COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA
Copyright Regulations 1969

WARNING

This material has been reproduced and communicated to you by or on behalf of The University of Adelaide pursuant to Part VB of the Copyright Act 1968 (the Act).

The material in this communication may be subject to copyright under the Act. Any further reproduction or communication of this material by you may be the subject of copyright protection under the Act.

Do not remove this notice.

Acker, Joan c2010, '[Extracted from] Gender, capitalism and globalization' in Plante, Rebecca F. & Maurer, Lis M. (eds.), Doing gender diversity : readings in theory and real-world experience, Westview Press, Boulder, CO, pp. 367-369, 373-383.

32 Joan Acker

Gender, Capitalism and Globalization

Feminist scholars have been producing research and theoretical reflections on women, gender, and global transformations at least since 1970, the date of publication of Ester Boserup's ground-breaking *Woman's Role in Economic Development*. In this essay, I discuss some aspects of the mostly Western feminist scholarship on gender and globalization to provide a context for the papers in this volume. Although I do not attempt to summarize what is now a very large literature,[1] I briefly look at how gender is implicated in globalization processes, asking whether and how these processes are gendered and what gendered effects result from these processes. Because both "globalization" and "gender" are contested concepts, I begin with a discussion of how I define them.

Gendering Globalization

"Globalization" captures a multiplicity of changes that are, it is claimed, altering the contours of economies, polities, and social life in general at the end of the 20th Century and the beginning of the 21st Century. Influential male theorists in the social sciences argue about the meaning of the term, the processes involved and the likely outcomes (e.g., Giddens 1999; Bauman 1998; Beck 2000; Sen 2002; Wallerstein 1974; Hardt and Negri 2000). Disagreements exist about whether present globalization is a new stage in capitalist development or a continuation of globalizing processes that have been characteristic of capitalism from its emergence in the 15th Century. Or, possibly, globalizing processes began much earlier and are not inevitably tied to capitalism (Sen 2002). Other disagreements have to do with how total is the economic and cultural penetration of global capitalism, how fundamental are the transformations of economic and social processes, how much these changes improve or undermine conditions of daily life, how central are technological innovations to other changes, and how much have global forces overwhelmed the autonomy of nation states. Many writers link the concept of a "new economy" to the concept of globalization, seeing new technology-based production and communication as necessary to and facilitating the expansions and penetrations of globalization.

Granting that capitalism has always been "global," there do seem to be identifiable changes in global processes in the past 30 years or so. As I understand it, globalization

Excerpted from the original. Joan Acker, "Gender, Capitalism and Globalization," *Critical Sociology* 30, no. 1 (January 2004): 17–41. Copyright © 2004 Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden. Reprinted by permission of SAGE Publications.

I want to thank Heidi Gottfried for suggesting I write this introduction and for her excellent editorial suggestions.

refers to the increasing pace and penetrations of movements of capital, production, and people across boundaries of many kinds and on a global basis. This view emphasizes that globalization is processual and contradictory as well as complex and multifaceted (e.g., Lenz 2002). Globalization is about class, race/ethnic, and gender relations: it is political and cultural, as well as economic.[2] The growth and consolidation of transnational corporations, along with new forms of decentralization, relocation and reorganization of production and subcontracting are parts of the process. "Free marketization," or the reduction of old state and contractual controls with the substitution of other controls, and the potential commodification of almost everything are other aspects of present changes.[3] The old controls that have either disappeared or are under attack include those that protected local/national firms and industries, enacted welfare state supports and constrained capitalist actions to oppose unions, to endanger workers' health and safety, or to pollute the environment. New controls, on the other hand, may regulate new categories of workers, constrain opponents of unlimited corporate freedom, or reinforce neo-liberal ideology, such as mandates in the U.S. that impoverished single mothers must work for pay without regard for the welfare of their children. Organizational restructuring, downsizing, new forms of flexibility and new forms of employment relations are parts of free marketization. Finally, there is the emergence of new leading sectors of global capitalism based on technological innovations, the "new economy." As identified in the business literature, these are computer and information technology, global finance, and biotechnological innovation. All of these changes are interrelated and shaped by the ideological dominance of neo-liberal thought.

The dominant discourse on globalization that describes and theorizes the above changes has a hidden commonality: gender and often race are invisible. Globalization is presented as gender neutral, even though some theorists do pay some attention to women, the family and women's employment (e.g., Castells 2000). This ostensible gender neutrality masks the "implicit masculinization of these macro-structural models" (Freeman 2001; see also Ward 1993). The implicit masculine standpoint in the ruling relations (Smith 1987) from which theories of society have been constructed impedes adequate analysis. For example, unpaid caring, household, and agricultural labor, along with much informal economic activity that maintains human life (Elson 1994; Mies 1986), do not enter the analyses or are assumed to be in unlimited supply. The omission of mostly women's unpaid work seriously biases discussions of the penetration of capitalist globalizing processes and limits understanding of both negative consequences and potentials for opposition (Bergeron 2001; Gibson-Graham 2002).

