultural globalization, environmental globalization, and the globalization of social problems.

Because of the many and varied components of globalization, a precise definition is difficult to create. Yet having a multi-faceted view of globalization is necessary to understand the impact of the larger process upon the women of Asia. Establishing a multi-faceted view of globalization is a daunting task that cannot be suitably addressed in a paper of this length. Due to these limitations, this paper will focus on globalization from a primarily economic perspective and the consequences of economic variables in globalization.

Evaluating globalization from a purely quantitative economic framework draws conclusions about globalization's impact on women in terms of percentages of increase in Gross Domestic Product, labor force participation rates or real wage increases. A purely quantitative framework may ignore phenomena such as: the cultural implications associated with paid-sector employment, the augmentation of the "double burden," and increasing trends in economic migration. To address these inadequacies, this paper will address globalization's impact on women from both a quantitative and qualitative perspective.

Globalization in the Literature

Literature concerning the impact of globalization can obviously be divided into that written by proponents of globalization and that written by critics of globalization. Proponents of globalization are mostly advocates of neo-liberal economic policies;

while critics of globalization often argue that it is the neo-liberal economic policies which hurt women the most.

Proponents of Globalization and Neo-Liberalism

Neo-Liberalism is the dominating political and economic theory in support of globalization. Central tenants of neo-liberal economic policies include the securing free trade, cultivating private ownership, supporting economic deregulation and decentralization, and fostering economic efficiency to maximize profits (WTO 2003). Neo-liberal organizations, such as the World Trade Organization, argue that free trade raises incomes, cuts the cost of living, and stimulates economic growth (2003).

Many neo-liberals argue that globalization will bring about positive changes for women by increasing economic opportunities for women. Lisa B. Meyer (2003) found that economic restructuring did in fact increase women's labor force participation rates, leading her to conclude that "global economic forces *reduce* occupational sex segregation and inequality." Meyer (2003) adds that this positive impact depends on a country's place in the process of globalization as an existing globalized country or a currently globalizing country, and she also notes that positive impacts from globalization are dependent on the level of existing gender inequalities within the globalizing nation.

Neo-liberals also argue that increased economic opportunity improves the quality of life of women and their families. Isobel Coleman argues that globalization pushes countries to educate their populations, including women, in order to improve their human capital so that they can attract more FDI (2004). Economic growth through globalization helps close gender gaps, and also increases standards of living because when women are given more economic power they devote money to "education, health, and nutrition," and less to tobacco and alcohol (Coleman 2004).

Neo-liberals also assert that structural adjustment plans (SAPs) help nations reach their full capacity and highest levels of productivity in order to maximize economic growth. The IMF (2000) claims structural reform packages are often necessary to promote long term growth to help the "poorest countries catch up more quickly." Trade liberalization is essential for growth, which includes the elimination of government subsidies to make certain sectors more competitive, according to the IMF (2004). SAPs, while they may hurt, are thus essential to the long term development of developing nations (IMF 2000). Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala emphasizes that SAPs are short term and beneficial to society as a whole by encouraging "growth, development, and poverty reduction" (Tsikata 1995).

Critics of Globalization

Critics of globalization with relation to its impact on women in Asia have lodged five major criticisms. These criticisms include: women's marginalization to the informal sector of the economy, the gendered division of labor, the exploitative nature of multi-national corporations (MNCs), the augmentation of the double burden, and the negative effects of structural adjustment programs imposed in the name of globalization (Hensman 1996; Hippert 2002; Jagger 2001; Kawewe 2001; Mills 2003; Sassen 2000).

Critics noting women's marginalization to the informal sector of the economy argue that globalization sometimes pushes women to non-traditional employment. Jagger (2001) argues that globalization deprives women of their land to meet the demands of export agriculture, subjecting many women to temporary, seasonal, and part-time work. Saskia Sassen (2000) asserts that globalization has created the "feminization of survival," in which many women are responsible for their family's welfare, yet are forced into foreign employment as migrants or domestic workers by unfavorable economic conditions.

Rekha Pande (2000) suggests that the conversion of developing economies to cash economies upsets the subsistence farming of many women, leading to the "ghettoization," "pauperization," and marginalization of these women. Teresita Oliveros (1997) notes that unfavorable economic conditions created by export agriculture create migration trends that prompt women to join burgeoning sex tourism trades in cities to meet the financial needs of their families. Victoria Tauli-Corpuz (1998) highlights the forced relocations of women in Asia to build critical infrastructure, which pushes women to "escape" by entering the sex trade.

The second main criticism of globalization's impact on women is the gendered division of labor that is perpetuated and accentuated by globalization. This gendered division manifests itself not only in sectors of employment, but also in wage disparities and types of work. Women are assigned to menial jobs with low pay and low authority, while men are trained to be managers and supervisors, according to Mary Beth Mills (2003), because international capital flows seek to lessen the costs of labor by hiring women as "devalued" or "supplementary" workers. Lucie Cheng (2000) notes women are often restricted to certain economic sectors, like agriculture and manufacturing, and argues that the jobs women fill are merely extensions of domestic and reproductive work.

