

Women Labour: What Was It? What Is It Now? A Theoretical Analysis Based on Different Economic Perspectives

Betül SARI-AKSAKAL (<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2668-364X>), Manisa Celal Bayar University, Turkey; betulllsari@gmail.com

Kadın Emęi: Neydi, Ne Oldu? Farklı İktisadi Anlayışlar Temelinde Kuramsal Bir Analiz

Abstract

One of the main mechanisms of development in economies is the efficient use of factors of production. In the use of labour, one of the primary production resources in economies, it can be said that there is a distribution in favour of men in many countries in terms of existing gender patterns. Women's labour remains secondary because men are central in almost all social institutions and relations, and men's leading position is also considered. Women are generally held responsible for domestic work, making them less likely to benefit from labour markets and educational opportunities than males. However, within the framework of the evolution of economic thought and development, economics emerged as a separate discipline following the Second World War. Some changes in women's labour and pertinent views about it have occurred. The impact of women's labour on development has begun to be grasped. In all these contexts, in this study, the socio-economic and cultural advancement and turn of women's labour concerning the evolution of economic thought and development economics are investigated, and the place and magnitude of women's labour in development are discussed.

Keywords : Women Labour, Economic Thought, Economic Development, Domestic Labour.

JEL Classification Codes : B2, N3, O1.

Öz

Ekonomilerde kalkınmanın temel sağlayıcı mekanizmalarından biri üretim faktörlerinin etkin kullanımınıdır. Ekonomilerde ana üretim kaynaklarından biri olan emeğin kullanımında, birçok ülkede var olan toplumsal cinsiyet kalıpları bağlamında erkekler lehine bir dağılım olduğu söylenebilir. Kadının ve kadın emeğinin ekonomilerde ikincil planda kalmasının temel sebebi, hemen hemen bütün toplumsal kurum ve ilişkilerde erkeklerin merkezi konumda yer alması ve erkeklerin merkezi konumunun veri olarak ele alınmasıdır. Kadınların ev içi işlerden genel olarak sorumlu tutulması da kadınların işgücü piyasalarından ve eğitim olanaklarından erkeklerle göre daha az faydalanmalarına yol açmaktadır. Ancak; iktisadi düşüncenin ve bunun yanı sıra İkinci Dünya Savaşı'ndan sonraki yıllarda ayrı bir disiplin olarak ortaya çıkan kalkınma iktisadının evrimi çerçevesinde, kadın emeği ve bununla ilgili görüşlerde birtakım değişiklikler meydana gelmiştir. Kadın emeğinin kalkınma üzerindeki etkisi anlaşılmaya başlanmıştır. Bu bağlamda, bu çalışmada, iktisadi düşüncenin ve

kalkınma iktisadının evrimi bağlamında kadın emeğinin sosyoekonomik ve kültürel gelişimi ve değişimi incelenerek, kalkınmada kadın emeğinin yeri ve önemi ele alınmıştır.

Anahtar Sözcükler : Kadın Emeği, İktisadi Düşünce, İktisadi Kalkınma, Ev İçi Emek.

1. Introduction

Due to the patriarchal social structure in many countries throughout the historical process, the idea has prevailed that the main task of women is family and homework. In addition to economic activities aimed at earning wages, women also did domestic work. The patriarchal thought, which continued after the emergence of economics as a separate discipline, impacted women and, therefore, women's labour. Although Classical, Neoclassical, Marxist and Institutional Economic Thought differ slightly in some respects regarding their view of women's labour, their opinions are almost identical. The evolution of the notion of development is based on the evolution of development economics. The terms of development and growth were considered identical concepts roughly from the 1950s until the mid-1970s. The underdevelopment problem and the discussions about its solution focused on increasing the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) in the period mentioned above. It was posited that the main phenomenon indicating the economic development levels of countries was the real increase in GDP and per capita income. However, after the economic crisis had broken out in the mid-1970s, it was started to claim that economic development could not be clarified only with the increases in the GDP; other criteria should be considered. With these advancements, the development concept has begun to be perceived with social, institutional, humanitarian, ideological, political, cultural, and economic aspects. Since it has become more evident in the last few decades that development cannot be such a narrow scope term that increases in any country's GDP can only elucidate. Accordingly, development economics has started to be concerned about the significance of women and women's labour in the development process. Gender equality is regarded as a fundamental requirement of sustainable development. For this reason, the role and importance of female and female labour in the formation of development policies began to be interrogated.

The world economy has entered a different stage in which neoliberal economic policies have been implemented in many countries since the 1980s. In line with these policies, the demand for women's labour has expanded by the enhancing inclination to export-oriented industrialisation. This enhancement is directly related to the different stages reached by the capitalist development model through neoliberal policies and the phenomenon of globalisation as a requirement of this model. Thanks to the improvements in information technologies, the transition from industrial to information society have occurred. These advancements, cropping up in the process of globalisation, have paved the way for some changes and transformations in the discernment of development in the world. In line with this change, innovative sustainable development strategies hinging on the concepts such as human capital, knowledge, research and development, innovation, environment, and foreign trade have come to the fore. On the other hand, such strides have

also allowed the investigation of the development levels of countries based on gender. The role of women in the economies and the noteworthiness of women's labour as being a component of human capital are often tidily keynoted, particularly by the international financial institutions, primarily by the World Bank.

Particularly after the 1990s, feminist economics has become one of the main topics of conversation in new development approaches. The debates arose, paying attention to women's role and labour in development. After the emergence of feminist economics, a new deal has come in sight that ponders women's presence in economies based on gender. Thereof, it has been dawned that women's labour is exceptionally outstanding in activating the internal dynamics of any economy. The secondary role of women in the labour market and social life and the negligence of women's labour can be sighted as the problem in almost all developed and developing economies. However, in the world's least developed economies, women are more disadvantaged than men due to the existing patriarchal structures of these countries. Today, it is clear that the development of economies cannot be attained merely through policies aimed at expanding national income. In addition, the assignation of women's domestic labour as an essential factor in economic development has accelerated the humanitarian and sustainable development discussions and the apprehension of the contribution of women's labour to development and its indispensability in economies.

In the context of all these matters, the birth of economic thought and the evolution of economic thought in the historical flow will be discussed in the first part of the study. Women's labour will be analysed in various schools of economic thought. After that, the concept of development will be studied. Within the context of the change in the discipline of development economics, the evolution of women's labour will be tried to be enlightened. Further, the development strategies that have been commonly followed in the world for the last few decades will be clarified, and the relationship between development and women's labour in parallel with the changes in these strategies. It will also be debated how these strategies have altered the demand and glance of women's labour in economies. To address the shift in development strategies, the emergence of the developing economy and its evolution since then will be taken under review.