"Gendering" the discourse of globalization exposes the discontinuities between the realities of women's and men's lives and mainstream scholarly work about global processes. Combined with integral attention to race and ethnic processes, "gendering" should produce a better understanding of contemporary global issues. Before presenting some of the extensive feminist work that has gendered globalization research and theory, I briefly examine the concept of gender. Gender as used here is defined as inequalities, divisions, and differences socially constructed around assumed distinctions between female and male. Gender is a basic organizing principle in social life, a principle for allocation of duties, rights, rewards, and power, including the means of violence. Gender is a factor in organizing daily life for individuals, families, communities, and societies as large structures. Women are usually disadvantaged in terms of power and material and status rewards. Gender is neither an essential attribute of individuals nor a constant in social life, but consists of material and symbolic aspects of existence, constantly produced and reproduced in the course of ongoing social activities and practices. Gender necessarily involves bodies of actual people and the ways that they see and experience themselves, their identities. This implies that there are many versions of gender, different masculinities and femininities, lived differently in different times and places, but also varying within particular times and places. Although there are many versions of masculinity and femininity and many ways of organizing gender differences, heterosexual gender is the norm almost everywhere. Most feminist analysts of gender and globalization use some such notion of gender as socially produced and highly variable, while recognizing the predominant subordination of women within gender relations.

Although gender includes female and male, masculine and feminine, women and men, in scholarly and everyday practice, including discussions of globalization, gender often means women. Much of the work on gender and globalization is actually research on women, work, and family under contemporary conditions of economic transformations. This gender research may include men as their actions and practices shape the worlds of women, but the bulk of the research on men, work, and economy is cast as gender-neutral, with the implicit assumption that to talk about men is to talk about the general situation. Much research in which men are the principle actors can be interpreted from a gender perspective, and fairly recent work on masculinity is helpful (e.g., Connell 1987, 2000; Hooper 2000). However, this is another long-existing conceptual problem and one that has been difficult to solve. I suspect that part of the problem has to do with the gender structure of research institutions: the specialization in which "gender" understandings are the domain of women researchers and of little interest to researchers who are men (or women working within a masculinized frame of reference).[4]

Is Globalization Gendered?

"Is globalization gendered?" could be answered in many ways. I have chosen to first look at how gender is embedded in the structuring and ongoing practices of globalizing capitalism, and second, to examine the impacts of some of the changes linked to globalization on women, men, families, and gender relations.

Gender as Embedded in Globalizing Capitalism

I argue that gender is intrinsic to globalizing capitalist processes and relations by discussing first, the gendered construction of a separation between capitalist production and human reproduction and continuing corporate claims of non-responsibility for reproduction that are linked to that separation. Second, I discuss the role of masculinities in globalizing capitalism. Third, I look at gender as a resource for globalizing capital.

The gendered construction of a division between capitalist production and human

by corporate farming, cheap agricultural imports, or deforestation. Demands for structural adjustment by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) force the sharp reduction of welfare state social protections for reproduction and increase poverty and inequality (Marchand and Runyan 2002; Stiglitz 2002). Women's unpaid labor keeps life going under these conditions. The transnational organization of production builds non-responsibility into the structure of capitalist processes. As corporations such as Nike or Liz Claiborne contract production to firms in other countries, the corporation has relatively few workers of its own, thus few who might demand responsibility. As Applebaum and Gereffi (1990: 44) say, "Contracting means that the so-called manufacturer need not employ any production workers, run the risk of unionization or wages pressures, or be concerned with layoffs resulting from changes in product demands." Thus, downloading responsibility in the interest of accumulation underlies corporate decisions to continually move production to the location with the cheapest labor. Non-responsibility is built into globalizing processes, indeed the opportunities for production and gain without challenges to non-responsibility probably constitute a major incentive for moving production from rich, capitalist countries to poorer, low wage locations. At the same time, back in corporate headquarters in the U.S. or other rich countries, where design, marketing, and production decisions are made, a significant degree of gender and race/ethnic equality may emerge as skilled professionals are hired to do this work. It may even be good business for Nike, for example, to have an Asian-American woman as a public spokesperson. Her work conditions, and possibilities for meeting obligations of home and reproduction are probably quite different than those of the non-employees making the company's products.

Although claims to non-responsibility have been loud and persistent during the recent period of the triumph of neo-liberalism and global capitalism, they are beginning to be challenged in many different arenas, including Seattle, Davos, etc., by feminist and women's organizing in many parts of the world (Bergeron 2002; Mohanty 2002; Gibson-Graham 2002), and potentially by the widespread discrediting of U.S. corporations in recent scandals.

