

CHAPTER 9

WOMEN'S ECONOMIC WELL-BEING

9.1 INTRODUCTION

The understanding of complex issues related to gender requires use of various methodologies. Sen (2000) recommends a combination of quantitative and qualitative research methods. Combining methodologies enhances each other. For example, the use of qualitative methods can provide an understanding of the outcome of a quantitative analysis, such as statistical outliers (Kanbur 2001). The CGE methodology used in the previous chapters identified women who are likely to benefit from globalisation policies in terms of acquiring employment. However, the analysis does not provide insight on how these women's well-being is affected. For such reason, gender economists advocate use of both quantitative and qualitative methods in order to provide a more comprehensive picture of gender impacts from the macro-level to the micro-level (Fontana 2001; Berenia 2003; Elson 2000; Cagatay 2000).

Until the development of appropriate methodological analyses, combinations of qualitative and quantitative methods are advocated. An example of a new methodology is the pioneering work of Fontana and Wood (2000) who included the element of time use in the CGE model. The combination can take various forms, for example, in some cases, it might be preferable to use different methods simultaneously, but separately, while in other instances a full combination of approaches can be more effective. Devarajan and Robinson (2002) argue that verifying model results with studies using other methods can significantly strengthen their influence on policy.

This chapter examines the extent to which globalisation has affected working women's autonomy and bargaining power in their households. According to the extended bargaining model (Sen 1990), a woman's well-being depends on the type of decisions she can make in the household, her personal autonomy, her control and ownership of resources, the contributions she can make to the household, and her ability to meet perceived self-interests.

As such, this chapter augments the previous ones by attempting to ascertain the well-being of working women at household level. The previous chapters described sectors/subsectors of the economy that provide women with greater economic opportunities under globalisation. This chapter attempts to ascertain whether these opportunities lead to improved well-being of

women at the household level. The following section gives a background to the study. Section 9.3 provides a theoretical underpinning of the model. Section 9.4 gives the data used in this study. Sections 9.5-9.7 follows by presenting the results of the survey, and section 9.8 concludes the chapter.

9.2 BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

Globalisation has contributed to an increase in employment of women, particularly in the manufacturing sectors (Cagatay, Elson & Grown 1995; Seguino 2000a and 2000b; Posel 2002; LFS: 2000-2006). Chapter six of this study has indicated rises in unskilled women labour in the service sectors and in the export-oriented sectors due to trade liberalisation. The results of Chapter 7 also indicated increased women labour demand brought about by increased productivity in sectors. The increase in women's employment, however, is often concentrated in low-skill labour-intensive sectors that usually pay low wages. As a result, the increase in women labour market participation has been associated with the willingness of women to accept jobs at lower wages (Tzannatos 1999; Seguino 2000a and 2000b). However, as shown in the chapter 7, productivity induced by globalisation (through openness/FDI etc.) has increased both the demand and wages for skilled women labour, implying that all types of women are not identically affected by globalisation policy changes.

It is argued that, despite the increase in women labour participation rates, women remain economically disempowered (Chambers 2000). In addition, women workers often have little control over the spending of their income. Male family members, such as husbands, fathers, fathers-in-law, brothers and uncles, frequently determine how the woman's income will be used (Elson 2000). Elson further observes that the key responsibility for unpaid household work remains with women, even in households where women are the main income earners.

9.3 THEORETICAL MODEL

The household model commonly used to represent the traditional household is known as the unitary model. This model considers the household to be a single entity with individuals in it sharing a single preference ordering. The new household economic model, which garnered Becker a Nobel Prize (Becker 1981), is the most well-known model of this kind. A major limitation of this model is that it assumes 'income pooling' and does not take into account which household member controls which portion of the income (Beneria 2003; Kanbur &

Haddad 1994; Chiapori 1992). The model assumes that a spouse does not impose his or her preference on the partner and that the power that comes with having earned a larger amount of the pooled income is not a factor.

Gender research findings in less-developed-countries (Thomas 1992; Cagatay & Elson 2000) have challenged this model. These researches highlight the need to utilise a model that takes into account asymmetric power relations and the conflict of preferences between partners in the household. Most economists have tried to find alternative models that will fit well into the household situation. Sen (1990) proposes that the relationship between men and women in a household should be conceptualised as consisting of both co-operation and conflict. He recommends the use of a 'cooperative conflict' bargaining model to analyse intra-household behaviour.

In the traditional bargaining models, the bargaining power depends on the individuals' respective breakdown positions (Nash 1950). A breakdown position refers to the point at which there is a breakdown of co-operation. It represents the strength or weakness of a person in the bargaining process. It is the point at which a person will accommodate the other person's interest in order to save the negotiation from breaking down. The weaker the breakdown position of an individual, the weaker will be her/his bargaining power.

Sen (1990) argues that, in the context of traditional societies, the traditional bargaining model of the household ought to be expanded to include a person's *perceived* contribution to the household. For example, although the objective reality is that women usually work hard and for long hours on many different household tasks, they often do not perceive themselves (and neither are they perceived by others) as making a significant contribution to the family. As long as such perception exists within society, which is often internalised by women, they will continue to be in a weak bargaining position. Their bargaining position is further undermined by their distorted perception of self-interest. Women fail to take their self-interest seriously, psychologically putting themselves in a secondary position to men who have superior status in a patriarchal culture. As women internalise the norms of discrimination against themselves, they deny their own self-interest. There has been support for women's work from progressive men leaders such as the first president of Tanzania, Mwalimu Nyerere. In 1967, the president acknowledged the tedious and continuous work done by women every day including Sundays and public holidays. (UNCTAD 1999).

In Sen's (1990) extended version of the bargaining model, the relative well-being of men and women depends on three determinants of bargaining power: (a) their objective breakdown position, (b) their perceived contribution to the family, and (c), their perceived self-interest. As such, any intervention, which increases a woman's perceived contribution to the household, will strengthen her bargaining power. The increased participation of women in the job market in response to new economic opportunities of globalisation is precisely such an intervention.

It is hypothesised that income earning which is made possible by globalisation opportunities should strengthen all three determinants of the working woman's bargaining power—which include her objective breakdown position through the income she earns, a greater sense of self-interest, and enhanced perception of making a contribution to the family.

9.4 SURVEY DATA

The Department of Trade and Industry maintains an electronic database of foreign direct investment (FDI) that benefited from its incentive programme as explained in Chapter 1. The database was used to draw up the sampling frame for women working in such sectors. A survey was conducted using a structured questionnaire of 77 questions, which investigated several aspects of women's well-being, including their ability to make decisions on the use of their income. Some are standard questions used in studies related to gender and autonomy (see Rahman & Rao 2004). Data were collected from 131 women working in the manufacturing sector. The firms selected were all foreign companies that have benefited from two of the government's investment grants, the Foreign Investment Grant (FIG) and the Special Support Program (SSP).

The survey was to be conducted in all nine provinces of South Africa but responses came only from seven provinces. The total sample consisted of two sub-groups: (i) working women who were married or living with a spouse or partner and (ii) a control group consisting of working women who were single and had neither been married, are divorced, widowed, or separated from their spouses. The key characteristic of this group was their ability to make decisions independently of a spouse, partner, or ex-partner.

Some studies (Ghuman, Lee & Smith 2000) have found that the perceptions of men and women differ greatly about who makes the most important decisions in the household. In

some instances, women will try to protect husbands and husbands will lie so as to be seen as if they are making all-important decisions in order to conform to cultural norms. Therefore, the comparison between married and single working women was used to determine if there were any significant differences between these two groups. However, this type of analysis is debatable because it has the potential of introducing bias into the assessment of subjective variables. Despite the problem of subjectivity, women are the only suited candidates to give views concerning their own well-being. This approach is supported by Kabeer (1997; 1998) who argues that it is valid to focus exclusively on the subjectivity of women's perception of their own reality.

Two indicators were used to determine a woman's perceived contribution to the family. One was their perceived contribution in terms of household workload; the other was their perceived contribution to the overall income and welfare of the family.

Following the example of Agarwal (1994), the presence of a father, mother, brother, brother-in-law, uncle, aunt, sister, and sister-in-law and measures of household wealth were taken in account in order to capture factors that might be associated with the perceptions of the women. Data on public services such as educational institutions and maternity or family healthy clinics were also gathered. Other variables collected include faith (religion), race, and their place of residence. Geographic factors were also considered, such as the location of residence (urban or rural), quality of roads, availability of public transportation, and distance to the nearest town as they might affect women's mobility and degree of remoteness.

9.5 GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS

Table 9-1 presents the general characteristics of the married women (N=64) and the single women (N=67). The average age of both groups was nearly the same, with married women averaging 36 years of age and single women having an average age of 34 years. In some respects, the two groups were also similar in terms of education. Approximately one half of both groups had a secondary education and approximately 10% of both groups had tertiary education. However, more married women had a post-secondary diploma (married: 37.1%, single: 19.7%), while more single women had a post-secondary degree (married: 1.61%, single: 6.06%).

The majority of both groups were black, with more being in the single category (71%) than in

the married category (63%). Likewise, coloureds were about the same percentage in both groups — married (6.25%) and single (5%). There were more whites in the married group (31.25%) than in the single group (17.91%). While there were no Asians in the married group, nearly 6% of the single group was Asian.

Table 9.1 Kinship and general characteristics

	Married Working Women N=64	Single Working Women N=67
Age	36	34
Religion (%)		
Christian (%)	73.02	61.54
Born-again Christian (%)	14.29	24.62
Muslim (%)	0.00	6.15
African religion (%)	11.11	7.69
Other (%)	1.59	0.00
Race: (%)		
Asian (%)	0.00	5.97
Black (%)	62.50	71.64
Coloured (%)	6.25	4.48
White (%)	31.25	17.91
Schooling (%)		
Primary school (%)	3.23	12.12
Secondary school (%)	48.39	51.52
Post-secondary diploma (%)	37.10	19.70
Post-secondary degree (%)	1.61	6.06
Tertiary (%)	9.68	10.61
Living with (%)		
Brother (%)	8.00	19.28
Sister (%)	9.27	18.07
Uncle (%)		2.41
Aunt (%)		2.01
Brother-in-law (%)	8.00	
Sister-in-law (%)	4.00	1.20
Father (%)	1.14	6.43
Mother (%)	4.57	11.24
Father-in-law (%)	4.00	
Mother-in-law (%)	5.14	
Children (%)	20.57	7.23
Other relatives, friends (%)	34.86	32.13

Source: Analysis of own surveyed data

The overwhelming majority of both groups were Christian (married 87.31%; single 86.16%). African religion ranked a distant second (married 11.11%; single 7.69%). Only among single women were there Muslims (6.15%).