2. Remarks About Women Labour in Economic Thought

2.1. The Status of Women Labour in Classical and Neoclassical Economic Thought: Subordination and Oppression of Women Labour

Considering the scope, subject and definition of the classical economic theory, it can be said that the women and women's labour in economies, in most cases, are being ruled out. However, women and women's labour in economies has been taken into account by some theorists of classical economic thought¹. Michele Pujol, a French intellectual, economist,

¹ *John Stuart Mill is one of these theorists. John Stuart Mill is a British philosopher, political economist and one of the most influential thinkers in the history of classical liberalism. In his essay The Subjection of Women, written in 1869, Mill remarked on the oppression of women and the reduction and underestimation of the worth*

feminist, scholar and human rights activist, asserts that Adam Smith's *The Wealth of Nations* (1776) brings forward those women do not contribute to the economy except for their contribution to population growth (Pujol, 1992). On the other hand, Jean Baptiste Say, a liberal French economist and businessman who promoted perfect competition, free trade and removing restraints on business, claims that women are more irrational consumers than men, especially because they are very extravagant against jewellery (Bodkin, 1999).

Women contribute to the development process solely from home. In other words, they are involved in economic activities using their domestic labour. Domestic labour includes jobs carried out by women who do not realise in return for wages, such as childcare, cooking, laundry and house cleaning. Women's domestic labour is not regarded as productive, does not find value in the economy and do not include in the market economy. Adam Smith finds it appropriate for women to make sacrifices within the home through their domestic labour to assure the capitalist system's permanence. Like classical economic thought, neoclassical economic thought contemplates women as beings who had to make sacrifices at home due to the natural division of labour and who only care for and raise children. Therefore, it did not take into account women as economic actors. Because, according to neoclassical economic thought, women do not make a notable contribution to the production activities in economies (Toksöz, 2011: 48).

Neoclassical economic thinkers such as Alfred Marshall, Francis Ysidro Edgeworth, William Stanley Jevons, and Arthur Cecil Pigou presume women as irrational and inappropriate economic agents and assert women's participation in the labour market would harm family life and welfare in economies (Pujol, 1995). For example, Pigou frankly lined up with those weaker women than men, so welfare can be maximised in economies by keeping women's wages lower than men's. Pigou (1960: 565-6) assumes that the most basic factor affecting the women's labour supply is their husbands' income. Pigou thinks that the women labour in the industry is unqualified and secondary. Therefore, men and women can't

of their productive contributions. Mill is recognized for being not only the important philosopher of British liberalism but also the exclusively prominent philosopher of liberalism to have made the subordination of women a fundamental part of his philosophical study. "All women" he noted, "are brought up from the very earliest years in the belief that their ideal of character is very opposite to that of men, not self-will, and government by self-control, but submission, and yielding to the control of others, it is their nature to live for others" (Mill, 2000: 22). This prejudiced sight of women and the opinion that it was their character to live for others paved the way for the effective neo-classical economists to categorize particular laborious activities as "women's work", labelling particular activities as natural tasks rather than productive work. Mill argues that the existing conditions regulating the social relations of men and women make one sex dependent on the other. By arguing that gender equality should be provided unconditionally, Mill states that all ideas that deny women's freedom are meaningless (Mill, 2000: 3-4; Smith, 2001: 181). However, Mill states that if women can freely choose between marriage or working life, the woman who chooses marriage has chosen her profession. According to Mill, it is not possible for a woman to carry out her marriage and working life together (Hekman, 1992: 681; Mill, 2000: 58). Mill asserts that the main responsibilities of women in this situation are to raise their children and to do housework. Women's employment in a paid job would prevent them from fulfilling these responsibilities. Mill differs from the male thinkers of his time in the context of his views about gender equality. However, he nonetheless deals with the emancipation of women in a limited framework in the context of the freedom to choose home or work life.

receive equal wages in a perfectly competitive market. From this point of view, it would not be wrong to point out that neoclassical economists do not appraise women as human beings. The most important impetus for this is the patriarchal structures and judgments existing in the world.

Alfred Marshall, one of the prominent representatives of neoclassical economics, came up with the idea that increasing women's wages would cause them to neglect their motherhood and housewife duties. For this reason, he opposes the admission of women to the university (Pujol, 1984: 217-34). Mothers, more than fathers, are fallen back upon to devote themselves for the sake of their children. Thus, women have to relinquish employment. Marshall frequently continues that women's employment is noxious since "it tempts them to neglect their duty of building up a true home and investing their efforts in the personal capital of their children's character and abilities" (Marshall, 1901: 342). From his line of sight of Marshall, a mother's care for her children is one of the most fundamental constituents in the generation of the human capital that is necessitated by modern industry:

"If we compare (countries, regions, trades), we find that the degradation of the working classes varies almost uniformly with the amount of rough work done by women. The most valuable of all capital is that invested in human beings. Of that capital, the most precious part is the result of the care and influence of the mother, so long as she retains her tender and unselfish instincts and has not been hardened by the strain and stress of unfeminine work (Marshall, 1890: 468)."

Besides Marshall, economists such as Francis Ysidro Edgeworth suggest that women cannot make rational economic decisions. He denotes that women's productive capacities are being valid merely in domestic work by setting forth those women are being not efficient in the industrial sector and other business areas (Blau et al., 1976; Brown, 1984). Thus, the sexual division of labour is simply an efficient way of organising work.

Edgeworth asks the question in his renowned article of 1922 (equal pay to men and women for similar work), should men and women receive equal pay for equal work? (Edgeworth, 1922: 431). Edgeworth answers his question negatively, claiming that the work of men and women can never be similar, either qualitatively or quantitatively. Edgeworth claims that the actual value as a worker was about 30 per cent (Edgeworth, 1922: 440). Since women are not being productive, which is a fact, the market already acknowledges that? In addition, Edgeworth puts forward that men's wages should be more than women's since men have to subsist their families: "the women worker has not acquired by custom and tradition the same unwillingness to work for less than will support a family, the same determination to stand out against a reduction of wages below that standard" (Edgeworth, 1922: 436). Edgeworth (1922) advocates excluding women from the market economy mechanisms by frequently alluding to the biological differences like women are not robust and productive as men.