Masculinities in globalizing capital. In the history of modern globalization, beginning with the expansion of England and other European countries in colonial conquest, agents of globalization, leaders and troops, have been men, but not just any men. They have been particular men whose locations within gendered social relations and practices can be captured by the concept of masculinity. "Masculinity" is a contested term.[10] As Connell (1987, 2000), Hearn (1996), and others have pointed out, it should be pluralized as "masculinities," because in any society at any time there are several ways of being a man. Connell (2000) defines masculinities as "configurations of practice within gender relations, a structure that includes large-scale institutions and economic relations as well as face-to-face relationships and sexuality" (p. 29). Masculinities are reproduced through organizational/institutional practices, social interaction, and through images, ideals, myths or representations of behaviors and emotions. Hegemonic masculinity is the most desired and admired form, attributed to leaders and other influential figures at particular historical times. More than one type of hegemonic masculinity may exist

simultaneously, although they may share characteristics, as do the business leader and the sports star at the present time.

Connell (2000) identifies "globalizing masculinities," beginning with the masculinities of conquest and settlement of the 18th and 19th Centuries that combined "an unusual level of violence and egocentric individualism" (p. 47) among the conquerors. Masculinities of empire cast the male colonizers as more manly and more virile than the colonized, thus emasculating colonized others, and, at the same time, legitimating violence in the interests of empire. Globalizing masculinities organized around violence and domination seems to have been predominant in these two periods of conquest and settlement. As corporate capitalism developed, Connell and others (for example Collinson and Hearn 1996) argue, a hegemonic masculinity based on claims to expertise developed along with masculinities still organized around domination. Hegemonic masculinity relying on claims to expertise does not necessarily lead to economic organizations free of domination and violence, however (Hearn and Parkin 2002). Hearn and Parkin (2002) argue that controls relying on both explicit and implicit violence exist in a wide variety of organizations.

In today's organizing for globalization, we can see the emergence of a hegemonic hyper-masculinity that is aggressive, ruthless, competitive, and adversarial. Think of Rupert Murdoch (Reed 1996), Phil Knight (Strasser and Beklund 1993), or Bill Gates. Gates, who represents a younger generation than Murdoch and Knight, may seem to be more gently aggressive and more socially responsible than the other two examples, with his contributions to good causes around the globe. However, his actions made public in the anti-trust lawsuits against Microsoft seem to still exhibit the ruthlessness, competitiveness and adversarialness of hyper-masculinity. This masculinity is supported and reinforced by the ethos of the free market, competition, and a "win or die" environment. This is the masculine image of those who organize and lead the drive to global control and the opening of markets to international competition. Masculinities embedded in collective practices are part of the context within which certain men make the organizational decisions that drive and shape what is called "globalization" and the "new economy." We can speculate that how these men see themselves, what actions and choices they feel compelled to make and they think are legitimate, how they and the world around them define desirable masculinity, enter into that decision-making. Decisions made at the very top reaches of (masculine) corporate power have consequences that are experienced as inevitable economic forces or disembodied social trends. At the same time, they symbolize and enact varying hegemonic masculinities (Connell 1998).

Researchers rarely study how gender, or masculinity, influences the orchestration of contemporary globalizing processes, probably because access to those levels of corporate, international agency (e.g., IMF, World Bank), and state decision-making is difficult to obtain for scholars interested in masculinity. An exception is Alison Woodward's (1996) study of the gendered nature of the European Commission, revealing a highly masculinized bureaucracy dominated by engineers and lawyers with a miserable record on opportunities for women. Press reports of international financial scandals and novels describing the machinations of Wall Street bond salesmen and

currency traders give additional insight into the organizing practices, passions, and illusions of men involved in the globalization of financial markets. In a book about the world of (mostly male) corporate managers, Robert Jackall (1988) chronicles the competition, ambitions, and defeats inherent in life at the near top and top of corporate hierarchies. Although he discusses gender in only one section in which he describes the difficulties experienced by women in presenting themselves as competent managers, most of the book can be read as an account about men with money and power who are desperately hanging on to that money and power. Similar studies of masculinities in globalizing organizations would be instructive.

The new hegemonic masculinity, which may differ from that revealed in studies such as Jackall's, represents neo-liberal ideology. *The Economist* talks about the Davos Man,[11] a term that includes businessmen, bankers, officials, and intellectuals (Benería 1999; see also Hooper 2000). "In many ways, he is the rational economic man gone global" (Benería 1999: 68). R. W. Connell (1998) describes a "trans-national business masculinity" as "marked by increasing egocentrism, very conditional loyalties (even to the corporation), and a declining sense of responsibility for others (except for purposes of image making)" (p. 16). This masculinity also seems marked by arrogance, a passion to control, ruthlessness, and aggression. I suspect that excitement and pleasure, perhaps bordering on the erotic (Hacker 1989), are also part of this hegemonic masculinity, including the intertwined pleasures of technology and power. We may have failed to take adequate notice of pleasures as we have considered the role that emotions and gender identities play in organizations, and by extension in the globalizing process of capitalism. Arlie Hochschild's (1997) description of the pleasures of being at work, pleasures that make the workplace a more desirable place to be than the home, is an exception. Pleasure may extend to domination (Hearn 1993). To dominate may produce a rush of exhilaration. Sally Hacker argued that the pleasures of technology often become "harnessed to domination, and passion becomes directed toward power over nature, the machine, and other people, particularly women, in the work hierarchy" (Acker 1990, p. 153).