About one third of both married and single women were living with other relatives or friends.

This reflects a common African cultural practice of living with other family members, especially younger relatives, who help with the household chores. About one fifth of the single women were living with a brother(s) and/or a sister(s). They were also living with a mother (11.24%) and/or a father (6.43%).

Table 9.2 Employment characteristics for working women

Employment Characteristics For Working Women.		
	Married Working Women (%)	Single Working Women (%)
Wages per month (%)		
R1 to R100 (%)	0	1.56
R101 to R1,000 (%)	29.51	45.31
R1001 to R3,000 (%)	36.07	20.31
R3,001 to R5,000 (%)	3.28	10.94
R5,001 to R10,000 (%)	18.03	14.06
More than R10,000 (%)	13.11	7.81
Type of work (%)		
Part time (%)	3.13	6.15
Contract (%)	25.00	38.46
Full time (%)	71.88	55.38
Nature of the work (%)		
Repetitive	54.44	58.54
Supervisory	25.45	22.34
Management	17.44	16.34

Source: Analysis of own surveyed data

Forty-five (45) percent of the single women were earning between R101-R1 000 per month, while about 30% of married women were earning this amount. In contrast, about 36% of the married women were earning between R1 001-R3 000 per month, while the proportion of single women earning that amount was 20%. The percentage of married and single women at the R5 001-R10 000 level was similar, but the proportion of married women earning more than R10 000 per month exceeded that of single women.

Fifteen (15.1) percent of the married women said that their income was supplementary to that of their husbands. The majority of the married women pooled their money with their husbands (56.67%). Thirty (30) percent maintained a separate account from the husband, while a few (11.67%) had a partial and joint account. The majority of the single women maintained separate accounts (60.61%), although nearly one third (30%) of the single women held a partial and separate account with another person.

The high percentage of pooled income tends to support the unitary model. However, more than 40% of married women did not pool their income with their spouses. Some studies in South Africa have found that even where there is no outright conflict, different members of a

household might have different priorities. Men and women, elders and juniors, have at least partially separate expenditure responsibilities (Buijs & Atherfold 1995). These authors found that men in the Eastern Cape, were not willing to give detailed information on their income to either their wives or girlfriends. This supports contentions that income-sharing is not a general South African household practice (Buijs & Atherfold 1995:73-4).

Research in a range of countries has shown that women are more likely to spend the money over which they have control on the basic needs of themselves and their families such as school uniforms and clothing. For example, the Income and Expenditure Survey (2000), shows that women spend a great share of their income on goods such as food, clothing and footwear. There is extensive work that indicates that, if female wages increase, the situation of females and children in households improves (Haddad, 1994; Haddad, Hoddinott & Alderman 1997; Quisimbing 2003).

A focus on women wages is therefore an important dimension of any comprehensive analysis of how females are affected by economic reform.

A larger percentage of single women were on contract (38%) than were married women (25%), and conversely more married women were employed full-time (72%) than single women (55%). The reason given for women working under contract was a lack of permanent positions. Many expressed the opinion that unemployment gave employers a ready and continuous supply of labour, and hence these employers could easily employ workers on a non-permanent basis with low wages and fewer benefits. They also noted that most of the permanent positions required skills that they did not possess.

On the other hand, legislation enacted through the influence of labour unions such as COSATU, is viewed by employers and investors as a deterrent to hiring permanent labour. It is alleged that small firms, in particular, which tend to be more labour-intensive, are hard-pressed to meet the requirements under these acts. COSATU has had an influence on important labour legislation such as the Labour Relations Act, the Basic Conditions of Employment Act, and the Equal Employment Opportunity Act. While protecting those who have jobs, the legislation makes it more difficult for outsiders to obtain jobs and is seen as contributing to continued inequality. Nattrass and Seeking (2000) argue that the labour market rigidities make South Africa especially poorly placed to deal with globalisation.

9.6 SPECIFIC SURVEY RESULTS

9.6.1 Breakdown position

As shown in Table 9-2, 65.58% of the married women were earning between R101-R3 000 per month, and 65.62% of single women were earning that amount. Asked whether they could support themselves and their families if they were left alone without a spouse or relative (single women), 57.50% of the married women in this income group said that they could. A larger percentage (87.87%) of single women in this income group felt confident of caring for themselves without the assistance of someone else. More than one third of married women (37.50%) in this income group felt that they would not be able to support themselves and their families. A significant percentage of both married and single working women therefore expressed confidence in sustaining their livelihood independently of the support of a partner.

The majority of married women had joint ownership with their husbands of major assets (furniture 68.25%, equipment 67.19%, house 40.63%). Almost 41% of the married women jointly owned the land with their husbands, and 20% of the married women indicated that others owned the land. One fifth (20.31%) of married women independently owned the furniture, 19.05% owned the equipment (e.g. kitchen appliances), 7.81% owned the house, and 6.45% owned the land. More than one half (54.05%) owned their own car. Because most women live and work in urban areas, none answered that they owned domestic animals such as cattle, sheep and goats.

A smaller proportion of single women owned a car (45.95%). More than one half (51.52%) of them owned furniture, 53.03% owned equipment, 35.82% owned the house, and 31.25% owned the land. Between 15-25% of the single women were in possession of major assets that were owned by their fathers or mothers. Parents play a significant role in the lives of single working women. In comparison with single working women, working married women appear to have notable bargaining power.

Table 9.3 Working women and ownership of assets

	Most furniture		Equipment		House		Land		Car	
	Married	Single	Married	Single	Married	Single	Married	Single	Married	Single
I own it	19.05	51.52	20.31	53.03	7.81	35.82	6.45	31.25	54.05	45.95
My husband or partner only	6.35		6.25		14.06		11.29	0.00		
My husband or partner and myself	68.25		67.19		40.63		38.71	0.00		
My brother		3.03		1.52		1.49				
My sister		3.03		4.55		1.49	0.00	1.56		
My uncle						1.49	1.61	1.56		
My aunt		1.52								
My brother-in-law			4.69		2.99		0.00	3.13		
My sister-in-law			1.56							
My father		19.7		13.64	1.56	23.88	3.23	25.00		
My mother	4.76	18.18		22.73	4.69	19.4	4.84	15.63		
My father-in-law	1.59				9.38		9.68	0.00		
My mother-in-law					1.56					
Others		1.52		1.52	17.19	8.96	19.35	17.19		

Source: Analysis of own surveyed data

9.7 AUTONOMY

Table 9.4 shows responses to questions posed to ascertain the amount of autonomy the women have. Only 4.84% of married women said they were in a position to make the final decision about whether they can take a job outside the household; the overwhelming majority (95.16%) of married women had to defer to someone else. In contrast, almost three quarters of single women (71.64%) reported that they make those decisions.

Table 9.4 Measurement of working women's autonomy

	Married women		Single women	
	I do	Others	I do	Others
Labour force participation				
Do you or others make the final decision about who can work outside the house? (%)	4.84	95.16	71.64	28.36
Do you need permission:	Yes	No	Yes	No
To give gifts or loans to friends from pooled resources? (%)	32.26	67.74	44.39	55.61
To lend money to a friend or relative without permission of husband or relative? (%)	25.00	75.00	55.36	44.64
Mobility				
To go outside the house or compound at any time? (%)	54.84	45.16	63.49	36.51
To travel alone to visit a friend or relative within the area? (%)	81.25	18.75	89.55	10.45
To travel alone to the local health centre or clinic? (%)	95.24	4.76	97.01	2.99
To travel alone to the local market? (%)	95.24	4.76	98.51	1.49

Source: Analysis of own surveyed data

However, more than one quarter of single women (28.36%) reported that the final decision concerning employment outside the house rested with someone else.

Nearly all the married and single women can go to the local market or health centre alone without seeking permission, reflecting their accepted social role in the “care economy.” More than one-third of the single women (36.51%) stated that they could not go outside the house at any time without permission and could not visit a friend or relative without prior permission (10.45%). More than one half (55.61%) of the single women indicated that they would need permission to give gifts or loans to relatives or friends and 44.64% would have to get permission to lend money.

The extent to which single women appear dependent on another authority is striking. The fact that so many single women needed to acquire permission regarding a job, financial matters, and mobility demonstrates the social rigidities they face. As noted above in Table 9-2, many of the single women were living with brothers, sisters, other family members and, to a lesser extent, mothers and fathers — all of whom can act as monitors of the single woman’s behaviour. Single women still need to seek permission concerning their participation in the workforce and other areas such as going outside the household or visiting friends. This shows the existence of cultural norms that still hinder women’s autonomy. Such constraints faced by women might hinder their access to market opportunities created by globalisation.

The existence of the high incidence of violence in South Africa, however, might be a factor in terms of relatives of women putting restrictions on their movements (Bollen, Artz, Vetten, and Louw 1999). Another factor might be living in a poor neighbourhood without public infrastructure such as street lighting and well-maintained roads. In order to test this, the women were asked questions related to area infrastructure shown in Table 9-5 below. Roughly one half of the respondents indicated good infrastructure while the other half indicated a lack of good infrastructure. The data indicate that the two groups of married and single women shared common characteristics in terms of their living environment.

Table 9.5 Location related to working women’s residence

	Married Working Women (%)		Single Working Women (%)	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Residence (%)				
Rural (%)	32.26	67.74	37.88	62.12
Urban (%)	67.74	32.26	59.09	40.91

	Married Working Women (%)		Single Working Women (%)	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Informal settlement (%)	0		3.03	96.97
Area infrastructure				
Well-maintained roads (%)	55.56	44.44	44.44	55.56
Health Unit or Clinic (%)	44.83	55.17	54.02	45.98
Street lights (%)	50	50	50	50
Running water in the home (%)	48.28	51.72	51.72	48.28
Flush water toilet (%)	52.63	47.37	47.37	52.63
Easy access to public transport (%)	46.84	53.16	53.16	46.84
Easy access to public schools (%)	45.88	54.12	54.12	45.88

Source: Analysis of own surveyed data

9.7.1 Decision making in the household

As shown in Table 9.6, while only 4.84% of the married women can independently make the decision to work outside the home, 71.64% of the single women do so. The majority (74.19%) of married women make this decision jointly with their husband, while nearly 9% of the single women rely on their fathers, and 6% rely on their mothers to make such a decision.