Rohini Hensman (1996) articulates the barriers to economic advancement by women. Gendered divisions of labor subject women to more occupational physical, psychological, and chemical hazards, argues Evelyne Hong. Fauzia Erfan Ahmed (2001) raises the idea that women are recruited to fill certain positions

because of stereotypes that women are more docile, easier to control, and thus better suited to do repetitive manufacturing work, so that gendered divisions of labor rise out of gender biases in society.

The third criticism of globalization's impact on women is the exploitation of women by MNCs. Christine Hippert (2002) argues that MNCs have discriminatory hiring practices which relegate women to menial labor positions in unsafe working conditions, with no recourse to address any grievances the women may have. Hippert (2002) also accuses MNCs of intentionally hiring more vulnerable unmarried women from rural areas so that these women have less opportunity to quit their jobs in protest of poor working conditions.

Corroborating Hippert's arguments, Evelyn Hu-Dehart (2003) adds that MNCs subcontract manufacturing to absolve themselves from any responsibility for factory conditions, and in requiring manufacturing flexibility provide women with no job security. Niza Licuanan-Galela (2001) notes that MNCs often set up patriarchal management structures which trap female employees by manipulating familial and cultural loyalties.

The fourth criticism of globalization's impact on women is the augmentation of the double burden, where women are increasingly expected to work in labor intensive factory positions, while also continuing to manage all household duties. Hensman (1996) notes that because women are still expected to manage the home, the types of work they may enter are limited. Hong (1995) adds that the double burden creates "overstrain and mental stress," thus jeopardizing women's health. Because of the double burden phenomenon, women's contributions to the economy are often underrated because domestic work is not included in estimates of productivity (Cheng 2000).

The final major criticism of globalization's impact on women is the negative impact that structural adjustment plans (SAPs) have on women. These plans are mandated by organizations such as the IMF or World Bank in the name of economic efficiency, and often include substantial cuts in government social welfare services. Saliwe M. Kawewe (2000) suggests that the budget cutbacks due to SAPs increase burdens on families by removing social welfare nets, so that families must have women and children work to survive. Families often make female children drop out of school to support the family and women are often exploited through the loosening of labor rights due to SAPs (Kawewe 2000). Jagger (2001) emphasizes the importance of social welfare programs for women, who face even bigger burdens at home as healthcare burdens formerly carried by the government are shifted to the shoulders of women. SAPs are instrumental in forcing women into informal sector employment to make up for the social welfare losses their family faces (Jagger 2001).

Evaluating the Arguments with Statistical Indicators

With such substantial literature on the impact of globalization on women, this section of the paper seeks to look at the points raised in the literature from perspective of the quantitative and qualitative economic indicators to determine whether or not the points may be dismissed or accepted. Following the presentation of the statistical indicators, the arguments made in the literature are distilled into several competing hypotheses about the impacts of globalization and then evaluated according to the indicators.

Evaluating Globalization through Quantitative and Qualitative Indicators

A complete picture of the impact of globalization upon the women of Asia must evaluate globalization in both qualitative and quantitative terms. Quantitative indicators include, but are not limited to: labor force participation rates, real wage increases, economic sector participation rates, percentage of management positions held, and access to education relative to men. Qualitative indicators include, but are not limited to: healthcare benefits, labor hours and conditions, life expectancy relative to men, and income disparities by class, region, and in relation to men.

Before globalization may be said to have been a positive force in the lives of women in Asia, it must demonstrate positive gains in both quantitative and qualitative indicators. If globalization is found to have created 1,000 new jobs for women in southern Malaysia, giving them increased financial independence, then it may be judged a success quantitatively. Yet if those same 1,000 jobs must be performed in addition to traditional household duties, creating the double burden, women are discriminated against in wage earnings compared to men, and women are barred from managerial positions, then globalization may be viewed as a qualitative failure.

While clearly a quantitative success, globalization failed qualitatively in this example and therefore can not be judged as an entirely positive process for the women of southern Malaysia. Globalization must be viewed in a holistic manner to accurately gauge its impact upon women in Asia.

Quantitative Indicators of Globalization in Asia

A.T. Kearney and *Foreign Policy* create a yearly “Globalization Index” of the most globalized nations of the world. The 2004 “Globalization Index” included the following south Asian nations among the most globalized nations: Singapore, Malaysia, Philippines, Thailand, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, Indonesia, and India.

Surprisingly, Singapore ranked 2nd in overall globalization, with Ireland ranked as 1st and Switzerland ranked as 3rd. The quantitative statistical indicators, pulled from the 2004 “Globalization Index” statistics, are documented in Table 1. Each Asian nation is listed in descending order according to its rank on “Globalization Index” (Globalization Index 2004).