Moreover, Edgeworth asserts that women are untrustworthy and non-continuous workers. For a woman, different from a man, it is valid to go out and get married as soon as she starts to be out of use (Edgeworth, 1922: 444). The existence of women in the labour force is not regarded as a benefaction to economic welfare; it is rather problematised as disquieting serious unfavourable results for national welfare and household utility. Edgeworth informs that large numbers of women in the labour force would give rise to depression or the collapse of industry (Edgeworth, 1922: 436).

Jevons also disputes that child-bearing women should be excluded from the labour market (Jevons, 1883: 157). Jevons also remarks on his worry that women's employment would negatively affect household tasks and infant mortality rates. For this reason, the optimal division of labour is the conventional type, in which men work full-time outside the home and women work full-time within the home. Marshall and Pigou also voiced their worry about the negative effect of employment on women's household responsibilities and infant mortality rates (Marshall, 1930: 198, 721; Pigou 1960, 187). Marshall pointed out that women's employment seduces them to ignore their responsibility to construct a true home and give their endeavours in the personal capital of their children's character and talents. He persisted in their existence in the home (Marshall, 1930: 685). Working outside the home prevents women from carrying through their housework fully and raising their children properly (Marshall, 1930: 721). As Pigou indicates:

"The reality of this evil [working mothers' alleged neglect] is not disproved by the low, and even negative, the correlation between mothers' factory work and the rate of infant mortality. For in districts where women's work of this kind prevails, there is presumably - and this is the cause of women's work - great poverty. This poverty, which is injurious to children's health, is likely, other things being equal, to be greater than elsewhere in families where the mother declines factory work. It may be that the evil of the extra poverty is greater than that of the factory workers. This consideration explains the statistical facts that are known. They, therefore, militate in no way against the view that other things equal the factory work of mothers is injurious (Pigou, 1960: 187)."

These examples from different theorists point out that the builders of the neoclassical economy shared a biological comprehension of gender, which is a belief that the gender differences in the labour market, such as lower wages for women, gender discrimination, and the like, are a direct and natural result of the physical and biological disparities between men and women. But their claims about gender at the same time make an exception. The existing disparities between men and women at the same time form the traditional division of labour at home and in the labour market inevitably. This view has become widespread by the influence of their ideas: *Women's principal field of activity should be the home.*

Neoclassical economic thinkers have acted from the point that the presence of women in the labour market can only be in need. Women's labour force participation depends on the

husband's earnings. This situation sheds light on where today's economic understanding also gets its patriarchal foundations.

2.2. Marxist Economic Thought: As an Inevitable Structural Characteristic of Capitalism Subordination of Women Labour

In Marxist economic theory, women's labour is considered secondary in economies. Marxist economic thought considers women as a segment of the working class. It discusses the relationship between women and men within workers' relations with capital. In this context, it derives the subordination of women from capitalist class exploitation (Hartmann, 1979: 1).

In *Capital*, Marx expresses the family and the home by emphasising men. In pre-capitalist societies, a man must provide for his family. As Marx (1967) puts forth his elucidation of commodity production and his theory of surplus value, he focuses on the male worker who purchases commodities in the market to produce himself again for the labour of the following day. The work that enters into making ready these commodities for consumption and the unpaid labour which is fundamental to reproducing the worker is not participated to. In this context, Marx seems to come behind Adam Smith on the *Wealth of Nations*, who indites about the significance of self-interest:

"It is not from the benevolence of the butcher, the brewer, or the baker that we expect our dinner, but from regard to their self-interest" (Smith, 1976: 18).

But Nancy Folbre -who is an American feminist economist who directs attention to family economics, non-market work and the economics of care-asserts in response to this:

"Just a minute. It is not usually the butcher, the brewer, or the baker who fixes dinner, but his wife or mother (Folbre, 2001: 11)."

Marx disregarded domestic labour when they spoke of use and exchange values. In other words, any woman's labour at home does not have use and exchange value. Marx (1867: 718) also refutes that wage workers owe their existence to women, who continue their generation thanks to women's labour being spent in the home. At the same time, women's labour is fundamental to sustaining men's existing capacities and powers within the capitalist chain of production. Therefore, it can be asserted that Marx did not realise how useful and essential women's domestic labour is for the permanence and sustainability of the capitalist system. In addition, it would not be wrong to say that Marx has a patriarchal tendency while elucidating the concept of labour-power. As he states in *Capital* Volume I under the title of *Value, Price and Profit*:

"Like that of every other commodity, its value is determined by the quantity of labour necessary to produce it. The labouring power of a man exists only in his living individuality. A man must consume a certain mass of necessaries to grow up and maintain his life. But the man, like the machine, will wear out and must

be replaced by another man. Besides the mass of necessities required for his maintenance, he wants another number of necessities to bring up a certain quota of children to replace him on the labour market and perpetuate the race of labourers. Moreover, many values must be spent to develop his labouring power and acquire a given skill (Marx, 2018: 7)."

Domestic labour is regarded as unproductive labour. Because according to the analysis in question, no labour can be considered productive unless it has a concrete output that is subject to change in the market. Productive labour produces material, final, and valuable products that include all products except labour-power. The domestic labour of women mostly bounds up the reproduction of labour-power. Activities such as cooking, washing dishes and laundry, ironing and cleaning prepare the worker for the next working day. Thus, the reproduction of the labour force in the capitalist system would be actualised without interruption. These activities peculiar to women, and therefore the labour being expended for them, are not counted as productive according to Marx (1867: 718). In no part of Capital, Marx did not acknowledge that the regeneration of labour-power interconnects with women's unpaid domestic labour. On the contrary, he points out characterising the waged worker as self-producing. Even while touching on the generational reproduction of the labour force, Marx does not talk about the women's promotion to it, just referring to it as the natural increase of population (Marx, 1867: 788).

Friedrich Engels is a theorist who analyses the position of women and women's labour in the economies from a historical perspective. According to the author's book *Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, throughout the periods of matriarchal production, women have been stronger than men, or at least equal to men. Afterwards, through the transition to the private property regime, families had gained a patriarchal structure through the nascency of the capitalist system. Naturally, women began to lose power in a positional sense. Following the rise of capitalism and the detachment of family-based households from commodity production, the man continued to live as an individual who provides for the family and earns money. The woman continued to live as a housewife devoted to her man and home (Toksöz, 2011: 92). Engels and Marx acknowledged that women's secondary position was peculiar to capitalism in their early texts. The Communist Manifesto, published in 1848, claims that ruling class men oppress their wives in their own families and that communists aim to liberate women from this oppression. As they clarify:

"The bourgeois sees in his wife a mere instrument of production. He has not even a suspicion that the real point aimed at is to do away with the status of women as mere instruments of production (Engels & Marx, 1968: 50)."