In terms of the number of children to have, 78.13% of the married women indicated that it is a joint decision with spouses, while 14.06% of the married women reported that they were the major decision-maker in this regard. Almost 68% of the single women reported that they were in control of the decision to have children, while nearly 10% suggested that this decision was out of their control.

Table 9.6 Decisions made by working women related to employment and children

	Work outside the home		Number of children to have		How much schooling	
	Married	Single	Married	Single	Married	Single
I decide this by myself	4.84	71.64	14.06	67.74	9.52	63.49
My husband or partner only	8.06		1.56		4.76	
My husband or partner and myself	74.19		78.13		74.6	
My brother		1.49				3.17
My sister		1.49		3.23		3.17
My uncle						1.59
My father		8.96		3.23		7.94
My mother	4.84	5.97		3.23		1.59
My father-in-law						
My mother-in-law			1.56			
I do not make decisions	8.06	7.46	3.13	9.68	6.35	7.94
Others		2.99	1.56	12.9	4.76	11.11

Source: Analysis of own surveyed data

Approximately 75% of the married women reported deciding with their husband how much schooling a child would have, while 9.52% reported being able to decide this on their own.

As indicated in Table 9.7, nearly 61% of married women make decisions on which type of food to purchase and prepare, and nearly 27% do this with their husbands or partners. Almost 77% of single women purchase food by themselves, while 10.45% do this with their mothers. The higher percentage of married women making decisions concerning food preparation is different from other decisions which they mostly make with their spouses. This mirrors the traditional responsibility of women in such areas as the preparation of food.

In regard to paying school fees, caring for ill children and buying medicine, roughly one third of the married women do this alone, while approximately half do this jointly with their husband or partner. The majority of single women (78-87%) do these activities by themselves. Three to four percent of single women do these activities with their mothers.

Table 9.7 Decision made by working women as economic authority in the household

Decision made by working women as economic authority within the household								
	Purchase food		Pay school fees		Care for ill child		Buy medicine	
	Married	Single	Married	Single	Married	Single	Married	Single
I do this by myself	60.94	76.12	36.51	78.79	33.33	87.30	35.94	84.85
My husband or partner only	6.25		7.94		4.76		6.25	
My husband or partner and myself	26.56		49.21		55.56		54.69	
My brother				4.55			0.00	1.52
My sister		5.97		3.03		1.59	0.00	3.03
My uncle							0.00	1.52
My aunt						1.59		
My brother-in-law								
My sister-in-law								
My father		1.49	0	1.52	0	1.59		
My mother	1.56	10.45	0	4.55	3.17	3.17	0.00	9.09
My father-in-law								
My mother-in-law								
I do not make decisions	3.13	4.48	1.59		1.59		3.13	
Others	1.56	1.49	4.76	7.58		4.76		

Source: Analysis of own surveyed data

As shown in Table 9.8, when major purchases or financial decisions are to be made, married women have much less influence. Only 26.56% may purchase a radio or TV by themselves, 14.06% may acquire or dispose of household items, 24.19% may settle debts, and 26.56% may make a decision to improve the structure of their dwelling. About 76-86%

of single women do these activities on their own, with mothers or fathers involved in these decisions for 3.12% of the single women.

Table 9.8 Economic authority in the household

	Buy radio, TV		Acquire/dispose household items		Settle financial debts		Improve dwelling structure	
	Married	Single	Married	Single	Married	Single	Married	Single
I do this by myself	26.56	86.36	14.06	76.92	24.19	80.6	26.56	82.09
My husband or partner only	10.94	0	3.13	0	8.06	0	7.81	0
My husband or joint (partner and myself)								
My brother	0.00	1.52	0	3.08	3.23	1.49	0	2.99
My sister	0.00	1.52	0	1.54	50	1.49	0	1.49
My uncle								
My aunt								
My brother-in-law								

Source: Analysis of own surveyed data

In summary, married women, as Sen (1990) observed, exist in relationships characterised by co-operation and conflict. But in the light of the social constraints the single working women apparently faces, married women are faring quite well. While married women need to engage in collaborative decision-making with their husbands, they nonetheless demonstrate appreciable bargaining power when compared with their single counterparts.

9.7.2 Perceived contribution

Married women were asked about their perceived contributions in terms of (a) household chores and (b) income. The women were allowed to respond to more than one item in Table 9.9. Fewer married women than single women felt that they are making little contribution to household duties and fewer felt guilty about their limited participation in household chores. This relatively more positive perception among married women prevails even though more single women reported helping with the housework. The perceived contribution is the contentious issue which many analysts find hindering women's participation in the labour force or which affects their health as they juggle both market work and household work, thus overburdening women. However, most women interviewed said they get help from spouses, household family members and domestic workers to carry on household chores.

Table 9.9 Contribution to household duties

Contribution to household duties	Married working women frequency	Single working women frequency
I make little contribution because I have a paid job outside the household	8	16
I perform household chores together with my paying market job	21	26
I have family members helping with household chores	23	30
My husband /partner helps with the household chores	25	0
I can afford to hire the household helper who performs the chores	11	9
I feel guilt because I should be staying home and participating more in household chores	2	7

Source: Analysis of own surveyed data

Nearly one fifth of the married women reported that they are the sole breadwinners (see Table 9.10). Almost one half (46.33%) of the married women stated that their income is insufficient to contribute to the family's income needs (see Table 9.10).

Table 9.10 Contribution in income

Contribution in Income	Total women	Married workin women (%)	Single working men (%)
My income supports all of the household members	19.84	19.05	51.52
My income is not enough to enable me to contribute sufficiently to my family	46.83	20.31	53.03
My income is supplementary to my husband, who is a breadwinner	15.87	70.81	35.82
I only use my income for my personal use	8.73	6.41	31.25
My contribution is very significant	7.94	54.05	45.95

Source: Analysis of own surveyed data

9.7.3 Perceived self-interest

Table 9.11 shows the results to the question: "Do you agree that women receive a smaller share of household resources such as food, healthcare and education?" More married women disagreed than agreed with the statement (disagreed 48.44%, agreed 34.38%) in contrast to single women, more of whom agreed than disagreed (disagreed 36.51%; agreed 42.86%).

Table 9.11 Perceived self-interest

Perceived Self-Interest	Married (%)	Single (%)
Yes	34.38	42.86
No	48.44	36.51
I don't know	17.19	19.05
Other	0.00	1.59

Source: Analysis of own surveyed data

Table 9.11 shows the results when asked to respond to statements about women's self-

interests, for example, whether women should be given the opportunity to work outside their homes. The overwhelming majority (married, 81%; single 89%) strongly agreed that women should be given an opportunity to work outside their homes.

Most women were cognisant that many of their gender were employed in jobs that are less than ideal. The majority (married 88.64%; single, 86.68%) perceived that women work long hours for low salaries and wages. Married women were somewhat more convinced than single women (married 90.71%; single 77.59%) that women often work in non-professional, repetitive jobs.

Just over one half (54.84%) of married women and almost two thirds (63.33%) of single women disagreed with the proposition that woman who could afford it should not work outside their homes. In responding to the proposition that women with jobs do not need to get married because they can support themselves financially, the majority again disagreed (married 68.85; single 72.13%). In other words, even if women did not need the money, they should still work outside the home and pursue married life.

Table 9.12 Opinions concerning women's self-interest

	Married (%)				Single (%)			
	Sta (%)	Sla (%)	Sld (%)	Std (%)	Sta (%)	Sla (%)	Sld (%)	Std (%)
Sta=strongly agree; Sla=slightly agree; Sld=disagree; Std=strongly disagree								
Women should be given the opportunity to work outside their homes	80.95	12.70	4.76	1.59	88.52	11.48	0.00	0.00
Women usually work long hours for small salaries/wages	46.77	33.87	11.29	8.06	68.85	18.03	4.92	8.20
Women mostly work in non-professional, repetitive jobs	53.57	32.14	3.57	10.71	50.00	27.59	6.90	15.52
If women can afford it they should not work outside their homes	22.58	22.58	11.29	43.55	23.33	13.33	20.00	43.33
Women with jobs do not need to get married because they can support themselves	16.39	14.75	16.39	52.46	16.39	11.48	24.59	47.54
Women who are financially independent can make decisions regarding financial matters/expenditures.	66.13	22.58	3.23	8.06	74.19	12.90	6.45	6.45
Some imported goods compete with goods produced by women; this is a threat to women's jobs	33.33	36.67	23.33	6.67	45.16	22.58	17.74	14.52
Some imported goods can be bought more cheaply than those produced by women in South Africa	37.70	26.23	22.95	13.11	50.82	21.31	18.03	9.84
Companies establishing themselves in South Africa provide employment for women.	41.94	40.32	14.52	3.23	46.67	33.33	8.33	11.67

Source: Analysis of own surveyed data

Two thirds of married women (66.13%) and three quarters of single women (74.19%) accepted the notion that financial independence enables a woman to make more financial decisions.

When asked whether some imported goods compete with goods that are primarily

produced mostly by women and therefore are a threat to their jobs, the majority of respondents agreed (married 70%; single 67.74%). However, the majority (married 63.93%; single 72.13%) also agreed that they are able to buy some imported goods more cheaply than domestically produced goods.

On the other hand, a larger majority (married 82.26%; single 80%) agreed that the companies establishing themselves in South Africa are providing employment for women.

The above finding mirrors to some extent what Kudat (1989) found in Tanzania. He reports that the most important impact associated with women wage employment in public works programmes appeared to be the enjoyment of personal decision-making. Women who obtained wages from the programmes were able to decide alone on the use of their earnings and this gave them a sense of power, which they had not enjoyed before. The women reported that work gave them a sense of increased self-fulfilment, which they could not realise by limiting themselves to staying at home to take care of the household.