Common features of the more globalized nations include high rates of foreign direct investment (FDI), increases in GDP larger than the world average of 3.8% a year, positive changes in exports, high percentages of trade in GDP, large transfer payments (remittances, capital flow), and unemployment rates within the developed world average of 4%-12% a year.

Qualitative Indicators of Globalization in Asia

Table 2 is a compilation of several qualitative statistical indicators of globalization that are necessary to better understand globalization’s impact on women. Statistics were pulled from the United Nation’s *World’s Women 1970-1990*, the UN Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP), the International Labor Organization’s LABORSTA Database, and Focus International’s Women in Development Network.

Some common features of these nations include: women’s labor force participation rates below 50 percent, disparities between men’s and women’s literacy rates despite literacy rates generally higher than the world average, greater women’s unemployment compared to men’s unemployment, low women’s participation in management and administration positions, as well as minor political roles, and wage disparity between men and women. Each of these similarities will be explored more fully below.

Both these qualitative and quantitative indicators demonstrate the high level of globalization experienced by each of these Asian countries. Due to such high levels of globalization, these nations’ experiences with globalization may serve as indicators of its impact on women in this region.

Testing the Hypotheses

1. Globalization creates economic growth, increasing economic opportunities for women.

For most of the last decade, each of the eight Asian countries compared experienced high rates of growth in GDP (*Globalization Index 2004*), which has traditionally been the predominant indicator of economic growth. All but one nation (Sri Lanka) experienced positive changes in the growth rate of exports

(*Globalization Index* 2004), evidence of the growing export based economies. Each country shows trade encompassing a high percentage of GDP (*Globalization Index* 2004), an indicator of increased trade and trade liberalization, key sources of economic growth (WTO 2003).

Each country experienced unemployment rates within 3-12%, which is far less than the world average of 30% (WID NETWORK 2003). Additionally, women's labor force participation in South Asia increased from 20% in 1970 to an average of 35% in 1990 (WID NETWORK 2003). Women's economic activity in the formal sector has increased in many of these nations, including examples such as Bangladesh where women's economic activity rates increased from 5% in 1970 (World's Women 1970-1990, 1991) to 56% in 2000 (UNESCAP 2005). According to the neo-liberal economic theory, globalization has brought increased economic growth to these eight Asian nations, and economic growth was asserted by several authors as the key to closing the gender gap (Coleman 2004).

Clearly, these nations have experienced economic growth and greater economic participation for women, which lends some credence to the arguments proposed by the neo-liberal proponents of globalization.

2. Globalization reduces economic sex segregation and inequalities.

As addressed in the hypothesis above, women's economic activity rates have increased fundamentally in several Asian nations (UNESCAP 2005) and have increased by 15% from 1970 to 1990 (WID NETWORK 2003). Increases in women's economic activity and labor force participation rates seem to support the argument that economic sex segregation is declining as women take their place in the economic arena. But when one examines the percentage of management and administrative positions held by women, the case becomes less clear. In all but two nations, Malaysia and Indonesia, the percentage of women in management or administrative positions has either declined or increased by less than 4% in 30 years, and in the two nations where the percentage of management or administrative positions held has declined, it has been by more than 12% or even half (World's Women 1970-1990, 1991; WID NETWORK 2003). This suggests that although women are more active in the economy they are not active in the higher level management or administrative positions traditionally held by men, undercutting the notion that sex segregation and inequalities are reduced by globalization.

Another important indicator in examining economic inequalities between the sexes is women's unemployment rates relative to men's unemployment rates. Higher unemployment rates among women than among men manifests gender inequality in the economy, as women are shown to be more susceptible to economic fluctuations which cause unemployment. Only two nations, Malaysia

and Indonesia again, had appreciable declines in women's unemployment rates relative to men's unemployment rates (World's Women 1970-1990, 1991; WID NETWORK 2003), indicating a decline in economic gender inequalities. Unfortunately, however, the other nations either experienced an appreciable increase in women's relative unemployment or faced fluctuating rates (World's Women 1970-1990, 1991; WID NETWORK 2003), which undermined conclusive support for the neo-liberal theory. Both of these latter scenarios deals a blow to the neo-liberal theory that globalization reduces gender inequalities in the economy, either by directly undermining the principle (increasing inequality in unemployment) or by proving that globalization has not be a conclusive success (fluctuating rates failing to exhibit appreciable increases in equality).

The absence of appreciable gains in both the percentage of management and administrative positions held by women and in the relative employment levels of women suggest, at worst, that globalization has failed in the second hypothesis, or, at best, that globalization has not yet developed uniform results. In either case, doubt is cast on this neo-liberal hypothesis.