The bourgeois family uses women just as private property (Marx & Engels, 1848). Almost in every part of these writings, the objective of this use was characterised by private property. The bourgeois regards and uses women as property and utilises them with the object of the transmission of private property. There are also some views of Engels and Marx

allege that the exploitative relationship, in which the men confiscate the labour of the women, takes place within the marriage:

"The first-class antagonism which appears in history coincides with the development of the antagonism between men and women in monogamous marriage, and the first-class oppression with that of the female by the male (Engels, 1968: 66)."

On the other hand, Christine Delphy's views on the subject are remarkable; she was a French sociologist, feminist, and theorist known for pioneering materialist feminism. She also co-founded the French Women's Liberation Movement in 1970. Women's unpaid labour is not subject to exchange in the market, and the nature of production cannot explain this. This is due to the patriarchal structure and institutions in society. Delphy (1999: 83) states that the unpaid household services provided by married women are not considered a separate profession, but these services have value when purchased from the market. Delphy defends the view that women participate in a prevalent class position in which men exploit them as a class:

"The appropriation and exploitation of their labour within marriage constitute the oppression common to all women. Destined as women to become "the wife of someone and thus destined for the same relations of production, women constitute but one class (Delphy, 1977: 26)."

Delphy (1977) has used particular Marxist concepts to build her investigation of patriarchy and claims that the base of gender relations in the domestic mode of production. She asserts that there are two modes of production in contemporary society: a capitalist one and a domestic one. Gender inequality originates from the trained model, in which the husband confiscates the wife's labour. The woman does not get an equitable yield for the housework and childcare, cooking, washing clothes etc.; she provides for her husband. Therefore, Delphy contends she should be considered in the case of exploitation. Delphy grounds her contention on the traditional Marxist presumption that the organisation of the material level, especially the relations included in the production, is the centre for social organisation's specification (Delphy, 1999). Delphy's invention was not merely to claim that housework is as much a mode of production as working in a capitalist-owned factory. At the same time, it is to follow this analysis by conceptualising a different way of production in which that work is included. The first step of this argument is relatively uncontroversial today, which can be expressed as *housework being a mode of production*. But that wasn't the case when Delphy's work was first published in France in the 1970s. Delphy (1977) effectively demonstrated that housework is a production by giving examples from French agriculture. Furthermore, she claims that much analysis carried through by so-called Marxists on the status of women and domestic labour is in direct paradox with the basic tenets of Marxist analysis and thinks her analysis is more coherent with the principles of historical materialism. Afterwards, Delphy puts forward that women's relation to production

is defined not by the content of the tasks being carried out by them but by the nature of the social relations under which they labour:

"I would contend that, on the contrary, far from it being the nature of the work performed by women which explains their relationship to production, it is their relations of production which explain why their work is excluded from the realm of value (Delphy, 1977: 4)."

Delphy considers the injustice that women are exposed to more than men while working in a paid job due to the housework duties imposed on women. Delphy strongly opposes those who say that capitalist relations primarily determine women's oppression. She considers this type of theorising to be particularly harmful in its effects on the women's movement. As pointed out by Maxine Molyneux (2012: 118-9) who is a Pakistani sociologist focusing on the women's movement:

"Although the importance of female labour in the family is not always acknowledged, it has been an indispensable contribution to the economy. In history, women have almost always done other things besides housework. This is especially true where a family is a production unit, for example, in large farms, retail trade, and workshops; even today in France, there are more than a million women in agriculture, classified as support for the family, i.e., unpaid workers. As a result of the development of industrialisation and the decline of subsistence agriculture, female labour has ceased to be fully exploitable in the family; for this reason, some women were withdrawn from wage labour, while others were condemned to full-time housewives, deprived of the possibility to participate in production for the market. However, for two reasons, women's participation in wage labour did not lead to a significant change in their general situation: First, whether or not they worked outside the home, all women continued to spend unpaid household labour; secondly, in cases where women participate in paid labour, their wages are most likely controlled by their husbands and used to cover the services that women have provided in the past (such as childcare and laundry). So, the only difference is that women do housework in return for their livelihood before joining paid labour. When they join paid labour, they no longer receive any compensation because they make their living in the paid sector. The marriage contract that most women have at some point in their lives has led to this continuation. This common position in the contract constitutes the basis of the common class situation of women. Women are deprived of their right to control their labour through marriage because they no longer have the freedom to sell that labour. How to spend their labour hand over to use the products of their labour is subject to the will of their husbands. Therefore, men exploit women's labour and, as such, they oppress women in the class."

Molyneux continues to remark that gender and class are closely interrelated for explicit motives generally; poor women are so quickly mobilised by economic exigency.

When governments fall through basic supply needs, women take away their backing. When the subsistence of their families, particularly their children, is menaced, women compose the body of troops of bread rebels, protesters, and petitioners (Molyneux, 2001: 44).

The status of women in the capitalist system is considered to a great extent. Women's exploitation is emphasised by simulating the relationship between men and women, labour and capital. In the socialist system, it was foreseen that women would be emancipated. Engels would notice the emancipation of women arising from their expanded entering into the domain of production:

"The emancipation of woman would only be possible when women can take part in production on a large, social scale, and domestic work no longer claims anything but an insignificant amount of her time (Engels, 1972: 221)."

This statement functions with the gendered supposition that women inherently take responsibility for domestic labour. This process has no place in terms of the division of society into social classes. In the state socialist societies following the Russian Revolution of 1917, this self-assured argument by Engels was repeated many times to prove right and their lack of success in indicating the emancipation of women expressively. The final statement of this intentional gender-blind approach of Marxism was professed by a Yugoslav official in the 1970s, whom:

"Marxists have ascertained that the causes of the unequal position of women do not lie in their oppression by men, and those women do not constitute a uniform stratum; rather, their status is inextricably linked to the existence of class society based on the exploitation of man by a man based on private ownership. Hence the only way to achieve the emancipation of women is by pursuing the road to the revolutionary struggle to topple the class social system (Quoted in Wilber & Jameson, 2013: 1023)."