Transnational business masculinity, although it may involve the pleasures of domination, does not need to be openly violent because the means of violence are institutionalized in seemingly neutral, rational business practices (Hearn and Parkin 2002). The violence of leaving people without resources for survival through downsizing or moving production from one low-wage locale to another lower-wage locale is simply business necessity. Conceptualized through accounting and strategic planning, no human bodies appear on the books, thus such violences are accomplished as gender neutral and abstracted from actual human consequences. This is another way that corporate non-responsibility and its gendered consequences are embedded in ordinary practices.

Will men and various forms of hegemonic masculinity continue to dominate and symbolize the organizations leading and profiting from globalization? Women, at least a few, are represented among business and political leaders, but they are rare and usually must perform in terms of prescriptions gendered as masculine. However, there are indications that the "new economy" is emerging in a form as male-dominated as

the "old economy." The new dominant growth sectors, information technology, biotech innovation, and global finance, are all heavily male-dominated, although women fill some of the jobs in the middle and at the bottom, as is usual in many old economy sectors. Numerically these are small sectors, but their importance far outdistances their size. Much of the evidence for the male dominance of these sectors is anecdotal and comes from the press, from novels, and from TV images. There is, however, some systematic data on gender in computer science and computer technology, occupations that are fundamental to the new economy sectors; without computers these sectors would not exist.

In the U.S., women are a decreasing proportion of those being educated in computer science as well as a decreasing proportion of those working as computer scientists and analysts. The National Science Foundation reports (NSF 2000) that in 1984 women constituted 37 percent of those graduating with a BS in computer science, 29 percent of those graduating with a MS in the field, and 12 percent of those obtaining a Ph.D. By 1996, women had dropped to 28 percent of BS graduates and 27 percent of MS graduates, but had slightly increased their proportions at the Ph.D. level to 15 percent. It could be that fewer women are entering the field, but that those who enter persist more doggedly. Employment in the field follows similar patterns. Women as a proportion of Computer/mathematical Scientists (this includes all those employed regardless of their academic degrees) seem to have hit a high point in 1990 when they were 36.5 percent of those employed in the field (NSF 2000). By 1997, their proportion had dropped to 27.3 percent. Women are a much smaller proportion of those employed as electrical and electronic engineers, having expanded their representation from 8.7 percent to 9.1 percent of these categories in the period between 1990 and 1997 (NSF 2000). In computer programming, a similar pattern occurred. While the numbers of computer programmers increased between 1991 and 1999, women's representation in the field dropped by 6.42 percent (Bureau of Labor Statistics 2000). A recent *New York Times* article confirms that the relative scarcity of women in computer science is still being replicated in U.S. high schools. For example, in Los Angeles, "more than 19,000 boys took the Advanced Placement computer science examination in 2001, compared with just over 2,400 girls" (Stabiner 2003: 35).

Although no one has definitive answers to why computer science and technology remains so male dominated, a primary factor seems to be the identification of computer work with forms of masculinity that exclude women and emphasize obsessive concentration and/or violence and self-absorption. The culture of computer science and technology heavily emphasizes total commitment to the work to the exclusion of the rest of life. Many news stories about Silicon Valley dramatize the round-the-clock work lives there. Henry Nicholas, an electrical engineering Ph.D. and co-founder of Broadcom is quoted as explaining the 18-hour days he often works, "You have to take yourself to the absolute limits of human behavior. The whole concept is you leave nothing in reserve" (*International Herald Tribune*, June 27, 2000). Tracy Kidder documented this peculiarity of computer designers in *The Soul of a New Machine* in 1982. Apparently, little has changed. In addition, computer science emerged in close connection to engineering, which has always been a male-identified and dominated field. Although as this is written in 2003, the IT and computer industry is in a deep recession, there are no indications that this technology will become less important for globalizing transnational firms.

Male dominance and a masculine ethos of computer science have an importance that goes beyond the new economy sectors and extends to the global society as a whole.

Computer scientists and technologists may not be the Information Technology managers of the future. Instead, they may be people trained in business administration, but with a broad grasp of technology issues, which might mean that more women could move into such positions. However, the gendered expectations and behaviors of top corporate leaders seem to continue to be defined in terms set by hegemonic masculinities even when women fill these positions, as noted above.