3. Globalization increases women's education by forcing nation's to improve their human capital through educating women.

Two of the most appropriate indicators to test this hypothesis are women's literacy rates and women's literacy rates relative to men's literacy rates. Unequivocally women's literacy rates increased across the board in each of the eight Asian nations (World's Women 1970-1990, 1991; UNESCAP 2005). Several cases, including Singapore, Indonesia and India featured dramatic increases of between approximately 25-50% (World's Women 1970-1990, 1991; UNESCAP 2005). Increases in literacy are an obvious indicator of improvements in education, thus the experience with these Asian nations' increases in women's literacy supports this hypothesis (if it can be assumed that there is a causal link between increased literacy and globalization rather than just a correlative link). Although women's literacy rates average 76.3% in these nations, this rate is still significantly below the 98% and 99% literacy rates of Ireland and Switzerland, respectively (WID NETWORK 2003), demonstrating that there is still room for much improvement in the area of women's basic education. These statistics support the argument of Martha C. Nussbaum, that globalization does not automatically guarantee First World levels of women's education (2003).

Furthermore, when one examines women's literacy rates relative to men, this hypothesis comes under more challenge. Women's literacy rates relative to men's rates help distinguish between generalized, broader improvements in education and improvements unique or specific to women's education. Relative literacy rates for women have increased dramatically in each of the nations, except

for Bangladesh and India (World's Women 1970-1990, 1991; UNESCAP 2005), which does not undermine the hypothesis but suggests that the results of globalization are not universal and that perhaps globalization is not sufficient to overcome previously existing barriers to improving women's education.

Another interesting indicator related to women's education is the percentage of women in minor political roles. A higher percentage of women active in politics seems to denote a relatively more educated female population. After all, it is highly likely that one must be literate to hold a legislative office. In examining this indicator, three nations clearly enjoyed appreciable increases in women's political involvement, while the other nations experienced patterns where women's political involvement may have increased initially but later fell or simply remained static (World's Women 1970-1990, 1991; UNESCAP 2005). The experiences of Singapore and Sri Lanka are examples of these patterns (World's Women 1970-1990, 1991; UNESCAP 2005). One might argue that these patterns show globalization has had either no effect on women's political participation or an initially positive and then subsequently negative impact on women's political participation.

Examining the percentages of women in minor political power roles and women's literacy rates also suggest that globalization is a long way from improving the overall education and empowerment of women in these Asian societies. In 1995, these nations also had an average participation rate for women in minor political power roles of 7.6%, which is almost half the developed world's average of 14.5% (WID NETWORK 2003), suggesting that globalization does not inherently enhance the political participation of women. Furthermore, a world average rate of 14.5% participation by women in minor political power roles suggests that this trend in globalization is not unique to Asia, but that globalization has also failed to bring about significant increases in women's positions of political power in the larger developed world.

Again this indicator does not unequivocally undermine this hypothesis, but reveals the complex and contradictory impacts of globalization on women.

4. Globalization perpetuates and increases the gendered division of labor and allows for the exploitation of women by multi-national corporations (MNCs).

Feminist critiques of neo-liberal arguments on globalization often cite that despite increased economic opportunity; women still face discrimination and barriers in the workplace due to a gendered division of labor (Ahmed 2001; Cheng 1999; Hensman 1996; Hong 1995; Meyer 2003; Mills 2003; Pande 2000). In addressing hypothesis 2, it was noted that examining the changing percentage of women in management and administrative positions over time does not conclusively support

the neo-liberal claims about globalization's benefits, and may actually serve to undermine such claims. In a snapshot of time provided by the most recent data, the eight nations studied have percentages of women in management and administration from 5-36% (WID NETWORK 2003). When compared with labor force participation rates in these countries at the same time period (1995), Singapore had a women's management level (36%) equal to the women's labor force participation rate (36%), while the Philippines had a women's management level (35%) higher than its women's labor force participation rate of 31% (WID NETWORK 2003).

The remaining nations compared faced levels of women's management that were half or less of the women's labor force participation rates (WID NETWORK 2003). This disparity between labor force participation rates and levels of women's management positions seems to indicate that while globalization obviously increases women's labor force participation, it does not guarantee greater opportunity in administrative or management positions. Meyer's empirical studies corroborate this notion. Meyers notes that:

trade openness, risk, and foreign investment in the form of [trans-national corporations] contribute to a more equal distribution of women and men in national occupational structures, *not taking into account rank or status of occupations* (2003, 370, emphasis added).

Meyers went on to conclude that nominal increases in managerial or administrative position participation rates suggest many of these nations who are hiring larger numbers of women "are more likely to provide them with jobs in low-status occupations" (2003, 373).

The qualitative indicators support Meyers' work and lend credence to the hypothesis that globalization perpetuates gendered divisions of labor and that MNCs may exploit women to find cheaper labor sources and comparative advantage.

The continued discrimination that women encounter in the work place is also evidenced by disparity of wage rates between men and women. In 1995, women's wages as a percentage of men's wages in these nations ranged from 60% to 87%, with an average of approximately 70% (LABORSTA 2005; WID NETWORK 2003). Singapore, the most globalized nation in the world (*Globalization Index* 2004), has a women's wage rate of only 60% of men's wage rate (WID NETWORK 2003). These statistics support the feminist critique of globalization that globalization perpetuates gendered divisions of labor, in terms of lower pay rates for female employees. In other words, globalization may provide more jobs for women and thus greater economic participation, but these jobs are at significantly lower pay rates than similar jobs held by men.