It is propounded that the struggle against the capitalist system is a required condition for the emancipation of women. Since the subordination of women is a structural characteristic of the capitalist system.

Within all these contexts, in respect of Marxist economic thought, it can be articulated that women's domestic work has no material value. The labour that women spend does not directly affect the production of a commodity materially. Beyond that, it is evident that women's emotional, spiritual, and mental labour is not considered.

2.3. The institutional economic thought: Institutional Determinants of the Exclusion of Women Labour

Gender is a series of social relationships generated in a particular institutional frame of reference (Jones, 2007). Few economic historians deal with the relevance of gender-division-based institutional structures. Most neoclassical and Marxian accounts of the rise

of capitalism assume a stage-based transition from precapitalist to capitalist institutions without explicit consideration of social, cultural, political and institutional conflicts that do not comply with this progression. Inequalities based on gender sticky cultural norms about it, exonerating many historical representatives of accountability for them. Nonetheless, gender issues cannot be demoted to simply being informed and motivated through cultural relationships. Instead, as Frasner (2007) puts forward, gender requires to be comprehended using a bifocal objective: one that associates gender with the economic structures of society, that is, the gender-based division of labour, and the fundamental distinction between paid productive labour and unpaid reproductive and domestic labour, and one that clarifies how status is specified within a different cultural framework, especially institutionalised forms of interacting that are culturally appraised as masculine and feminine.

Economies are being affected by institutional factors and gender beliefs, which are cultural models that exemplify what most people rely on or ratify as being true about the classifications of men and women. By acting from here, the institutional economic thought confirms the existence of a gendered division of labour in economies. The ability of women to participate in the labour market, for example, is frequently hindered by custom and sexist rules and institutions which, as Douglass Cecil North (1990: 3)-who was an American economist known for his studies in economic history by applying economic theory and quantitative techniques to clarify economic and institutional change- has claimed, institutions are the rules of the games in a society, or more formally, are humanly devised constraints that structure human interaction and affect the way markets function. As much as possible, these constraints require to be included in macro models and enrich economic policy:

“Neoclassical theory is simply an inappropriate tool to analyse and prescribe policies that will induce development. It is concerned with the operation of markets, not with how markets develop. How can one prescribe policies when one doesn’t understand how economies develop (North, 1994: 359).”

In addition, institutional economic thought imported those women, in particular, to work in lower-quality jobs and secondary markets beyond their preferences by citing the inflexibility of labour markets and the legal and institutional arrangements made by companies with monopoly power. It emphasises women’s employment in secondary jobs and men’s in high-paying primary jobs in the markets. Primary jobs in the market entail encouraging, creative, problem-solving, and disciplining personality traits. Secondary jobs are more related to the service sector and employ women and youth. Women are often employed at lower wages (Reich et al., 1973: 359-62).

Institutional economic thought has been analysed by separating men and women by hinging on the logic of neoclassical economic thought (Konca, 2006: 31). As a result of this separation, two distinct concepts have transpired in labour market, characterising *men's and women's jobs*. The labour market encapsulates women's position that is few. On the other hand, the desire of many women to work in a small number of women's careers has led to

an increase in the competition between them and, accordingly, a reduction in their wages. On the other hand, men belonging to the broader job groups face less competition in the market compared to women. Therefore, their salaries are becoming higher than that of women. As Anker puts forth:

"It is not clear whether women's preferences in the labour market reflect their real preferences before joining the labour market. Both the neoclassical and institutional economic thought ignores some critical variables that are non-economic and are located outside the labour market. They are lacking in clarification of many non-economic questions, such as why women come to the labour market having less education, why women have a narrower range of professions, why responsibilities such as housework and childcare always belong to women, or why women do not reach higher levels in their professions (Anker: 1997: 315-39)."

Gender inequality is composed of institutional forces to a certain degree, which purports that the results may not be based solely on impacts associated with the employee's qualifications (Doeringer & Piore, 1971).

2.4. Feminist Economics: Rebellion Against the Neglectedness of the Women Labour

Since the 1980s, the sex-oriented approaches and basic principles of classical, neoclassical and institutional economics have begun to be interrogated, putting women and women's labour at the secondary level in world economies. Interrogations, as well as criticism, have been mainly brought by feminist economists². Feminist economists have

² *Feminist thought can be periodically divided into first, second, and third wave feminism in the relevant literature. First wave feminism directs its critiques on the subordination of women in the economy and society. It associates the reason for this with the fact that women do not have equal rights and freedoms with men in the public sphere. The liberal feminism, which showed its influence in the 18th and 19th centuries, is periodically included in the first wave feminism. Liberal feminism has brought to the fore the argument that women are individuals just like men, and therefore they should have equal rights with men in every domain. Issues such as equality of educational opportunity and women's leadership and political participation are among the subjects that first-wave feminism is closely paid attention (Altınbaş, 2006; Kotef, 2009). Towards the middle of the twentieth century, feminist thought began to gain an appearance beyond the defence of women's rights. In addition to women's rights, it has gained an appearance that focuses on femininity. In this period being called second-wave feminism, radical and cultural feminists focused on the female body and sexuality particularly in the 1960s and 1970s (Evans, 1995; Thompson, 2002). Unlike first-wave feminism, they acted on the idea that gender discrimination exists not only in the public sphere, but also in the private sphere. Issues such as the prevention of harassment and rape, the right to abortion are the focus of radical and cultural feminists (Pearce, 1999; Schulman, 2004). Socialist and Marxist feminist thoughts are periodically included in the second wave feminism. Issues such as the improvement of women's working conditions in the market, and closure of the gender pay gap are the subjects of Marxist and socialist feminist thought (Luxton, 2014). In the 1990s, the theoretical framework of first wave and second-wave feminism started to be criticized, which offers a single solution for the emancipation of all women across the world. The impact of third wave feminism still continues robustly throughout the world, which is also described as post-modern feminism in the relevant literature (Gillis & Munford, 2004; Snyder, 2008).*

argued that the influential economic theories have shaken down women and women's labour to the economy's background. For this reason, they asserted that economics as science also does not involve women and, therefore, women's perspective. There is an inevitable linkage between the social construction of nature and social disciplines and the social construction of gender. The application of the discovery of this linkage by feminist thought to the field of economics can be qualified as feminist economics (Ferber, 1995). Within this scope, the destination of feminist economics is to purify the economics of masculinity. In addition, it can be expressed as the enrichment of economics by incorporating the experiences of all people belonging to different cultures, ethnicities and economic classes on the principle of a more multiple human understanding and identities (Nelson, 1995). Mainstream economics presents only the identity and perspective of men through the general, objective, rational and universal investigation. By this means, mainstream economics exercises implicit domination over women and reproduces it continuously through several institutions (Strassman, 1995: 1-5). This is the issue that feminist economics directly sets against. Feminist economists have disclosed that the suppositions of mainstream economics (especially neoclassical economics) are not capable of expounding economic and social advances coming off in the historical process (Serdaroğlu, 1995: 71).