9.8 CONCLUSION

The women who participated in the survey expressed their appreciation at being able to work outside the home, although many complained about the low pay which they receive from employers. Both single and married women shared a firm sense of self-interest as members of a household and the larger economic community.

When compared with single women, married women displayed a more positive sense of contribution to the welfare of the household. They paid school fees and contributed to the purchase of household assets. With the help of others (e.g. relatives, domestic workers, spouses) married women still ensured that household duties would be carried out in their absence. As a result, they felt that they were able to fulfil their responsibilities at home and still participate in the commercial market economy.

The study found co-operation was a critical aspect of conjugal life for married women. They deferred to their husbands about conditions relating to working outside the home, the number of children to have, the amount of schooling a child should have, and the acquisition of major assets. In addition, they pooled income with their spouses. At the same time, their ability to work outside the home allowed them to acquire substantial assets of their own. The fact that

their earned income enabled them to contribute financially towards these aspects further strengthened their breakdown position in the bargaining process in their households.

Single women, too, enjoyed the ability to work. However, they also had to accommodate social norms and the expectations of others. In addition, many of them did not have a sufficient asset base and therefore required assistance from other family members, particularly parents and brothers. Their perception of making a contribution was not as strong as that of the married women. Nonetheless, as mentioned, they shared with their married counterparts a firm sense of self-interest as women working in an increasingly globalised economy.

In short, the increase in the number of decently remunerated wage-earning opportunities resulting from a more globalised economy will likely have a positive effect on improving the well-being of women. But this will not happen quickly and without assistance from society at large. There is a need to tackle any deep-rooted obstacles that might hinder appropriate participation in the economy. In addition, women will need opportunities to upgrade their skills so that they can qualify for more permanent, higher-paying jobs most of which are stimulated by globalisation.

This study is by no means representative of the general nature of the well-being of women working in the manufacturing sector. This is due to the small sample upon which the study is based. However, the study attempts to accurately capture themes and issues of importance as raised by sample respondents in the hope that their experiences will form a useful basis from which to inform any future policy interventions related to employment and women.

APPENDIX 9

Table 9.13 Significancy levels : married and single working women

	MW	TMW	%	SW	TSW	%	P1	P2	z	p-value	S
Working women as:	52	64	0.8	60	67	0.9	81.2	89.5			
Major wage earner	19	64	0.3	44	65	0.68	29.6	67.6	4.31755	1.578E-05	S
Handle monthly income	18	60	0.3	20	33	0.6	30.0	60.6	2.87281	0.004	S
Working women decision making in the household											
Buy household items	17	64	0.27	57	66	0.86	26.5	86.3	6.88387	5.859E-12	S
Improve structure of house	17	64	0.27	55	67	0.82	26.5	82.0	6.38521	1.719E-10	S
Pay school fees	23	63	0.37	52	66	0.79	36.5	78.7	4.86568	1.142E-06	S
child becomes ill	21	63	0.33	55	63	0.87	33.3	87.3	6.19116	5.996E-10	S
buy medicine	23	64	0.36	56	66	0.85	35.9	84.8	5.71006	1.132E-08	S
make contact wit relatives v	15	64	0.23	41	63	0.65	23.4	65.0	4.72573	2.295E-06	S
household assets acquird	9	64	0.14	50	65	0.77	14.0	76.9	7.16547	7.807E-13	S
settle financial debts	15	62	0.24	54	67	0.8	24.1	80.6	6.41702	1.396E-10	S
give gifts to friends	28	64	0.44	64	67	0.96	43.7	95.5	6.47791	9.345E-11	S
food to prepare for meal	39	64	0.61	51	67	0.76	60.9	76.1	1.87316	0.061045	NS
work outside the home	3	62	0.05	48	67	0.72	4.84	71.6	7.75340	9.103E-15	S
how many chldren to have	9	64	0.14	42	62	0.68	14.0	67.7	6.13710	8.437E-10	S
schooling for children	6	63	0.1	40	63	0.63	9.52	63.4	6.29129	3.162E-10	S
Working women and autonomy											
use pooled family money	20	62	0.32	15	67	0.22	32.2	22.3	1.25964	0.207798	NS
go outside family compound	34	62	0.55	40	63	0.63	54.8	63.4	0.98424	0.324993	NS
travel alone to friends home	52	64	0.8	60	67	0.9	81.2	89.5	1.34887	0.177376	NS
travel to health centre	60	63	0.95	65	67	0.97	95.2	97.0	0.52648	0.598551	NS
travel alone to market	60	63	0.95	66	67	0.99	95.2	98.5	1.07876	0.280691	NS
express opinion publicly	24	64	0.38	24	59	0.4	37.5	40.6	0.36096	0.718124	NS
lend witout husband approval	16	64	0.25	31	56	0.55	25.0	55.3	3.39879	0.000676	S
Ownership of assets in the households											
Who owns the house	5	64	0.08	24	67	0.36	7.81	35.8	3.85968	0.000113	S
Who owns the land,farm	4	62	0.06	20	64	0.3	6.45	31.2	3.54396	0.000394	S
Who owns the furniture	12	63	0.19	34	66	0.52	19.0	51.5	3.84829	0.000118	S
Who owns the equipment	13	64	0.2	35	66	0.53	20.3	53.0	3.86447	0.000111	S

Source: Calculation from own surveyed data

KEY: S: significant; NS: not significant; MW: married working women; TMW: total number married working women; SW: single working women; TSW: total number single working women; p-value: significance level comparing two proportions

The table 9.13 compares two proportions, $H_0: p_1 = p_2$ against $H_1: p_1 \text{ not equal to } p_2$. This indicates the level of significance related to married working women and single working women. After testing the hypothesis on a 5% level of significance if the item is marked with “S”, the proportion of married and single working women who answered yes on a

specific issue does not differ significantly. Otherwise working and married working women differ particularly with regards to household decision making where most married women report to be making joint decisions with the spouse.

WELL-BEING QUESTIONNAIRE

SECTION 1 GENERAL

1. Which Province do you live in?

2. What racial group do you belong to?

1. Asian 2. Black three. Coloured 4. White

3. What is your faith affiliation?

1. Christian Asian
2. Born again Christian Black
3. Muslim Coloured
4. White
5. Jewish
6. Hindu
7. African Religions
8. Other (specify):

4. What is your marital status?

1. Married and living with spouse
2. Married but separated
3. Single
4. Divorced
5. Living with a partner
6. Widow

5. Where is your place of residence located?

1. Rural area
2. Urban area
3. In an informal settlement

6. Which of the following infrastructures are available where you reside? (You may provide more than one answer)

1. Good well maintained roads
2. Health units or clinics

3. Street lights
4. Running water in your home
5. Flush water toilets
6. Easy accessible public transportation
7. Easy accessible public schools

7. What is the distance from your home to the following places? Please indicate clearly whether the distance is in kilometres or metres)

1. Health units or clinics
2. Recreational areas
3. Public transportation
4. Public schools
5. Local market

8. In respect of your home...

1. Are you renting?
2. Are you buying?
3. Have you bought?
4. Are you living with relatives or friends?

9. Besides yourself, how many family members reside with you in your home?

10. Regarding family members residing with you in your home as indicated in Question 9, please indicate the relationship of each to you and their ages in the table below.

11. What is your age in completed years? (For example 37 and not 37 and 8 months)

12. What is the level of your education?

1. None
2. Primary school
3. Secondary school
4. Trade school
5. Post-secondary, diploma
6. Post-secondary, degree
7. Post-graduate
8. Other (specify):

13. What is the level of education of your spouse or partner?

1. None
2. Primary school
3. Secondary school
4. Trade school
5. Post-secondary, diploma
6. Post-secondary, degree
7. Post-graduate
8. Other (specify)

14. Are you currently working on part time, contract or full time?

1. Part time
2. Contract
3. Full time

15. If your answer to Question 14 is “*Part time or contract*”, what is the main reason for the situation?

16. What is the current type of your job?

1. Repetitive
2. Supervisory
3. Management

17. Who is the major wage/salary earner in your household?

1. I am
2. Husband / partner
3. Brother
4. Sister
5. Uncle
6. Aunt
7. Brother-in-law
8. Sister-in-law
9. Father
10. Mother
11. Father-in-law
12. Mother-in-law
13. Other: (indicate relationship)

18. If the major wage/salary earner in your household is someone other than you, please

indicate the age of that person

19. Where is the major wage earner in your home employed? (Please mark one answer only)

1. Agricultural processing
2. Mining
3. Construction
4. Manufacturing
5. Retail/wholesale
6. Transportation, Communications & Public Utilities
7. Finance, Insurance & Real Estate
8. Government (including education)
9. Services
10. Retired income

20. Where are you currently employed? (Please mark one answer only)

1. Agricultural processing
2. Mining
3. Construction
4. Manufacturing
5. Retail/wholesale
6. Transportation, Communications & Public Utilities
7. Finance, Insurance & Real Estate
8. Government (including education)
9. Services
10. Retired

21. Into which category does your monthly income fall? (Please mark one answer only)

1. Less than R100
2. R101 to R1,000
3. R1,001 to R3,000
4. R3,001 to R5,000
5. R5,001 to R10,000
6. More than R10,000

22. How many cars does your family own?

23. Who own the family car(s)? (You may provide more than one answer)

1. I do
2. My husband or partner
3. Brother
4. Sister
5. Uncle
6. Aunt
7. Brother-in-law
8. Sister-in-law
9. Father
10. Mother
11. Father-in-law
12. Mother-in-law
13. Other (specify):

24. How do you and your husband/partner handle your monthly income?

1. We pool it together
2. We have separate accounts
3. We have partial and separate accounts
4. Other (specify):

SECTION 2 DECISION-MAKING

This section attempts to determine your control over decision-making.

25. In respect of spending YOUR OWN MONEY, in your home, who makes the final decision on whether or not to buy household items like a radio, TV or furniture? (Please mark one answer only)

1. I do
2. My husband or partner only
3. My husband or partner and myself together
4. My brother
5. My sister
6. My uncle
7. My aunt
8. My brother-in-law
9. My sister-in-law
10. My father
11. My mother
12. My father-in-law

- 13. My mother-in-law
- 14. I do not make any decisions
- 15. Other (specify):

26. If in Question 25 you marked any option from 4 to 9 or “Other”, please indicate the age of that person.

27. In respect of spending YOUR OWN MONEY, in your home, who makes the final decision on whether or not to improve on the structure of your house/dwelling, such as adding rooms? (Please mark one answer only).