Alternatively, examining women's wage rates relative to men's wage rates over time does not help the neo-liberal reverse of this hypothesis. In the nations where data was available to compare over time, half of the nations experienced increases in women's relative wages whereas the other half experienced decreases in women's relative wages (LABORSTA 2005; WID NETWORK 2003). This data proves that the hypothesis is neither completely true nor completely false, and thus neither side of the debate is completely wrong or completely right on this hypothesis, which highlights the complex and contradictory nature of globalization's impact on women in Asia.

Women's unemployment rates is another important qualitative indicator necessary for judging the qualitative impact of globalization on women in Asia. While these Asian nations have a typical unemployment rate for the developed world, and a much better unemployment rate when compared with the rest of the world, disparities do exist between unemployment rates for men and women (WID NETWORK 2003). In all but two (Singapore and Thailand) of the Asian nations examined, women have average unemployment rates over time that higher than those of men (WID NETWORK 2003), suggesting that feminist critiques that women are especially vulnerable to economic fluctuations (Jagger 2001; Sassen 2000, 2001) may be true.

In 1995, disparities between unemployment rates ranged from 0.1% to 4.1% (WID NETWORK 2003). While these disparities may seem small, if a work force is composed of 1 million workers, and women have a 0.1% higher unemployment rate than men, then 10,000 more women workers are unemployed than men who are unemployed. In Sri Lanka where the disparity in 1995 was 4.1%, a workforce of 1 million workers would generate 41,000 more women workers who are unemployed than men who are unemployed.

These figures should also be examined in relation to women's labor force participation rates. In all of the examined countries women's labor force participation rates are below 45%, with women composing an average of approximately 1/3 of workers (WID NETWORK 2003). If women only compose an average of 1/3 of the workforce *and* they have higher unemployment rates than men, the arguments of globalization perpetuating a gendered division of labor are easily supported.

Low participation rates in management and administration, combined with disproportionate unemployment rates in relation to labor force participation, may be offered as empirical proof for critiques of globalization, which suggest that MNCs intentionally employ female workers because of their perceived expendable nature (Ahmed 2001; Hippert 2002; Hu-Dehart 2003; Licuanan-Galela 2001).

Again, it is important to note that the composite effect of these indicators only highlights the true difficulty and assessing the overall impact of globalization on women in both quantitative and qualitative terms.

5. Globalization encourages the use of Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs), which leave women more vulnerable to economic problems by mandating austere social welfare spending by governments in globalizing nations.

The disparity in unemployment rates mentioned in hypothesis 4 also suggests that women are more susceptible to economic downturns, which in turn makes them more likely to be reliant on state supported welfare programs during these periods of economic downturns. This reliance would support the arguments of feminist critics that women are more vulnerable to the cuts in social welfare programs that are part of structural adjustment policies mandated by globalization's gurus, the IMF and World Bank (Jagger 2001; Kawewe 2000; Koczberski; Sassen 2000).

The relatively low percentage of women in legislative positions also leaves them less empowered to decided which social welfare programs will be cut under the SAPs, leaving women with less of a voice in the matters which will effect them the most.

Alternatively, the increases in women's literacy as an indicator of improving women's education may suggest that women in these nations are an increasingly dynamic workforce, capable of receiving additional training necessary to successfully adapt to changing economic conditions. If improved education suggests women are more readily able to "land on their feet" during times of economic crisis, then the impacts of scaled back social welfare spending may not be as negative as once thought.

Additionally, women's economic activity rates have generally increased in each nation except for Thailand and India (World's Women, 1970-1990, 1991; UNESCAP 2005). This increasing activity within the formal sector provides women with new jobs and cash income which would be more likely to be helpful in times of economic crisis than jobs in the informal sector. For example, if a women works in the informal agricultural sector growing yams and bartering her yams for other goods, her livelihood is only as secure as the capability of her neighbors to buy her yams, which may be decreased during times of economic austerity. Alternatively, a women working in an industrial export-oriented factory will be receiving cash wages at a job that is not as dependent on the overall economic health of her nation. Consequently, she will maintain a steady job, with steady income, despite the austerity her nation is currently facing. If she loses her job, however, due to gendered differences in unemployment levels mentioned in hypothesis 4, then she will indeed be more susceptible to the impact of SAP-induced austerity.

As with the other hypotheses, the indicators serve mostly to demonstrate

the complexity of the issue. It is difficult to prove the hypothesis entirely correct or entirely incorrect.