Meanwhile, postmodernism paved the way for feminist theory to increase its influence on world economies and formulate new economic theories and policies. In essence, feminist economics aspires to discover the place and involvement of women in economies by unveiling the flaws through the re-examination of mainstream economics. The impetus because feminist economists have focused their criticism on mainstream economics, especially neoclassical economics, is as Serdaroğlu emphasises:

"Feminism is primarily a revolt against relations of domination. Relations of domination point to the patriarchal understanding. Another reason is that feminist economics aims to decipher the borders and break the codes of the patriarchal understanding of neoclassical economics hinged on the dominance of men. Under market-based economics, neoclassical economics tries to invalidate these criticisms (Serdaroğlu, 1997: 3-7)."

Feminist economics does not take as a goal to generate a comprehension of the economy that includes only women and takes men at the rear. Feminist economics criticises the mainstream economics' behaviour about attaching priority to men in economies by asserting that economic thought should be deputed of such discrimination (Strober, 1994). A discipline that rejects the understanding of male domination of economies and societies and criticises the sex-oriented structure of mainstream economics cannot make the mistake of defending women's dominance in economies (Kalaycı, 2017: 356). Feminist economics aims to redesign the discipline of economics by revising it to improve women's social and economic position (Strober, 1994). Thuswise, the field of economics would become more comprehensive concerning both theory and policy.

Feminist economics cannot be considered an economic thought that only considers production and consumption activities, subject to market exchange (Işık & Serdaroğlu, 2015: 12). Feminist economics has sights trained to be a thought which covers all economic activities being carried out in the market, including women's economic experiences and economic activities, i.e., domestic labour. Stand together with this objective; it professes that the subject and borders of economics should be extended. Regarding feminist economists, there are two main reasons for the devaluation of women and women's labour. One is the gender division of labour, and the other is society's existing patriarchal structure. As Blue (2017: 66) indicates:

"Gender analysis of women's positions in the labour market looks at how changing, transforming, and differing expectations affect women's labour market experience regarding women's roles as wives and mothers as being defined by society. Gender is considered a part of the complex social structure, which impacts other individuals' cultural, social, and economic status."

Feminist economics attempts to make women's invisible domestic labour visible³. The conceptual dualism between male and female sets apart the family from social production, which bounds women to the domain of domesticity (Brown, 2014: 48-57). Mainstream economics has developed its analysis on the existence of some exchange goods with the monetary value commodified and produced in the market. However, it is a significant contribution to the literature to consider different production activities such as housework, childcare and elderly care⁴, which do not transform into commodities, hence are not subject to exchange activities but play a vital role in the continuation of the capitalist

³ *The phenomenon of feminism has underlined the role of mothers' unpaid work in finding resources for the ascending of the following generation. The feminist agenda would involve provision for that work, in some sort that would turn on alternatives rather than confining women in domestic roles. Folbre (2006) has proposed that government payments to parents should be regarded as payments for services rather than as welfare. Payments for mothers would characterize women as fundamental and incarcerate them in the domestic domain. But there is some demonstration that there is culturally advancement towards a place where being confined in the role of housewife is hereafter such a menace. At that time the work of mothering was extremely combined with housework, however, the difference between the two is now obvious. We could claim that everyone makes housework, and it is logical self-care that everyone should do some housework. Caring for young children is different, which generates a public benefit, and it is logical that the entire society should contribute to the costs of this work (Folbre, 2001, 2006). Cultural evolution towards men requesting to join much more than former generations in the hand on the care of their children drops the probability of women being essentialized and confined in housewife roles. If the work of caring for young children gets provisioned as a duty to the rest of the society, it may enhance men's take upon of these works, as increased wages have taken in jobs like nursing and social work carried out by trained personnel with the aim of welfare. Indisputably, it may look intimidating to some women to abandon supervision over their children's care, particularly given the insufficient access that women have to labour market money-making and career progression.*

⁴ *Women's conventional responsibility for the unpaid work of caring dependents has enhanced their economic dependence on men and putted them on favourable circumstances especially with regard to financial and social opportunities in the labour market. Mothers earn substantially less than other women over their lifetime and face a significant risk of poverty in the event of nonmarriage or divorce. More care work is now being realized for pay, frequently by women who earn less than they would in other jobs calling for the same education and experience (England et al., 2001; England & Folbre, 1999).*

system and most of them are carried out by women. In this sense, feminist economics is an alternative point of view that highlights the role of patriarchy in discriminating against women in the labour market, declaring men to have played a substantial role in safeguarding male jobs at the expense of women (Hartmann, 1976: 139). Succinctly, the main purpose of feminist economics is to stress the contribution of women in the economic field and manifest that women are an active part of the development process in economies. Thus, expanding the boundaries of economics with different methods, theories, and policies would be actualised.

3. Overview of the Development Economics and Its Assessment in the Focus of Women Labour

Regarding the emergence of development economics as a sub-discipline, Second World War was accepted as the turning point. The collapse of the international economic system between 1939 and 1945, which corresponds to the war years, has caused a global shock. This has given real impetus to the ascendancy of development economics as a separate discipline. Herewith, development theories have started to occur. Each development theory relies on different assumptions about the nature of the development. They present their concepts by asking questions to illuminate countries' development processes by proposing their strategies (Toksöz, 2011: 13). Truthfully, the perspective of development economics on the problem of development and its solutions have differed in the historical process. Roughly throughout the 1950s and 1960s, it has taken cognisance of the notions of growth and development equivalent to each other. Development has been tackled as an economic issue that relies on production and accumulation. Private investments and assistance should contribute to industrialisation, a process in which technological improvement is principal. This, also known as traditional development economics or modernisation theory, was questioned by many scholars in the mid-1960s and lost its influence. Since modernisation theory has lost its impact, alternative approaches have come into play.