Gender as a resource for globalizing capital. Women's labor is a resource for capital, as documented in the very large literature on women and development and gender and economic policy, detailing research on the working lives of poor women, especially women in non-Northern countries, makes clear (for example, Bakker 1994; Benería and Roldán 1987; Boserup 1970; Nash and Fernández-Kelly 1983; Rowbotham and Mitter 1994). Gender has been a resource for globalizing firms as they seek out new sources of low-wage labor. In country after country, women and often children have been drawn into production for the world market and into wage labor in transnational organizations. Although such employment often provides welcome income for poor families, much research also exposes how exploitive it is. Multinationals may find it particularly profitable to locate production where labor laws and unions are weak and women workers are still attached to peasant families. For example, Ong (1983) describes these processes in rural Malaysia in the late 1970s. Where the state and women's lack of power are not sufficient to maintain low wages, transnational corporations or their local contractors may, of course, resort to more blatant methods. In a later example from Malaysia, Bhopal (1997) details the campaign of intimidation orchestrated by a U.S. company against strong union organizing among electronics workers in Malaysia. The author notes that 85 percent of the workers were Malaysian women, but does not examine the role that gender might have played in their struggle or the gender consequences of the loss of union rights.

Literature on Third World women workers also reveals the great variety of ways in which women are incorporated into transnational capitalist production and the ways in which existing local gender relations are a resource for capital. For example, production may be done in the home, with the family organized as an entrepreneurial enterprise, as in the satellite factory system in Taiwan (Hsiung 1996). In such cases, class, gender, production, and reproduction meld in different ways than in Western societies, with employer/supervisory control folded into existing patriarchal family controls. In other cases, for example in China, some industrial production for the world market is carried out by mostly women workers living in large dormitories reminiscent of the dormitories set up for women textile workers in New England at the beginning of the nineteenth Century (Lee 1998). In other cases, young women workers live at home and contribute their

cash incomes for the support of parents and siblings, while they remain under the traditional control of parents (Wolf 1992). These examples do not begin to reflect the complex and multifaceted ways in which gender relations, mediated by race/ethnic and class relations, are integrated into the relations of capitalist production as globalization progresses.

Capitalism can prosper from many different gender and race/ethnic patterns. While the above examples come from "developing" countries, gender, along with immigration, continues to be a resource for employers in the rich Euro-American countries. Gender is particularly a resource for the provision of the multiple support services that make possible the existence of the centers of transnational business in "global cities" as Saskia Sassen (1998) argues. In global cities the work of provisioning, cleaning the offices, child tending, and caring for bodies and homes must be done so that global managers and other members of the global elite can go easily about their business. The labor power for these tasks is to a large extent provided by immigrants, disproportionately women, from Third World countries.

Evelyn Nakano Glenn (1998) and others discuss the transnational gender relations that exist in caring work. For example, Filipinas and Guatemalan women migrate to the United States to become domestic workers for affluent women whose professional careers are thus facilitated. Transnational migration of domestic and caring workers is also nothing new for the United States. Forced migration of African slaves included women who became house servants and child minders. Waves of European immigrant women worked first as domestics in the cities of America in the late 19th and early 20th Centuries.

Gendered images and ideologies of femininity and masculinity are used in various sectors of international capital to construct desirable workers (and managers) and desired behaviors. Working class and Third World women are often seen as docile, cheap to employ, and able to endure boring, repetitive work, whether or not women see themselves in these ways. The "feminization of labor" (Standing 1989), or the increasing insecurity, low pay, and routine tasks of jobs and other forms of employment, confirms such images of women workers.

In the rich "developed" countries, gender images continue to help shape sex segregation, the continuing gender stereotyping of jobs, and the symbolic construction of desirable workers. Images of successful professionals and managers in global businesses are sexualized and gendered as they are presented in the media. These images are not uniform, but seem to present a variety of ways in which to be assertive, smart, competitive, and in control. Some of these images are depictions of feminine success, the young and sexy woman who is beautiful as well as on top in the business world. Such images suggest the changing class configurations of gender in the centers of capitalist global power. Changing gender images seem to have also been part of the transition from socialism to market capitalism in Eastern Europe. For example, the image of the male worker as the hero of socialism has been replaced by the entrepreneur (True 2000).

The Gendered Effects of Globalization

Globalization has had gendered impacts on the lives of women, men, and their families. The following is a very brief summary of

some of these effects. One of the most visible impacts has been the increased participation of women in the paid labor market almost everywhere, except in the former socialist countries, while for men labor market participation has decreased (Standing 1999). At the same time, Standing (1999) and others argue, the old full-time, secure, with-benefits kind of employment is eroding as new "feminized" jobs, low-paid, temporary or part-time, insecure, and without benefits are created. However, these new jobs are often much better than no jobs and they do improve the lives of many of the women who have them. In addition, in many countries educated middle-class women have had in the 1980s and 1990s increased opportunities for professional and managerial employment, contributing to increased affluence for their families, while exacerbating class differences among women. Another general impact is that unemployment has also risen around the globe (Standing 1999), with some indications that men's unemployment rates are rising to the levels of those of women.[12] Inequality and dire poverty are gendered outcomes of globalization. Inequality and poverty contribute to the apparent increase in the international trafficking in women for prostitution and trafficking in both women and men for other kinds of labor (NIKK 2002).