- 1. I do
- 2. My husband or partner only
- 3. My husband or partner and myself together
- 4. My brother
- 5. My sister
- 6. My uncle
- 7. My aunt
- 8. My brother-in-law
- 9. My sister-in-law
- 10. My father
- 11. My mother
- 12. My father-in-law
- 13. My mother-in-law
- 14. I do not make any decisions
- 15. Other (specify):

28. If in Question 27 you marked any option from 4 to 9 or “Other”, please indicate the age of that person

29. In respect of spending YOUR OWN MONEY, in your home, who makes the final decision on whether or not money should be used to pay school fees for a child? (Please mark one answer only)

- 1. I do
- 2. My husband or partner only
- 3. My husband or partner and myself together
- 4. My brother
- 5. My sister
- 6. My uncle

7. My brother-in-law
8. My sister-in-law
9. My father
10. My mother
11. My father-in-law
12. My mother-in-law
13. I do not make any decisions
14. Other (specify):

30. If in Question 29 you marked any option from 4 to 9 or “Other”, please indicate the age of that person

31. In respect of spending YOUR OWN MONEY, in your home, who makes the final decision on what to do when a child in the family becomes ill? (mark one answer only)

1. I do
2. My husband or partner only
3. My husband or partner and myself together
4. My brother
5. My sister
6. My uncle
7. My aunt
8. My brother-in-law
9. My sister-in-law
10. My father
11. My mother
12. My father-in-law
13. My mother-in-law
14. I do not make any decisions
15. Other (specify):

32. If in Question 31 you marked any option from 4 to 9 or “Other”, please indicate the age of that person

33. In respect of spending YOUR OWN MONEY, in your home, who makes the final decision on whether or not to buy medicine for a person in the family who is ill? (Please mark one answer only)

1. I do
2. My husband or partner only

3. My husband or partner and myself together
4. My brother
5. My sister
6. My uncle
7. My aunt
8. My brother-in-law
9. My sister-in-law
10. My father
11. My mother
12. My father-in-law
13. My mother-in-law
14. I do not make any decisions
15. Other (specify):

34. If in Question 33 you marked any option from 4 to 9 or “Other”, please indicate the age of that person

35. In your home, who makes the final decision on how often to make contact with relatives such as in-laws? (Please mark one answer only)

1. I do
2. My husband or partner only
3. My husband or partner and myself together
4. My brother
5. My sister
6. My uncle
7. My aunt
8. My brother-in-law
9. My sister-in-law
10. My father
11. My mother
12. My father-in-law
13. My mother-in-law
14. I do not make any decisions
15. Other (specify):

36. If in Question 35 you marked any option from 4 to 9 or “Other”, please indicate the age of that person

37. In respect of spending YOUR OWN MONEY, in your home, who makes the final

decision on whether or not household assets should be acquired and disposed of?
(Please mark one answer only)

1. I do
2. My husband or partner only
3. My husband or partner and myself together
4. My brother
5. My sister
6. My uncle
7. My aunt
8. My brother-in-law
9. My sister-in-law
10. My father
11. My mother
12. My father-in-law
13. My mother-in-law
14. I do not make any decisions
15. Other (specify):

38. If in Question 37 you marked any option from 4 to 9 or “Other”, please indicate the age of that person

39. In respect of spending YOUR OWN MONEY, in your home, who makes the final decision on whether or not financial debts should be settled? (Please mark one answer only)

1. I do, if I incurred the debt
2. I do, even if the debt was incurred by my husband or any member of household
3. My husband or partner only when he has incurred that debt
4. My husband or partner even if debt was incurred by me or a member of household
5. My husband or partner and myself together regardless who incurred it
6. My brother
7. My sister
8. My uncle
9. My aunt
10. My brother-in-law
11. My sister-in-law
12. My father
13. My mother

- 14. My father-in-law
- 15. My mother-in-law
- 16. I do not make any decisions
- 17. Other (specify):

40. If in Question 39 you marked any option from 4 to 9 or “Other”, please indicate the age of that person

41. In respect of spending YOUR OWN MONEY, in your home, who makes the final decision on whether or not to give gifts from your own income to your friends or relatives? (Please mark one answer only)

- 1. I do
- 2. My husband or partner only
- 3. My husband or partner and myself together
- 4. My brother
- 5. My sister
- 6. My uncle
- 7. My aunt
- 8. My brother-in-law
- 9. My sister-in-law
- 10. My father
- 11. My mother
- 12. My father-in-law
- 13. My mother-in-law
- 14. I do not make any decisions
- 15. Other (specify):

42. If in Question 41 you marked any option from 4 to 9 or “Other”, please indicate the age of that person

43. In respect of spending YOUR OWN MONEY, in your home, who makes the final decision on what food to prepare for family meals? (Please mark one answer only)

- 1. I do
- 2. My husband or partner only
- 3. My husband or partner and myself together
- 4. My brother
- 5. My sister
- 6. My uncle

7. My aunt
8. My brother-in-law
9. My sister-in-law
10. My father
11. My mother
12. My father-in-law
13. My mother-in-law
14. I do not make any decisions
15. Other (specify):

44. If in Question 43 you marked any option from 4 to 9 or “Other”, please indicate the age of that person

45. In respect of spending YOUR OWN MONEY, in your home, who makes the final decision on who should or should not work outside the home?

1. I do
2. My husband or partner only
3. My husband or partner and myself together
4. My brother
5. My sister
6. My uncle
7. My aunt
8. My brother-in-law
9. My sister-in-law
10. My father
11. My mother
12. My father-in-law
13. My mother-in-law
14. I do not make any decisions
15. Other (specify):

46. If in Question 45 you marked any option from 4 to 9 or “Other”, please indicate the age of that person

47. In your home, who makes the final decision on how many children to have?

1. I do
2. My husband or partner only
3. My husband or partner and myself together

4. My brother
5. My sister
6. My uncle
7. My aunt
8. My brother-in-law
9. My sister-in-law
10. My father
11. My mother
12. My father-in-law
13. My mother-in-law
14. I do not make any decisions
15. Other (specify):

48. If in Question 47 you marked any option from 4 to 9 or “Other”, please indicate the age of that person

49. In your home, who makes the final decision on how much schooling to give to your children?

(Please mark one answer only)

1. I do
2. My husband or partner only
3. My husband or partner and myself together
4. My brother
5. My sister
6. My uncle
7. My aunt
8. My brother-in-law
9. My sister-in-law
10. My father
11. My mother
12. My father-in-law
13. My mother-in-law
14. I do not make any decisions
15. Other (specify):

50. If in Question 49 you marked any option from 4 to 9 or “Other”, please indicate the age of that person

51. Apart from your earnings, do you receive money from your husband / partner when you incur household expenses?

1. Yes, he contributes to any purchase
2. He does not have to, we pool our income and use it for household expenditures
3. No, he spends all of his earnings on his private use
4. Other (specify):

SECTION 3. AUTONOMY

This section attempts to determine your ability to spend family income and move around freely.

52. Can you use pooled family money for gifts, loans to your friends or relatives?

1. Yes
2. No

53. As a woman and wife are you allowed to go outside the family compound at any time you prefer?

1. Yes
2. No

54. Can you travel alone to the home of a relative or friend in the village, informal settlement or in town?

1. Yes
2. No

55. Can you travel alone to the local health centre, clinic or hospital?

1. Yes
2. No

56. Can you travel alone to the local market?

1. Yes
2. No

57. Should a wife or partner express her opinion publicly when she disagree with her husband or partner?

1. Yes
2. No

58. Should your friend or relative ask for monetary or other assistance, can you lend it without your husband's or partner's approval?

1. Yes
2. No

SECTION 4. ACCESS TO RESOURCES

This section attempts to assess the impact of your access to resources.

59. Who owns the house where you reside – who has the title deed? (Please mark one answer only)

1. I do
2. My husband or partner only
3. My husband or partner and myself together
4. My brother
5. My sister
6. My uncle
7. My aunt
8. My brother-in-law
9. My sister-in-law
10. My father
11. My mother
12. My father-in-law
13. My mother-in-law
14. Other (specify):

60. If in Question 59 you marked any option from 4 to 9 or “Other”, please indicate the age of that person

61. Who own the land, farm or plot that your house is built on? (Please mark one answer only)

1. I do
2. My husband or partner only
3. My husband or partner and myself together
4. My brother
5. My sister
6. My uncle
7. My aunt
8. My brother-in-law
9. My sister-in-law
10. My father
11. My mother
12. My father-in-law
13. My mother-in-law
14. Other (specify):

62. If in Question 61 you marked any option from 4 to 9 or “Other”, please indicate the age of that person

63. Mention different types of furniture which you have in you home?

64. Who own most of that furniture in your home? (Please mark one answer only)

1. I do
2. My husband or partner only
3. My husband or partner and myself together
4. My brother
5. My sister
6. My uncle
7. My aunt
8. My brother-in-law
9. My sister-in-law
10. My father
11. My mother
12. My father-in-law
13. My mother-in-law
14. Other (specify):

65. If in Question 64 you marked any option from 4 to 9 or “Other”, please indicate the age of that person

66. Who owns the equipment (e.g. refrigerator, cooker) and utensils in the kitchen in your home? (Please mark one answer only)

1. I do
2. My husband or partner only
3. My husband or partner and myself together
4. My brother
5. My sister
6. My uncle
7. My aunt
8. My brother-in-law
9. My sister-in-law
10. My father
11. My mother
12. My father-in-law
13. My mother-in-law
14. Other (specify):

67. If in Question 66 you marked any option from 4 to 9 or “Other”, please indicate the age of that person

SECTION 5 INDIRECT TEST TO ASSESS THE IMPACT ON WOMENS’ BARGAINING POWER

(A) Breakdown position

68. Who owns the land you reside on? (Please mark one answer only)

1. I do
2. My husband or partner only
3. My husband or partner and myself together
4. My brother
5. My sister
6. My uncle
7. My aunt
8. My brother-in-law
9. My sister-in-law
10. My father
11. My mother
12. My father-in-law
13. My mother-in-law
14. It is the property of the Chief or Government
15. Other (specify):

69. If in Question 68 you marked any option from 4 to 9 or “Other”, please indicate the age of that person

70. Do you think you can totally support yourself in case you are left alone without your husband’s or partner’s help?

1. Yes I can totally support myself
2. No, I usually rely on my husband or partner
3. It does not matter because my husband or partner never supports me
4. Other (specify):

71. Which property/properties among the following are solely registered in your own name? (You may provide more than one answer)

1. Land
2. House
3. Car

4. Television
5. Couches
6. cooker
7. Music system
8. Bedroom set
9. Cattle
10. Sheep
11. Goats
12. Chicken
13. Other (specify):

(B) Measure of perceived self-interest

72. Do you agree that women receive a smaller share of household resources such as food, healthcare and education?

1. Yes
2. No
3. I do not know
4. Other (specify):

73. If your answer to Question 72 is “Yes”, how do you feel about the fact that women generally receive a smaller share of household resources such as food, healthcare and education?