Since the mid-1980s, studies involving the social, political, cultural, institutional and environmental aspects of development have been carried out, and more holistic solutions have been proposed for the development problem than in previous periods. Since the 1990s, the notion of sustainable development has cropped out with economic, social and ecological aspects of development. When the evolution of development theories in the historical process is perused attentively, it can be claimed that there is some parallelity between the theories and the general international economic conjuncture. Women were not viewed as active actors in economies and part of the development process for a long time. The evolution of development economics, particularly concerning women's labour, will be discussed in detail from the historical perspective in the following chapters.

3.1. Modernization (Traditional Development) Theory: Unremunerative Women Labour

The emanation of development studies is mainly dated to President Harry Truman's speech (Inaugural Address) in 1949. He asked the Western world to share their technology, skills and experiences to pull formerly colonised countries out of poverty (Truman, 1949: 4-5). The stress on technological advancement and how developing countries should trace industrialisation, economic growth, and consumption that had emerged in the West came to the fore in development studies, mainly what has been denominated in the modernisation theory. Modernisation theory regards historical conventions and pre-existing institutions of alleged primitive societies as barriers to modern economic growth.

The modernisation theory presents the path and processes of developed countries as a prescription for underdeveloped and developing countries. Development has been submitted as a modernisation project in social, political, cultural and economic terms. The traditional development approach remained influential until roughly the mid-1960s. Accordingly, developing countries are directly associated with adopting developed countries' social, political, cultural and economic values and policies. From the viewpoint of the modernisation theory, Western countries, mainly Western European countries, can be classified as developed countries.

For this reason, the development path of Western countries should be taken as an example by the underdeveloped and developing countries of the world. In this way, the underdeveloped and developing countries of the world would be able to acquire economic, social and cultural wealth. The rise of the US from the Second World War as the world's most powerful state and hegemonic power contains the embodiment process of the modernisation theory. The general understanding of economics in this period involves Keynesian economic policies, the foundations of which date back to the Great Depression. The development theories generated in this period were in association with Keynesianism. Theories have claimed that economic development could be attained by implementing practical state intervention and import substitution industrialisation strategies. Most of the theories were inspired by John Maynard Keynes- his accentuation of the state's role-who supposes that market forces and private actors would be unable to procure adequate investments to develop the backward areas. The main discussions centred upon the suitable models and theories that encourage a process of industrialisation and growth.

Economic modernisation theories like Rostow (1960)'s Stages of Growth have been significantly motivated by the Harrod-Domar model that clarifies in a mathematical aspect the growth rate of a country concerning the saving rate and the productivity level of capital. Rostow has foretold that what he denominates backward areas would have to get through a predefined set of stages to achieve the US and Europe (Rostow, 1952: 26). This would only be attained by making significant investments and articulating the capitalist world economy. The large-scale intervention of the state has frequently been acknowledged. Paul Rosenstein

Rodan (1943) and Ragnar Nurkse (1952) also suggested that a big push model in infrastructure investment and the planned economy was required to incite industrialisation.

This period in question has a strong position on the place and demand of women labour in the economies. Afterwards, the Second World War demand for women's labour expanded. Especially between 1940 and 1947, the need for women labour accrued rapidly, particularly in the US (Schweitzer, 1980: 89). Women's wages rose dramatically throughout the war. They unexpectedly fell after the war as industries started to reproduce activities again. As Schweitzer indicates:

“After the war, when the defence factories closed and servicemen returned, the female labour force shrank to a size closer to that of 1940 than to that of 1944. There had been some growth. Eighty per cent of the women in the labour force in 1945 were still working, an increase of 18 per cent over the number of women working in 1940. But the rise in female employment is more appropriately attributed to the growth of traditionally woman-employing occupations (such as clerical work and electrical manufacturing) than to any changes brought by the war in either the willingness of women to work or the occupations open them. While more women were in the labour force in 1950 than in 1940, they still worked primarily in those industries that had always employed women. The barriers to women had been breached temporarily, but the return to peacetime conditions left women where they had been before 1941 (Schweitzer, 1980: 90)”.

It is pointed out that gender inequality deteriorates in the early stages of industrialisation, drives up throughout the intermediate level of industrialisation, but becomes indistinct after attaining a certain level. The traditional system of gender discrimination kept going and even escalated with rapid industrialisation, modernisation and economic development (Boserup, 1970: 53).

In the post-war period, economic progress in developing countries accelerated the gradual transition from household production to specialised production of goods and services. Meanwhile, the industrialisation effort in the period in question undermined the domestic production activities and the household industry (Toksöz, 2011: 144). The establishment of large industrial enterprises has led to the collapse of many household industries. These radical changes have also pushed men working at home towards becoming factory workers. On the other hand, women have continued to work predominantly in the household industry, which declined in number and importance. They were also excluded from income-generating economic activities in the market. The majority of workers were men in capital-intensive production sectors such as steel, shipbuilding, industry and automotive in the developing countries of Latin America and East Asia, which adopted import substitution industrialisation strategies throughout the period in question. On the other hand, women were predominantly employed in low-tech production sectors such as weaving and food. As it can be understood, the workforce requested by the system was

mainly met by the male workforce, and women were thrown into unskilled jobs and second place in the economy.

3.2. Dependency Theories: Understanding the Inequalities of Women's Unpaid Labour

The validity of the modernisation paradigm in the world economy began to be interrogated towards the mid-1960s. The modernisation paradigm was shortly criticised for its theoretical and empirical bases. Mainly, Rostow's evident relation between anti-communism and modernisation contributed to the criticisms against modernisation theory for being only a device for the US-led Cold War in opposition to communism. Modernisation theory was also criticised for accepting a suspicious distinction between the traditional and modern and characterising development in a linear and iterable mode. A Series of socioeconomic and macroeconomic problems, particularly in Latin American countries, has proven that the modernisation paradigm does not apply to all countries.

Dependency Theory has been effective since the mid-1960s, which has offered thorough elucidations of underdevelopment in many aspects. Paul Baran (1958) was the first propounder of the dependency theory, and the theory was subsequently further expanded and enhanced by many theorists, including Andre Gunder Frank (1966), Samir Amin (1974) and others. The dependency theory hinges on the concept of exploitation of the poor undeveloped countries by the capitalist developed countries. Dependency occurs since "some countries can expand through self-impulsion while others, being dependent, can only expand as a reflection of the dominant countries, which may have positive or negative effects on their immediate development" (Dos Santos, 1970: 231). In this context, it is originally Marxian in character. Dependency theory illuminates development and underdevelopment by taking a capitalistic framework to the centre.