6. Globalization pushes women to informal sector employment.

Increasing rates of exports, high percentages of trade in GDP, and higher unemployment rates for women, are all factors which lend support to the arguments of feminist critics that globalization pushes women to informal sector employment, such as the sex trade. Increasing rates of exports denote an increasing export oriented economy, especially if increases in exports exceed increases in imports, as was the case in all but two of the Asian nations, although all nations had larger export trade than import trade (*Globalization Index* 2004). Evidence of increasingly export oriented economies helps support the argument that as export agriculture denies women traditional modes of economic activity women are pushed into informal sector employment (Jagger 2001; Sassen 2000, 2001; Oliveros 1997; Pande 2000; Tauli-Corpuz 1998).

In examining the increasing economic activity rates of women mentioned in hypothesis 5, one sees an increasing push towards formal sector employment. These economic activity rates are by nature calculations of formal sector employment and do not include informal sector activity. It is easy to see forces that push women towards informal employment (export-oriented economies) and forces which push women towards formal sector employment (economic activity needed to meet foreign demands for exported goods). While export oriented agriculture does deprive women of traditional economic activity this is not a problem unless there is no formal sector activity to replace this loss. Disparities in unemployment rates indicate that there is possibility for this to happen to women more than to men. These indicators show that the outcome of globalization's push to either formal or informal sector employment is not pre-determined and will depend on the unique factors present in each nation and their relative weight and force. Thus it is difficult to say that hypothesis 6 is true or false for each nation.

7. Globalization augments the double burden.

Statistical evidence of the double burden phenomenon is difficult to find, although byproducts of this double burden are easier to find and analyze. Yet several of the authors who discuss the phenomenon of the double burden attribute a patriarchal attitude towards management and leadership as a significant barrier to women's advancement in the workplace (Hensman 1996; Hippert 2002; Hu-Dehart 2003;

Licuanan-Galela 2001). This patriarchal attitude discussed views women as inherently suited for tedious factory work and as inherently ill-suited for management outside of the family. A plausible explanation for low percentages of women in management and administrative positions is that women are still expected to fulfill all the duties of the home and thus are seen as incapable of taking on additional management and administrative duties. Evidence for low percentages of women in management and administration are illustrated in other hypothesis, as is the disparity between labor force participation rates and percentages of management and administrative positions held by women.

It can also be assumed, however, that unless traditional patriarchal attitudes towards the duties of the home are changed, then women's increasing formal economic activity rates will mean that Asian women are increasingly working outside of the home but still expected to complete household duties as well. Thus the truth or falsehood of hypothesis 7 depends on the degree of change, if any, in traditional patriarchal attitudes towards household duties. As with all of the other hypotheses, this one will depend on the unique forces in play in a particular nation.

Conclusion

Globalization has yielded a complex and contradictory experience for Asian women. Studies of both qualitative and quantitative indicators suggest that both neo-liberals and their feminist critics are correct to some degree in their arguments. A purely quantitative perspective of globalization's impact on women in Asia shows increased growth and economic opportunity, while a qualitative perspective shows darker sides of globalization. Yes, globalization has provided economic growth and greater economic opportunity in terms of increased work force participation for women in the countries of Singapore, Malaysia, Philippines, Thailand, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, Indonesia, and India. It is important to note, however, that the indicators also support the feminist critiques that this economic growth has had detrimental and even exploitative effects on the women of these nations. The statistical indicators support directly or indirectly the five essential arguments of the feminist critics, as well as the arguments of neo-liberals. The impacts of globalization on women may be seen as complex and contradictory.

Globalization brings economic growth and greater economic opportunity, but may also force women into the informal economy, augment the double burden, perpetuate a gendered division of labor, make women more vulnerable to structural adjustment programs, or allow MNCs to exploit women workers to maximize profits. The experiences of these Asian women with globalization have, in the

short run, been both positive and negative. Only time will tell if the predictions of the neo-liberals about the impacts of globalization will win out in the future.

Table 1: Quantitative Indicators in Eight Asian Nations

	% Δ GDP	FDI AS %GDP	%Δ EXPORTS (*01-'02)	%Δ IMPORTS (*01-'02)	TRADE AS %GDP	TRANSFER PAYMENTS- NON-GOVT. AS %GDP	UNEMP. RATES
SNP	1.10%	11.70%	3.02%	0.41%	339.4%	1.41%	4.8%
MAL	5.20%	5.38%	5.38%	5.93%	210.8%	4.13%	3.6%
PHP	4.50%	1.53%	8.14%	2.90%	97.2%	0.70%	11.4%
THA	6.70%	0.85%	7.17%	6.11%	123.2%	1.02%	2.2%
SRL	5.50%	1.54%	-3.43%	-0.73%	79.6%	9.00%	8.4%
BD	5.30%	0.10%	1.94%	-5.03%	32.6%	6.29%	3.3%
IND	4.10%	0.98%	2.21%	4.21%	67.5%	1.02%	8.7%
IN	8.30%	0.70%	9.91%	6.28%	31.1%	2.99%	9.5%
IR	1.40%	22.66%	11.46%	6.22%	168.3%	10.27%	4.7%

SWZ	-0.5%	5.09%	4.88%	0.37%	89.8%	6.87%	3.7%
------------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	------

*SNP=Singapore, MAL=Malaysia, PHP=Philippines, THA=Thailand, SRI=Sri Lanka, BD=Bangladesh, IND=Indonesia, IN=India, IR=Ireland, SWZ=Switzerland

*Ireland and Switzerland are included for comparison, due to their rankings as the 1st and 3rd most globalized nations, respectively.