1. It is justified/fair
2. It is not right
3. I do not care
4. I have never given it a thought because it is a norm
5. Other (specify):

C. Perceived contribution

74. How do you rate your household workload? (You may provide more than one answer)

1. Little contribution because I have a paying job outside the household
2. I perform household chores together with my paying market job
3. I have family members helping with household chores
4. My husband /partner helps with the household chores
5. I can afford to hire the household helper who performs the chores

6. I feel guilt because I should be staying home and participating more in household

7. Other (specify):

75. To what extent does your income contribute towards your family welfare?

1. My income support all of the household members

2. My income is not enough to enable me to contribute sufficiently to my family

3. My income is supplementary to my husband, who is a breadwinner

4. I only use my income for my personal use

5. My contribution is very significant

6. Other (specify):

76. Please read each of the statements below carefully and indicate your agreement or disagreement with each using the following scale:

1 = Strongly agree (Sta)

2 = Slightly agree (Sla)

3 = Slightly disagree (Sld)

4 = Strongly disagree (Std)

Statement:

Women should be given the opportunity to work outside their homes.

Women usually work long hours for small salaries/wages.

Women mostly work in non-professional repetitive jobs.

If women can afford it, they should stay at home and take care of their families and not involve themselves in any extra work.

Women with jobs do not need to get married because they can support themselves financially.

Women who are financially independent can make decisions regarding financial matters/expenditure.

Some imported goods compete with goods produced mostly by women and this is a threat to women's' jobs.

Some of the imported goods can be bought cheaply by women.

Companies establishing themselves in South Africa provide employment for women.

Please mention anything you feel like concerning your job or household situation in the space below.

CHAPTER 10

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

10.1 INTRODUCTION

This thesis sought to analyse the effects of globalisation policies on (a) the South African economy, (b) gender employment, (c) skills redeployment (d) wages and factor earnings, and (e) household welfare by applying a gendered CGE model based on a 2000 gendered Social Accounting Matrix (SAM) of the South African economy. In addition, a survey using a structured questionnaire with 77 questions was administered to 131 working women employed in selected manufacturing sectors, in order to determine their well-being as workers. This study turns a one-country (South Africa) conventional CGE model into a gender-aware model by disaggregating labour in all sectors according to gender. The disaggregation of labour according to gender enables the determination as to whether globalisation policies are gender-neutral as postulated in neoclassical theories.

In applying the general equilibrium model, the South African economy is divided into 49 sectors, consisting of seven agricultural sectors (maize, wheat, fruit and vegetables, livestock and dairy products, poultry, and other-agriculture), and 42 non-agricultural sectors comprising manufacturing, utilities and services. Disaggregation of the agricultural sector into subsectors aimed at identifying effects related to the implementation of the Doha Round of Multilateral Trade Negotiations. The model comprises 14 household categories, disaggregated according to income, in addition to a government, enterprises and the rest of the world accounts.

The theoretical underpinning of the employment consequences of trade liberalisation is based on the assumptions of full employment of resources and of rapidly adjusting and frictionless markets. These are strong assumptions, particularly in South Africa, where structural factors and non-price mechanisms hinder the response to changes in relative prices. For example, gender rigidities, labour laws, high levels of unemployment and underemployment of unskilled and semi-skilled labour, shortages of skills, and lack of resources for certain groups of people, segment the South African labour markets. As a result, policies affect various types of labour differently. For example, men and women labour, displaced in the sectors that contract due to policy changes, may not easily be equally re-employed in the expanding sectors given existing differences between men and women labour. This aspect is particularly

significant from a gender perspective. As Haddad et al. (1995:893) state, ‘in order to participate an individual must own factors of production, or have access to them, and must be able to reallocate them in line with the new economic incentives that trade policy provides.’

Three types of globalisation policy simulations were conducted:

(1) Full trade liberalisation. This involved complete tariff removal on all sectors under differing factor mobility and employment assumption scenarios. The first assumption is that capital is fully employed, but due to rigidity related to capital stock changes in the short run, capital is assumed sector-specific, skilled labour is fully employed and mobile across sectors, and unskilled and semi-skilled labour is mobile across sectors but unemployed. The second assumption under a full trade liberalisation is that all factors (capital, skilled men and women, unskilled and semi-skilled men and women) are fully employed and mobile across sectors.

(2) One percent increase in total factor productivity (TFP) of the South African sectors under the assumption of full mobility and employment of capital and skilled labour while unskilled and semi-skilled labour is assumed mobile but unemployed. This simulation assesses results (i) on specific sectors and (ii) from an economy-wide perspective.

(3) The third simulation assesses alternative treatments of agricultural prices on subsectors under the Doha Round. This policy follows anticipated increase of world prices of selected agricultural commodities. The ongoing agricultural trade distortions carried by developed countries suppress agricultural world prices, which are anticipated to be restored by the implementation of the Doha Round. This policy is considered to be taking place jointly with the government policy of trade liberalisation in agriculture.

This thesis comprises 10 chapters. Chapter 1 includes an introduction, identifies the problem to be studied, and provides the justifications and the objectives of the study. The chapter further gives an outlook of the South African economy and provides the synopsis of the impacts of various globalisation policies that the government has introduced. Chapter 2 analyses the gender situation in the country, describes various legislation concerning gender, and examines the performance of men and women in various sectors. The literature on globalisation and gender is reviewed in Chapter 3. This establishes the base for comparing the study’s findings with findings obtained elsewhere. Chapter 4 presents the database used for the study and describes the various sources of data and how the data was used in the

model. It also explains how data was handled in order to fit the requirements of the gendered SAM. Chapter 5 describes the core model applied in this study and gives all model equations, parameters and variables. Chapter 6 describes the simulations and presents results of a full tariff reduction under two differing factor closure scenarios. Chapter 7 focuses on the effects of a productivity increase on gender employment, wages and household welfare, and macroeconomic conditions. Because productivity increases has been associated with globalisation, this study examines the effects of such an increase, especially in relationship to inflows of FDI in the economy. Two simulations, one involving productivity increase on sectors economy-wide and the other involving productivity increase only in selected sectors, are carried out to assess whether the outcomes are similar or different and to what extent.

Chapter 8 performs simulations related to the implementation of the Doha Round. The policy changes stipulated by the Doha Round in relation to agricultural liberalisation are expected to have differing implications for different countries. South African agricultural producers are expected to benefit from the Doha Round when export subsidy reductions by major subsidising countries raise the export prices of certain agricultural products. These benefits are analysed by taking into consideration the effects on South African agricultural producers, due to government policies of reducing domestic protection. For example, the government abolished the export subsidies, reduced domestic support and continues reductions of tariffs on agriculture.

Chapter 9 presents the results of a survey used in the study to assess the well-being of women workers. The survey augmented the quantitative CGE by seeking to determine the qualitative aspects of globalisation on women, particularly at the household level. The survey utilises the extended bargaining model of Sen (1990) to assess the impact of globalisation on working women's autonomy, decision-making ability and possession of assets. The survey focuses solely on the perspective of married and single, working women. It purposely excludes spouses or partners (men) because only the subjective perspective of women is of interest.

10.2 IMPACTS OF FULL TRADE LIBERALISATION: VARYING FACTOR MOBILITY

The study results show trade liberalisation to induce imports and to stimulate economic growth (measured by GDP) based on the efficient reallocation of resources. Economic growth raises household incomes and hence savings as well as government non-tariff

revenues. This offsets the government revenue loss associated with removed tariffs. In addition to income effects based on increased factor earnings, households experience improvements in their welfare through price effect, based on lower purchase prices due to cheap imports.

The decline in government revenue due to tariff reductions implies a general fall in transfers from government to certain households and a reduction in the provision of government services, which might lead to government laying-off of workers and capital. As a result, the welfare of certain households, particularly that of low-income households, rises marginally.

Trade liberalisation is characterised by the increase of relatively cheap imports, particularly of consumable goods such as textile, apparel and footwear. As a result, trade liberalisation puts downward pressure on employment by shifting down these sector's products. High initial protection rates partially explain increased imports in most of these sectors. The contracting sectors (textiles, apparel, footwear, wood) are mostly labour-intensive sectors. This has negative employment effects for men and women working in these sectors. Although this outcome displaces workers, particularly the unskilled, it has a positive effect on consumption, due to relatively lower domestic commodity prices. This is mainly crucial for low-income households that spend a big share of their expenditure on such consumable goods.

Due to increased imports, there is greater pressure on the domestic currency, which leads to the depreciation of the currency. The depreciation of the domestic currency contributes to improved competitiveness of South African exports. The absolute effect of tariffs reduction is thus an increase of both imports and exports. As a result of enhanced exports, trade balance is restored because imports are partially paid off by exports that benefit from the depreciation of the currency induced by increased imports.

Domestic producers, who face relatively low domestic prices for their products, find it profitable to switch a certain amount of their sales towards the export market. Growth in manufactured exports is mainly observed in sectors such as mining, non-ferrous metals, petroleum, and coal products, all of which are based on large-scale capital-intensive production. Other significant exports include transportation equipment, machinery and electrical machinery that see exports rise through liberalisation. Tobacco, plastics, other-manufacturing, scientific-equipment exports also improve following the policy shock.