Generalization about the effects of changes in the structure of employment and welfare state protections is difficult and problematic because they vary tremendously over time, over nations, over economic sectors, and over class and race/ethnic as well as gender lines. However, it seems that women may be more negatively affected than men.

Global changes also affect personal gender relations and identities. For some women, increased opportunity for paid employment may mean greater autonomy and equality in personal life, or avenues out of oppressive relationships. For others, these changes lead to less security, greater difficulties in taking care of themselves and their families, and, perhaps, the necessity to remain in unsupportive or violent relationships with men. The old Euro-American gender contract in which men earned the family income and women did the unpaid work of maintaining home and family is substantially gone, although still an ideal for many. To the extent that a secure job and a living wage were supports for a stable masculinity, that masculinity may be threatened by the increasing difficulty in finding such work, as men are extruded from good jobs into less skilled jobs, unemployment, or early retirement. This is probably a particularly severe problem for young men who are trying to establish a satisfactory masculine identity. These examples only touch on a few of the possible consequences of global restructuring for the destabilizing of gender identities.

Some things remain the same. In spite of the erosion of the economic base for the old male/provider—female/carer model in the rich industrial countries of the North, work has been and still is organized on a masculine model of the worker. This model has a fundamental lack of fit with the more complex demands for nurturing and earning money of most women's lives. This model for work organization is predicated upon the separation of production from other aspects of life, as I argued above. The reorganization of work and demands for increased productivity, increased intensity of work, and longer or irregular hours, increase the lack of fit with women's lives (Hochschild 1997) and the lives of men who desire to

share family work. (Few men are as yet required to share this work.) These increasing demands stretch across levels of skill and hierarchy, although varying in terms of specific pressures. In the lowest paid female-typed service jobs, such as elder or child care, serving in fast food restaurants, or routine clerical jobs, work invades life through irregular schedules, required overtime and/or required part-time. Thus, increased stress for many workers, especially women, is another consequence of the complex changes that are summarized under the concept "globalization."

Notes

1. Valentine M. Moghadam (1999) has written a recent overview of research and theoretical issues in the field. See also, Chandra Talpade Mohanty (2002) and Marianne Marchand and Anne Sisson Runyan (eds., 2000). See also Basu et al. (2001) and Zillah Eisenstein (1998).

2. This statement, by implication, maintains conceptual distinctions between these large institutional areas. But, these distinctions are discursive as well as anchored in some concrete organizational arrangements. As discursive distinctions, the separation of economy, polity, and the rest of social life may impede rather than facilitate understanding by posing connections as particular objects of investigation rather than as integral to the ongoing functioning of social relations as a whole that extend across discursively constructed boundaries. Feminist deconstructions have long argued that boundaries, such as those between the public (male) and the private (female), are part of the conceptual practices of power (Smith 1990) that maintain the dominance of certain men. Conceptual boundaries may also be part of the practices of power that maintain the dominance of globalizing, gendered capitalism.

3. In some countries, there are also new controls that protect workers rights, particularly those of women to equal opportunities and equal pay with men, as Walby (2002) has pointed out.

4. *A Historical/Methodological note:* I have the sense that the term "globalization" began to be used as the dominance of neo-liberal capitalism began to be proclaimed in the late 1980s and certainly by the time of the demise of the USSR and communist regimes in other countries around 1989–90. At that time political leaders in the Northern, rich capitalist countries began to proclaim triumphantly, "There Is No Alternative" (TINA) to their form of capitalism. Until then, one could have argued that there were two competing global systems, but with only one remaining, TINA seemed obvious. "Globalization" as an area of research and publication exploded once there seemed to be only one global playing field. A bibliographical search for articles on globalization confirms this surmise. Academic Search Elite lists 5 articles on globalization for the ten years from January 1978 to January 1988. From February 1988 to December 1995 (8 years), 52 articles with this subject appear, while in the seven-year period from January 1996 to December 2002, 2,287 articles on globalization were indexed.

5. See, for example, the work of Maria Mies (1987).

6. North Atlantic masculinities were not, however, simply transferred to diverse colonial worlds, as Mohanty (2002) and others point out. In some colonizing efforts, colonized men were "feminized" by European occupiers as weak and compliant, not sufficiently masculine.

7. A large literature on these processes now exists. See, for example Mies 1986; Mohanty, Russo, and Torres 1991; Connell 2000.

8. The idea of a "productive" and a "reproductive" economy in uneasy interdependence is in some ways similar to the much earlier Marxist feminist argument that housework was necessary to the reproduction of labor power and thus necessary to the production of surplus value. This argument disappeared partly because of its functional nature—i.e., housework exists because it is necessary or functional for capital. The notion of productive and reproductive economies seems not to have this problem of circularity. However, this formulation is an oversimplified abstraction that does not provide space for the increasing role of the state in both production and reproduction in the history of capitalism in Euro-American countries.