**Trade as a percentage of GDP includes Total Trade, which was defined as the sum of all exports and imports.

Table 2: Qualitative Indicators in Eight Asian Nations

	WOMEN'S ECONOMIC ACTIVITY RATE	TOTAL LABOR FORCE SHARE	LIFE EXPECT. RELATIVE TO MEN	LITERACY RATES FOR WOMEN	LITERACY RELATIVE TO MEN	UNEMP. RATES RELATIVE TO MEN	% OF MANAGE. & ADMIN. POSITIONS	% OF MINOR POLITICAL POWER ROLES	WAGE AS % OF MEN'S
Singapore '70-'89	30%	--	+5.5	37.6%	-40.4%	+0.8	32%	0.0%	70.9%
'90	40%	40.2%	+4.3	83.0%	-12.1%	-0.6	--	5.0%	57.5%
'95	50%	38.7%	+4.7	85.8%	-10.0%	+0.1	36%	3.0%*	58.3%
'00	56%	39.6%	+4.7	88.3%	-7.9%	+1.1	--	4.0%	59.7%
Malaysia '70-'89	37%	--	+4.1	--	--	-13.0	9%	3.2%	67.8%
'90	44%	35.5%	+4.6	74.4%	-12.5%	--	--	5.0%	50.1%
'95	--	33.9%	+4.8	79.2%	-10.1%	-1.0*	16%	8.0%*	57.9%

'00	47%	34.7%	+4.5	83.4%	-8.0%	-0.1	--	9.0%	62.9%
Philippines '70-'89	42%	--	+3.8	74.8%	-5.7%	--	34%	--	--
'90	36%	36.2%	+3.6	91.2%	-1.0%	+2.7	--	9.0%	--
'95	--	37.0%	+5.3	93.2%	-0.6%	+1.7	35%	11.0%*	74.3%
'00	48%	37.9%	+5.3	94.8%	-0.3%	-0.4	--	12.0%	79.9%
Thailand '70-'89	75%	--	+4.1	59.3%	-23.6%	+0.7	45%	1.1%	--
'90	68%	46.6%	+4.6	89.4%	-5.9%	+0.3	--	3.0%	63.8%*
'95	--	45.4%	+4.3	89.4%	-4.3%	+0.5	21%	6.0%*	68.2%
'00	65%	44.9%	+7.7	93.9%	-3.2%	-0.1	--	6.0%	--
Sri Lanka '70-'89	31%	--	+4.2	60.1%	-24.1%	--	27%	--	77.2%

'90	29%	27.0%	+4.3	84.7%	-8.1%	+14.4	--	5.0%	90.4%
'95	36%	32.7%	+4.7	86.9%	-6.8%	+10.9	15%	5.0%*	94.8%
'00	37%	34.1%	+4.7	89.0%	-5.4%	+4.7	--	5.0%	83.8%
Bangladesh '70-'89	5%	--	-0.7	9.4%	-23.9%	+2.5	2%	4.8%	54.3%
'90	7%	39.3%	-1.0	23.7%	-20.6%	-0.1	--	10.0%	49.3%*
'95	--	38.2%	-0.3	26.9%	-19.9%	-0.4	5%	9.0%*	--
'00	56%	37.5%	-0.5	30.2%	-19.2%	+0.1	--	9.0%	--
Indonesia '70-'89	36%	--	+2.8	32.2%	-30.4%	--	7%	7.2%	--
'90	37%	44.0%	+3.7	72.5%	-14.2%	--	--	12.0%	--
'95	--	41.0%	+3.8	77.7%	-11.9%	+1.8	17%	13.0%*	--
'00	52%	38.5%	+4.0	81.9%	-9.9%	--	--	11.0%*	--

India '70-'89	38%		+0.1	13.7%	-28.3%	--	2%	4.3%	--
'90	29%	25.0%	+0.7	35.9%	-26.0%	--	--	5.0%	--
'95	--	24.0%*	+1.3	40.6%	-24.6%	-0.7	--	7.0%*	--
'00	--	32.3%	+1.2	45.4%	-23.0%	0.0	--	9.0%	--

*These statistics are from either a year before or a year after the date range because data was not available for that specific year.