Most of these sectors have higher initial levels of domestic production directed towards export. However, textile and apparel, which are sectors with substantial trade restrictions, improved their exports. This indicates forced efficiency by trade liberalisation in order for them to compete on international markets.

The increase in exports helps to offset the negative effects of employment demand due to influx of imports. Exports response leads to an increase in sectoral domestic production, which partly offsets the decline in domestic sales. Greater production response occurs mostly in export-oriented (coal, gold and other-mining) sectors and in service sectors. As a result of improved production and exports, growth of employment demand follows. Increase in employment demand occurs in exporting sectors because of reduced input costs based on cheap imports and output price shifts in their favour.

The analysis of the effects of trade liberalisation on labour markets and wage dispersion between men and women shows mixed results. Although the findings are mixed, there is evidence that trade liberalisation is associated with an increasing relative demand for skilled workers and with rising earning inequality between unskilled men and women. Although the increased employment demand benefits both men and women workers mostly in the export and service sectors, unskilled men who are the major workers in the export sectors (coal, gold and other-mining) gain the most. Such sectors employ low shares of unskilled women workers.

Trade liberalisation indicates an increasing demand for women employment in associated service areas of trade, finance and related mining services of nursing, teaching and clerks. The country's current mining charter, which seeks to give more mining ownership to the black majority under the black economic empowerment plan, could see other types of jobs being created for women in the mining sector. This can occur as mining companies try to meet the government's requirement to have 10% of jobs filled by women by 2009. Under the mining charter, a large share of unskilled workers and workers laid-off from the contracting and efficient sectors are set to take up positions in mining. This, however, follows the assumption that the sector has the capacity and the willingness to expand production and that adjustment for workers shifting sectors is costless.

Due to factor mobility, which is allowed in the model, some of the unskilled women workers, who lose their jobs in the import-competing sectors, obtain employment in other sectors,

particularly agriculture and the service sectors. The service sector tends to employ a large proportion of unskilled women because of the low level of expertise required in some of its subsectors. Many women are therefore able to enter this sector with ease. As a result, employment made through exports and increased services partly match those lost due to imports. This reflects reforms of the South African economy in the face of globalisation induced competition combined with domestic policies.

However, exports-led employment is insufficient to reduce unemployment, particularly for women, because most exporting sectors are capital-intensive and favour men's labour. The shift away from labour-intensive towards capital-intensive sectors reduces the trade's capacity to generate employment. This result is different from the outcome in the emerging economies where the industrialisation has been as much women-led as it has been export-led. For example, Ozler (2000) found that the export-led industrialisation policies in Turkey increased the women intensity in the export sectors. The high levels of education among women in the emerging economies, compared with the level of education of many of the South African women, might explain this difference.

Sectors with the highest ratio of export to total sales seem to be the ones where employment levels have increased. Exports have positive effects on employment, mostly for skilled workers and unskilled men. Unskilled and semi-skilled women labour benefit from employment created mostly in service sectors which are mainly low-paying jobs. Therefore, the larger the share of exports relative to domestic sales, the higher the employment level and the more highly-skilled workers and unskilled men are employed relative to unskilled and semi-skilled women labour.

Focusing on direct labour creation alone can be misleading, because it ignores the important and, in many cases, much larger contribution by linkages among sectors in the economy. Besides sectoral linkages, other factors such as availability of skills and capital are important when considering job creation. In the short run, there are possible costs to the rest of the economy in expanding output in particular sectors.

The results show improved earnings for capital and skilled labour, which benefits high-income households that derive most of their income from ownership of such factors. On the other hand, low-income households gain from employment growth of unskilled labour in export-oriented and service sectors, and from reduced domestic consumer prices enabled

by cheap imports. Although this study does not model consumption patterns between men and women, there is strong evidence that indicates that women spend a large share of their income on consumables such as food, footwear and clothing (IES 1995, 2000).

The effects of trade liberalisation are gender-differentiated given differences in skills between men and women coupled with the prevailing market segmentations. While some women have gained in terms of employment, others have lost their livelihood because of import competition. Exporters often are relatively skills-intensive employers, meaning that growth in exports will not necessarily produce increasing employment for the less-skilled, particularly women.

Trade liberalisation shows a declining gender earning gap between skilled men and women workers, while indicating a significant earning gap between unskilled men and women with unskilled men gaining the most. This suggests the importance of government's dealing with the skills gap between men and women. The challenge for women includes transferable skills and their reproductive roles.

10.3 IMPACTS RELATED TO PRODUCTIVITY INCREASE (FDI)

This study constructed two scenarios to ascertain the effects of a productivity increase on gender, employment, wages, and the welfare of households. The first scenario allows the productivity increase to encompass all sectors (economy-wide), while the second scenario restricts productivity increase to a few selected sectors.

The results show that productivity improves efficiency, generates direct welfare benefits, creates multiplier effects through sectoral linkages and is a step towards improved economic growth. In addition, increased production is accompanied by a decline in product prices which, coupled with increased income earnings, improves welfare of all categories of household welfare.

Economy-wide productivity expands employment and factor income of all skill types of men and women with skilled men benefiting the most in many sectors. These sectors use technologies that require skills mostly possessed by skilled men. As predicted by Pissarides (1997) and Berman and Machin (2000), productivity increases the relative demand for skilled labour by increasing the use of foreign, skills-based technologies by individual sectors and

enterprises. At the same time, economy-wide productivity results in increased demand for unskilled women workers relative to unskilled men workers. This is because, as the economy expands, extra output is generated that requires the employment of unskilled and semi-skilled women labour whose marginal productivity is low related to their lower wages from the base year level.

The lack of appropriate skills among women workers relative to men reduces the number of women benefiting from opportunities which arise from increased productivity. This is based on the disparity between men and women in acquiring skills through education. Education statistics show that, while men concentrate on scientific subjects, women concentrate in non-scientific subjects. Other factors such as gender sector segmentation, and inequalities in resources (land, credits) acquisitions, hinder most women from exploiting opportunities resulting from productivity increases.

When productivity increases only in few selected sectors, unskilled women face more of the negative effects than men. Under this scenario, a productivity rise boosts production in the selected sectors while reducing employment of unskilled women and men. This outcome implies that an increase in output does not necessarily result in job creation.

The results of the two simulations show that the key challenge in South Africa, from a gender employment perspective, is to promote productivity economy-wide rather than concentrating on a few sectors. For example, the government policy which promotes only high-technological oriented foreign firms (FDI) must be replaced by the one which promotes economy-wide FDI in order to garner maximum benefits for all.

Because South Africa has a chronic unemployment rate, particularly among women, it is expected that globalisation would reduce the relative demand for skilled labour by shifting the structure of production towards more unskilled labour-intensive sectors, as predicted by the standard Hecksher Ohlin theory. However, reductions in barriers to foreign investment increase the relative demand for skilled labour, by shifting the structure of production towards more skills-intensive sectors, as predicted by Feenstra and Hanson (1997). As a result, productivity increases raise the relative demand for skilled labour, by increasing the use of foreign, skills-technologies by individual sectors (Pissarides 1997; Berman & Machin 2000). The results of this model follow such predictions by showing complementary aspects between capital and skilled labour. For example, the sensitivity analysis carried out through

sectoral fixation of capital, indicated moderate demand and returns for skilled men and women labour. However, as capital became mobile across sectors, the growth in demand and returns for skilled labour was significant, because capital augmented skilled labour.

The study also shows that a rise of factor productivity improves household welfare mostly for higher-income households, when compared with low-income households. This is because high-income households derive their earnings from skilled labour, coupled with ownership of capital, relative to low-income households. Low-income households depend on unskilled labour earnings which are from jobs in low-paying low-productivity sectors.

The results of the study show that South Africa is losing its comparative advantage in cheap unskilled labour through the growth of capital-intensive production systems. From an employment standpoint, investing in human capital, especially for women, should be a key step in any FDI programme. Greater attention must be given to attracting women in the areas such as science, engineering, and information technology, which are associated with FDI technologies and hence high productivity. However, policy should promote FDI across the economy in order to encompass sectors which are women-intensive. If a strategic approach is not embraced, FDI and hence productivity may result in maintaining gender inequality as it has mainly in the developing world (Mitter & Rowboth 1995; Zaucher et al. 2000).

10.4 IMPACTS RELATED TO THE DOHA ROUND

The Doha Round is expected to have relatively small effects at the aggregate level, with small changes in GDP and exchange rates. This is because the South African agricultural sector plays a marginal role in terms of agricultural imports and exports and total economic output, with all shares estimated at around 4 percent. Furthermore, tariff rates for agriculture are relatively low with an average rate of 15%. However, with the implementation of the Doha Round, agricultural sectoral changes in output, trade and employment will be significant. South African agricultural producers of affected products are expected to benefit from the consequent increase in world price of these products after major subsidising countries reduce their export subsidies.

Although trade reform will bring substantial benefits to South Africa, the crucial question is: which category of households in South Africa will benefit? Many believe that all the benefits will go to large commercial farmers, thereby worsening the income distribution in South

Africa. However, the simulations conducted in this study show that the additional employment generated by the expansion of agriculture and related sectors such as food, chemicals, water and service sectors, will benefit poor households which usually comprise unskilled workers. However, the income distribution in South Africa will not improve because the sector is highly capital-intensive, which benefit owners of capital who are mainly high-income households.

In particular, South African maize, fruit and vegetables output and exports will increase substantially. Domestic production and exports of food and beverage and tobacco increase due to close linkages with the agricultural sector. While imports of fruit and vegetables fall, imports of wheat, maize, livestock, poultry and other agriculture increase. Increased imports of maize is partly explained by the increasing trade between South Africa and SADC countries, most of which countries have comparative advantage in the production of maize. In addition, South Africa has signed a free trade agreement with SADC countries whereby SADC products face limited import duties. Maize is of major importance for South Africa as it yields over 15% of the gross value of all agricultural products, while accounting for about 40% of the cultivated area in the country (World Bank 1994). In addition, maize is the largest harvested crop for local consumption and an important source of carbohydrates for humans and animals alike. Imports increase, however, in other agricultural commodities such as poultry, and “other agricultural” sectors. Imports of non-agricultural-related products, where world prices are assumed to remain the same under the simulation scenario, increase slightly by less than a percentage point except in the food and beverages, and leather and footwear which rise by a percentage point. The outcome partly reflects sectoral differences in production technologies and initial levels of protection.