9. See Lourdes Benería (1999) for another analysis focusing on the development of market society.

10. Much of this discussion is based on the work of R. W. Connell (1987, 2000).

11. Davos is the town in Switzerland where world business, economic, and political leaders meet yearly to discuss the world economy.

12. Unemployment is defined and measured differently in different countries. See Standing (1999), Chapter 5 for a discussion of some of the difficulties in measurement and suggestions of solutions.

References

Acker, Joan. (1990). Hierarchies, Jobs, Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organizations. *Gender & Society*, 4,2: 139–158.

———. (1988). Class, Gender, and the Relations of Distribution. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 13,3: 473–497.

Acker, Joan, Sandra Morgen, and Lisa Gonzales. (2002). *Welfare Restructuring, Work & Poverty.* Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon, Center for the Study of Women in Society.

Applebaum, Richard P. and Gary Gereffi. (1994). "Power and Profits in the Apparel Commodity Chain." In Edna Bonacich, Lucie Cheng, Norma Chinchilla, Nora Hamilton, and Paul Ong, Eds., *Global Production: The Apparel Industry in the Pacific Rim.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Bakker, Isabella (ed.). (1994). *The Strategic Silence: Gender and Economic Policy.* London: Zed Books.

Basu, Amrita, Inderpal Grewal, Caren Kaplan, and Liisa Malkki. (2001). *Globalization and Gender, special issue of Signs* 26,4.

Bauman, Zygmund. (1998). *Globalization: The Human Consequences.* Cambridge: Polity.

Beck, Ulrich. (2000). *What Is Globalization?* Cambridge: Polity.

Benería, Lourdes. (1999). Globalization, Gender and the Davos Man. *Feminist Economics* 5,3: 61–83.

Benería, Lourdes and Martha Roldán. (1987). *The Crossroads of Class & Gender: Industrial Homework, Subcontracting, and Household Dynamics in Mexico City.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bergeron, Suzanne. (2001). Political Economy Discourses of Globalization and Feminist Politics. *Signs* 26,4: 983–1006.

Bhopal, Mhinder. (1997). Industrial Relations in Malaysia—Multinational Preferences and State Concessions in Dependent Development: A Case Study of the Electronics Industry. *Economic and Industrial Democracy* 18,4: 567–596.

Boserup, Ester. (1970). *Woman's Role in Economic Development.* London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd.

Bureau of Labor Statistics, Current Population Survey. (1983–1999). Employed Persons by Detailed Occupations and Sex. Washington, DC: GPO.

Castells, Manuel. (1997). *The Power of Identity. The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture,* Volume II. Oxford: Blackwell.

Collinson, David L. and Jeff Hearn (eds.). (1996). *Men as Managers, Managers as Men.* London: Sage.

Connell, R. W. (1987). *Gender & Power.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Connell, R. W. (2000). *The Men and the Boys.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Eisenstein, Zillah. (1998). *Global Obscenities: Patriarchy, Capitalism, and the Lure of Cyberfantasy.* New York: New York University Press.

Elson, Diane. (1994). "Micro, Meso, Macro: Gender and Economic Analysis in the Context of Policy Reform." In Isabella Bakker, ed., *The Strategic Silence: Gender and Economic Policy.* London: Zed.

Freeman, Carla. (2001). Is Local: Global as Feminine: Masculine: Rethinking the Gender of Globalization. *Signs* 26,4: 1007–1038.

Gibson-Graham, J. K. (2002). "Beyond Global vs. Local: Economic Politics Outside the Binary Frame." In A. Herod and M. Wrights, eds., *Geographies of Power: Placing Scale.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Giddens, Anthony. (1999). *Runaway World.* London: Profile Books.

Glenn, Evelyn Nakano. (1999). "The Social Construction and Institutionalization of Gender and Race: An Integrative Framework." In Myra Marx Ferree, Judith Lorber, and Beth B. Hess, eds., *Revisioning Gender*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Hacker, Sally. (1989). *Pleasure, Power, and Technology*. Boston: Unwin Hyman.

Harcourt, Wendy (ed.). (2002). Place, Politics and Justice: Women Negotiating Globalization. *Development* 45,1.

Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri. (2000). *Empire*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hearn, Jeff. (1993). "Emotive Subjects: Organizational Men, Organizational Masculinities and the (De)construction of 'Emotions.'" In Stephen Fineman, ed., *Emotions in Organizations*. London: Sage.

Hearn, Jeff and Wendy Parkin. (2001). *Gender, Sexuality and Violence in Organizations*. London: Sage.

Hochschild, Arlie. (1997). *The Time Bind: When Work Becomes Home and Home Becomes Work*. New York: Metropolitan Books.

Hooper, Charlotte. (2000). "Masculinities in Transition: The Case of Globalizations." In Marianne H. Marchand and Anne Sisson Runyan, eds., *Gender and Global Restructuring: Sightings, Sites and Resistances*. London and New York: Routledge.