References

- Ahmed, Fauzia Erfan. 2004. "The Rise of the Bangladesh Garment Industry: Globalization, Women Workers, and Voice." *National Women's Studies Association Journal* 16(2): 34-45.
- "Bangladesh." 2005. *CIA World Factbook*.
<<http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook>>.
- Cheng, Lucie. 1999. "Globalization and Women's Paid Labor in Asia." *International Social Science Journal* 160:217-228.
- Coleman, Isobel. 2004. "The Payoff from Women's Rights." *Foreign Affairs* 83(3):80-96.
- "Common Criticisms of the IMF: Some Responses." 2004. International Monetary Fund Online.
<<http://www.imf.org/external/np/exr/ccrit/eng/crans.htm#g>>.
- "Globalization Index." 2004. *Foreign Policy* Online.
<<http://www.foreignpolicy.com/wwwboard/g-index.php>>.
- "Globalization: Threat or Opportunity." IMF Issues Brief. International Monetary Fund Online.
<<http://www.imf.org/external/np/exr/ib/2000/041200.htm#V>>.
- Hensman, Rohini. 1996. "A Feminist Movement in Sri Lanka: the Potential and the Necessity." *Contemporary South Asia* 5(1):67-75.
- Hippert, Christine. 2002. "Multinational Corporations, the Politics of the World Economy, and their Effects on Women's Health in the Developing World: a Review." *Health Care for Women International* 23:861-869.
- Hochschild, Arlie Russell and Barbara Ehrenreich. 2003. *Global Woman: Nannies, Maids, and Sex Workers in the New Economy*. 2nd ed. New York: Metropolitan.
- Hong, Evelyne. 1995. "Women as Producers and Consumers in the World Market." *Third World Resurgence* 61/62.
- Hu-Dehart, Evelyn. 2003. "Globalization and Its Discontents." *Frontiers* 24:244-260.
- "India." 2005. *CIA World Factbook*.

- <<http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook>>.
- “Indonesia.” 2005. *CLA World Factbook*.
<<http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook>>.
- “Ireland.” 2005. *CLA World Factbook*.
<<http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook>>.
- Jagger, Allison M. 2001. “Is Globalization Good for Women?” *Comparative Literature* 53(4):298-314.
- Kawewe, Saliwe M. 2000. “The Impact of Economic Structural Adjustment Programs [ESAPs] on Women and Children: Implications for Social Welfare in Zimbabwe.” *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare* 28(4):79-107.
- Koczberski, Gina. 1998. “Women in Development: a Critical Analysis.” *Third World Quarterly* 19(3):395-411.
- “LABORSTA Database.” 2005. International Labor Organization website.
<<http://laborsta.ilo.org/>>.
- Lechner, Frank J. and John Boli, eds. 2000. *The Globalization Reader*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Licuanan-Galela, Niza. 2001. “Economic Development Policies and Women Workers: Filipina Workers in a Japanese Transplant.” *National Women's Studies Association Journal* 13(3):169-180.
- “Malaysia.” 2005. *CLA World Factbook*.
<<http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook>>.
- Meyer, Lisa B. 2003. “Economic Globalization and Women’s Status in the Labor Market: A Cross-National Investigation of Occupational Sex Segregation and Inequality.” *The Sociological Quarterly* 44(3):351-383.
- Mills, Mary Beth. 2003. “Gender and Inequality in the Global Labor Force.” *Annual Reviews Anthropology* 32:41-62.
- Nussbaum, Martha C. 2003. “Women’s Education: a Global Challenge.” *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 29(2):325-355.
- Oliveros, Teresita. 1997. “Impact of New World Trade Regime on Peasant Women

in the Philippines.” *Third World Resurgence* 86(October).

Pande, Rekha. 2000. “Globalization and Women in the Agricultural Sector.” *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 2:409-412.

Sassen, Saskia. 2001. “The Excesses of Globalisation and the Feminisation of Survival.” *Parallax* 7(1):100-110. - - -. 2000. “Women’s Burden: Counter-Geographies of Globalization and the Feminization of Survival.” *Journal of International Affairs* 53(2):503-525.

“Social Indicators on Men and Women.” 2005. United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP) website. <<http://unescap.org/stat/data>>.

Tauli-Corpuz, Victoria. 1998. “Asia-Pacific Women Grapple with Financial Crisis and Globalisation.” *Third World Resurgence* 94(June).

Tsikata, Dzodzi. 1995. “Globalisation the Cause of Poor Women’s Woes, Says Panel.” *Third World Resurgence* 61/62(Sept./Oct.).

Wolf, Martin. 2000. “Why This Hatred of the Market?” *The Globalization Reader*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

“World Trade Organization: 10 Benefits of the WTO Trading System.” 2005. World Trade Organization Online. <http://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/whatis_e/10ben_e/10b00_e.htm>.

“World’s Women – Trends and Statistics.” 1995. United Nations Statistics Division. Women in Development Network. Focus International Website. <<http://www.focusintl.com/widnet.htm>>.

“World’s Women, 1970-1990.” 1991. United Nations Statistics Division. New York: UN.