Output and exports increase greatly in the maize and vegetables and fruits subsectors with the Doha Round. Increases in agriculture exports might not necessarily benefit most women farmers, because in most cases they lack ownership of land, credit, inputs, extension services and information concerning marketing in South Africa (Budlender 2000; Verhoef 1996). The livelihood of women who are engaged in the production and sale of fruit and vegetables is likely to be enhanced by the rise in world agricultural prices.

The expansion in agricultural output, supported by export growth, necessitates changes in employment especially in the maize and fruits and vegetables sectors. These sectors witness

growth in employment demand. The simulation results show the relocation of mobile factors from the non-agricultural sectors of manufacturing, mining and service sectors into the profitable sector of agriculture. The demand for labour increases by 15.861% and 6.888% in maize and vegetable and fruits, respectively, while they decline by -1.765% in the wheat sector and slightly in the range of -0.1% and -0.5%, respectively, in the other agricultural subsectors and non-agricultural sectors. In agriculture, value added at factor cost and hence factor incomes increase the most in the maize sector by 2.579% above the base-year levels.

In terms of gender, the study found positive direct effects related to increases in unskilled women employment in the expanded agricultural subsectors of maize and fruits and vegetables, while declining in the contracting subsectors. This follows high level of employment of women in the fruits and vegetable subsector. The positive indirect employment effects were also felt in some manufacturing and service sectors due to inter-sectoral linkages. However, the low rate of world price increases as used in this study and the domestic policy of full tariff reduction reduce value added in all agricultural subsectors except in maize and vegetables and fruits subsectors, which leads to declining factor income returns.

The sensitivity analysis to ascertain the robustness of the model results was carried out using high rates of world price changes and moderate tariff reduction. The results of higher world price changes show that South Africa will benefit from the implementation of the Doha Round. Under this scenario, production and exports rise in all subsectors albeit slightly in commodities with low export shares from the base year level. Imports of all agricultural subsectors decline significantly while non-agricultural imports rise, which improves household welfare.

However, in order to realise benefits, results indicate that higher world prices changes are needed in order to offset the negative effects of the domestic agricultural policy such as tariff reduction on agriculture. As a result, most consumers, especially low-income households which comprise a big percentage of women, will be negatively affected by the increase in world price of maize. These households spend a great share of their income on food, particularly maize for their household (IES 2000). This outcome could threaten the food security, especially for those who do not produce their own food.

Improved production and exports necessitate employment demand for both men and women, particularly for unskilled women and skilled men. Improved value added leads to higher

returns for all type of skills, mostly for skilled men and slightly for unskilled women. Highest returns accrue to capital. This outcome is similar to that of Adilu et al. (2004) who found higher price changes to cause gains of agricultural producers in Canada while low price changes caused negative effects on agricultural production and trade. In South Africa, McDonald and Kirsten (1998) used varying rates (5-20%) of world price rise to model its effects on the aggregate agricultural sector. Their results show the price rise by 20% to generate an increase in intermediate input demand of 6.9% and labour demand by 1.6%.

These effects accrue to men and women who are currently participating in the agricultural market sector and exclude the majority of rural farmers who produce for their own consumption. This is because part of agriculture produced for home consumption is not included in the 2000 gendered South African SAM. According to Klasen (1999), 66% of women activities, such as subsistence agriculture, are unrecorded and hence not included in the System of National Accounts (SNA).

This study also included simulations on the effects of single trade policy changes, i.e. tariff reductions and changes in world prices of imports and exports. These policies were simulated separately in order to compare the results of combined policies (tariff reductions and world price increases). As far as domestic production is concerned, the results of the separate simulation show that agriculture is better off with world price rises than with tariff reduction. On the other hand, agricultural exports, which have positive effects on capital and labour, are more encouraged by world price rises than by tariff reductions alone.

The demand for capital and labour in agriculture is positively impacted by the rise in world prices, which improves domestic production and negatively affected by reductions in tariffs which leads to declining domestic production. Although positive income earnings is realised in the agricultural sector, economy-wide earnings for all factors drop except for capital that sees increase in its earnings. In terms of gender, a tariff reduction reduces the demand for both women and men labour except for skilled men while the world price rises improves the demand for capital, men and women labour. Overall, the Doha Round has a positive effect on the employment of men and women and mostly for women in the maize and vegetables and fruits sectors. The increased demand for women labour, relative to that of men, is due to greater employment demand in the women-intensive sectors such as fruit and vegetables – these sectors favour unskilled women labour. However, labour demand declines in all other

agricultural subsectors of wheat, livestock, poultry and other-agriculture. In contrast, employment demand increases for both capital and labour in the non-agricultural sectors due to tariff reductions while employment declines in most of the non-agricultural sectors while it increase in most of the service subsectors and in water, machinery and equipments which are needed in the production of improved agriculture.

Several features of the model used in this study contribute to the analysis of the effects of the Doha Round on agriculture and gender. First, the disaggregation of the agricultural sector into subsectors illuminates important effects. Small effects of the Doha Round on the aggregate generally consisted of large changes in the individual agricultural sub-sectors and on the food, beverage and tobacco, chemical, other-chemicals, and water sectors, which are non-agricultural, but are sectors with linkages to the agricultural sector.

10.5 SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The study results show that women labour participation increases after changes in globalisation policies. However, it is difficult to determine whether women-created jobs are permanent, part-time or temporary positions thus making it difficult to determine the sustainability of created jobs. This is based on the short-run nature and static comparative results of the model used for this study. Such outcome of the model in the current and in other studies, have been the basis for criticism from researchers such as Ghosh (1999) and Joekes (1999) who are sceptical about the long-term impact of globalisation-created jobs, questioning their quality and their sustainability. This would necessitates introducing dynamism in the model in order to model long-term characteristics.

Although the model has proved useful for determining the impacts of globalisation on gender and the economy in South Africa, it could be extended to determine the effects on countries that have increased their trade with South Africa. For example, assessing the impact on men and women jobs in SADC countries given their free trade agreement with South Africa while recognising the high GDP for South Africa, which accounts for more than one third of the Sub-Saharan Africa total GDP.

The current model includes only three classes of labour: skilled, semi-skilled and unskilled, without distinguishing between unskilled labour in urban and agricultural labour markets. In South Africa, however, there is a large share of the economically active population,

particularly women who are engaged in small-scale agriculture. The labour market in that sector is quite distinct from urban labour markets. To reflect this reality, disaggregating labour into agricultural labour, urban unskilled labour, urban semi-skilled labour, and urban skilled labour together with gender would enhance the model. This could help capture the characteristics of subsistence agricultural production and subsistence farmers who are currently not represented in the SAM.

South Africa has a high rate of poverty, particularly among unskilled women. It is estimated that 35% of the population survive on two US dollars (2\$). It is estimated that around 70% of South African residing in the rural areas are poor and mostly women (Budlender 2000). This study would be enhanced by the introduction of the ‘microsimulation’ methodology to analyse the impacts on income distribution and poverty due to macroeconomic policies.

SUMMARY

Globalisation has greatly increased the employment demand for labour, especially that of unskilled women. There is, however, increased demand of skilled women who are involved in higher-skill business services, such as software design, computer programming and financial services (banking and insurance) which follows the growth of globalisation-related employment in the service sector of tourism, finance, and information processing.

However, despite the rapid increase in sectoral employment for women, occupational segregation by gender remains a social constraint. Women dominate in clerical and secretarial jobs and in low-level service occupations such as shop assistants, waitresses, maids, hairdressers, and dressmakers. Other lower-skilled level service sectors that have seen an increase of women employment include data entry (see Chapter 4 for skills identification). In high paying export-oriented mining sectors, women are most likely to be clerks, teachers or nurses. These “women occupations” generally pay less and have lesser status and advancement potential. In addition, such types of jobs are excluded from formal and informal networks, mainly men’s networks, which are important for advancement within sectors.

Although women still earn less than their men counterparts for every level of educational qualification/skill in South Africa, the wage gap for more highly skilled women is getting smaller. Initial higher wages for skilled women come from improvement in higher wages that women workers have achieved in recent years, which have resulted in part from changes in

the pattern of occupational segregation, as skilled women have been recruited at higher levels. The enactments of various equal rights labour laws have also contributed to the improvement in women working conditions (see Chapter 2). The gender wage gap has shown a tendency to diminish with women's increased participation in paid work, especially for skilled women.

Globalisation appears to have been a key source of employment for women in South Africa, which has positive implications for unemployment alleviation. On contrast, globalisation has also been a key source of loss of employment for women mostly in women-intensives sectors, such as textile. These sectors face global competition from well-established and well-capitalised foreign sectors and in many cases they cannot survive. Men and women labour made redundant by cut backs in production/output is not easily absorbed, thus exacerbating the problem of long-term unemployment. In most instances, however, these job losses have been offset by the jobs which have been created mostly in highly productive sectors. These sectors, however, attract women at lower-skilled levels. As such, globalisation is credited for both creating and for shedding jobs in the South African economy.

The study results indicate that export-oriented sectors of mining (gold, coal, other-mining) and service (trade, transportation, hotel and communication) sectors which have low protection in the base year level gain the most from globalisation policies. On the other hand, textiles, footwear, leather, rubber, glass, apparel, wood, non-metal minerals, and metal products, which are sectors with initial high levels of protections (see Table 4.16), are negatively affected by globalisation policies. The service sector benefits the most compared to manufacturing in terms of employment with globalisation policies because the sector is the highest employer of all skill types from the base year level (see Chapter 4).

Paid employment is vital for women. For example, the income and expenditure survey (IES 2000) show the earnings of women to be mostly allocated to education, health and nutritional well-being of their children. Thus, any increase in women's employment and/or increases in their wages are likely to improve the quality of life in households where women work. This study has found the regularity of the wages from jobs and the location of the work outside the sphere of control of men to have empowered women, and to have increased their influence on personal and household decision-making and their autonomy. Even unskilled women, who earn less than their skilled counterparts, report greater autonomy and improved household and personal decision-making.