Hsiung, Ping-Chun. (1996). *Living Rooms as Factories: Class, Gender and the Satellite Factory System in Taiwan*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Jackall, Robert. (1988). *Moral Mazes: The World of Corporate Managers*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Kidder, Tracy. (1981). *The Soul of a New Machine*. New York: Avon Books.

Lee, Ching Kwan. (1998). *Gender and the South China Miracle: Two Worlds of Factory Women*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Lenz, Ilse. (2002). Globalization, Gender and Work: Perspectives on Global Regulation. Working Paper.

Marchand, Marianne H. and Anne Sisson Runyan. (2000). "Introduction. Feminist Sightings of Global Restructuring: Conceptualizations and Reconceptualizations." In Marianne H. Marchand and Anne Sisson Runyan, eds., *Gender and Global Restructuring: Sightings, Sites and Resistances*. London and New York: Routledge.

Mies, Maria. (1986). *Patriarchy and Accumulation on a World Scale*. London: Zed Books.

Moghadam, Valentine M. (1999). "Gender and the Global Economy." In Myra Marx Ferree, Judith Lorber, and Beth B. Hess, eds., *Revisioning Gender*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. (2002). "Under Western Eyes" Revisited: Feminist Solidarity through Anticapitalist Struggles. *Signs* 28,2: 500–535.

———. (1991). "Cartographies of Struggle: Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism." In Chandra Talpade Mohanty, Ann Russo, and Lourdes Torres, eds., *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Mohanty, Chandra Talpade, Ann Russo, and Lourdes Torres (eds.). (1991). *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Nash, June and Fernández-Kelly, María Patricia (eds.). (1983). *Women, Men, and the International Division of Labor*. Albany: SUNY Press.

National Science Foundation/Division of Science Resources Studies. (1997). SESTAT (Scientists and Engineers Statistical Data System), 2000. *Women, Minorities and Persons With Disabilities in Science and Engineering: 2000*.

NIKK. (2002). *Bodies Across Borders—Prostitution and Trafficking in Women*. Oslo, Norway: Nordic Institute for Women's Studies and Gender Research.

Ong, Aihwa. (1983). "Global Industries and Malay Peasants in Peninsular Malaysia." In June Nash and María Patricia Fernández-Kelly, eds., *Women, Men, and the International Division of Labor*. Albany: SUNY Press.

Reed, Rosslyn. (1996). "Entrepreneurialism and Paternalism in Australian Management: A Gender Critique of the 'Self-Made' Man." In

David L. Collinson and Jeff Hearn, eds., *Men as Managers, Managers as Men*. London: Sage.

Rowbotham, Sheila and Swasti Mitter. (1994). *Dignity and Daily Bread*. London and New York: Routledge.

Sassen, Saskia. (1998). *Globalization and Its Discontents*. New York: The New Press.

Sen, Amartya. (2002). How to Judge Globalism. *The American Prospect, Special Supplement: Globalism and the World's Poor*, Winter: 2–6.

Smith, Dorothy. (1987). *The Everyday World as Problematic*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.

———. (1990). *The Conceptual Practices of Power*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Stabiner, Karen. (2003). Where the Girls Aren't. *New York Times*, January 12, Section 4A: 35.

Standing, Guy. (1988). Global Feminization through Flexible Labor. *World Development* 17: 1077–1095.

———. (1999). *Global Labour Flexibility*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Stiglitz, Joseph E. (2002). Globalism's Discontents. *The American Prospect, Special Supplement: Globalism and the World's Poor*, Winter: 16–21.

Strasser, J. B. and Laurie Becklund. (1993). *Swoosh: The Unauthorized Story of Nike and the Men Who Played There*. New York: Harper Business.

True, Jacqui. (2000). "Gendering Post-Socialist Transitions." In Marianne H. Marchand and Anne Sisson Runyan, eds., *Gender and Global Restructuring: Sightings, Sites and Resistances*. London and New York: Routledge.

Walby, Sylvia. (2002). Gender and the New Economy: Towards a Framework for Comparative Analysis. Paper presented at workshop of the Globalization, Gender and Work Transformation Research Groups, Tokyo, Aug. 29–Sept. 1.

Walby, Sylvia and Heidi Gottfried. (2003). *Gendering the New Economy: Theorizing the Trajectories of the G-4Y, Regulation and Gender*. London: Palgrave.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. (1974). *The Modern World System*. New York: Academic Press.

Ward, Kathryn B. (1993). "Reconceptualizing World System Theory to Include Women." In Paula England, ed., *Theory on Gender/Feminism on Theory*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Wolf, Diane. (1992). *Factory Daughters: Gender, Household Dynamics, and Rural Industrialization in Java*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Woodward, Alison E. (1996). "Multinational Masculinities and European Bureaucracies." In David L. Collinson and Jeff Hearn, eds., *Men as Managers, Managers as Men*. London: Sage.