Dependency theory claims that the development prescription proposed by the modernisation paradigm cannot be easily implemented in underdeveloped countries because of the dependency in question. Baran asserts that colonisation prohibited industrialisation in the colonial countries since the profits that could have been reinvested in productive areas were transferred to the centre of the colonial power (Baran, 1958). Accordingly, he put the ground for dependency theory's comparison of the relation of exploitation between capitalist and worker to that of the geopolitical centre and periphery or metropolises and satellites (Frank, 1966). This was an obvious criticism of modernisation, which insists that the growth of dual economies or traditional societies could be achieved by switching from the traditional to the modern sector. It would not be possible to carve out a uniform development strategy that relies on Western countries' experience without considering the underdeveloped and developing countries' political, economic, social and cultural possibilities. The dependency theory proclaims that women continue to be exploited despite the technological developments that encourage women's participation in the labour force in the development process throughout the world (Günday, 2011: 70). Furthermore, it has been accepted that

keeping the wage level of women at the lower limit, and exploiting women at this point, is a kind of necessity to ensure the continuity of the capitalist system in the world economies.

Another critical point is that the crises experienced by capitalism since the 1970s have caused a significant loss of momentum in the production process in Western countries. As a result, restructuring the world economies has become necessary. Reorganising production and changing the position of labour in the economic system have come to the fore, particularly in women's labour.

3.3. Globalization, Integration and Economic Development: The Emergence of Women Labour in the New Economic Order

Over the past few decades, countries have rapidly integrated into the global economy. This has led to unprecedented global market growth and the emergence of capitalist relations worldwide. Neoliberal economic policies lie behind these advancements. In this context, privatisation, financialisation, and deregulation policies have diffused to almost all countries. These policies continued by accelerating their effects on world economies, especially in the globalisation process that thrived afterwards the Cold War. From the 1980s onward, Keynesian or socialistic policies of full employment, well-built public sectors, and protection of domestic industries yielded precedence to neoliberal policies of flexible labour, privatisation, export-led growth and foreign investment promotion. This change brought about the end of the welfare or developmental state, the wearing out of trade unions, and the reduction of numerous social benefits and rights.

On the other hand, globalisation has laid the groundwork for extraordinary economic, political, and social changes. After adopting export-based industrialisation and development models in the globalisation process, dramatic increases have been experienced in women's employment in developing countries. Employment in the manufacturing and service sectors has enhanced significantly and more rapidly than in agriculture in almost all developing countries (Toksöz, 2011: 146).

The phenomenon of globalisation has induced the rising exigency for women workforce in world economies. Parallel to this, the importance of women's labour, and accordingly, women's employment, has enlarged worldwide. The competitive environment has put pressure on all world economies, manifesting itself in every domain using globalisation. Countries that want to augment their global competitiveness have modernised their labour markets. It has begun to be acknowledged that preventing the exclusion of women from the labour market is one of the driving forces of economic development.

The labour market was contemplated by women's unpaid domestic labour who were heads of households and whose vital needs were provided by women. This presupposition of domesticity, in turn, worked into women low-wage workers once they presented their labour to the productive sector. As the advancement of capitalism and globalisation kept going, capital demonstrated gender-blindness, and women's cheap, efficient labour was

regarded to be more expedient than that of men (Elson & Pearson, 1981). Furthermore, the neoliberal policies, especially trade liberalisation, have substantially influenced women, as export-oriented production has enlarged female employment in most developing countries (Standing, 1989).

The new international division of labour has taken place in developing countries (notably the newly industrialised countries of East Asia), specialising in exporting low-tech traditional consumer goods. They were at the forefront of exporting these goods by utilising cheap women's labour and advanced in production. Employment of young women in export industries such as textiles and electronics started in East Asia, where they have taken an essential part in productive growth (Horton, 1996: 3). After a while, they specialised in producing high-tech products, especially electronics. They continued to employ women's labour as an important and inexpensive source of the production process.

A great deal of analysis about the impacts of globalisation in developing countries has arisen from the inclusive effect of enhancing transnationals and the new international division of labour (Frobel et al., 1980, Jenkins, 1984). There has been attention to both negative and positive impacts within the literature, especially on women (Elson & Pearson, 1981; Mitter, 1986). Since globalisation, women's employment has increased, gaining a certain degree of economic independence. However, this has increased their domestic responsibilities even more. Particularly within the scope of the structural adjustment programs, the withdrawal of the state from the social sphere can be regarded as one of the factors that paved the way for this. Structural adjustment created a triple burden for women (Moser, 1992), and globalisation has consolidated its results. As state welfare systems have been suspended, such provision has passed over unpaid women's labour. The new global labour market relied on low-paid, flexible work; poor households could not pivot on a sole breadwinner to keep alive (Standing, 1989). Women have become an essential component of this liberalised labour market. As part of the structural adjustment policies, certain areas have emerged where women are stacked as unregistered, uninsured, insecure, and low-paid, with often uncertain and long working hours and poor working conditions. In addition, women have been exposed to exploitation in many economies under flexible and deteriorated working conditions as a cheap labour force in the globalisation process. Patricia Fernandez-Kelly and Diane Wolf addressed this ambivalence in their analysis of women's labour and globalisation:

"Globalization is a double-edged process as far as women are concerned. On the one hand, employment opportunities derived from transformations in the global economy produce new kinds of capitalist and patriarchal controls over women. In addition, those women receive very low wages, often below subsistence standards. On the other hand, in Indonesia, new modalities of labour gave women tools with which they resisted patriarchy. Furthermore, despite their level of exploitation, those jobs were often more appealing than the pre-existing options. Women I interviewed preferred work in global sweatshops to the village rice fields" (Fernandez-Kelly & Wolf, 2001: 1246).

Women were generally employed in jobs considered a continuation of women's feminine roles, such as housekeeping, child and patient care, cooking, knitting and sewing. Jean I. Pyle and Kathryn B. Ward, in their studies examining the impact of globalisation on women's labour, identified four sectors in world economies where primarily women work, which reinforce the reproduction of the female roles:

"Over the last three decades, increasing numbers of women have become sex workers, maids, workers in export production, or microfinance recipients to earn incomes in the restructured global economy. Many must migrate domestically or internationally to obtain this work. These 'industries' now span the globe, occurring in most areas of the developing world and industrialised countries" (Pyle & Ward, 2003: 470).

The expansion of the service sector has brought along a rapid increase in women's employment. The service sector has reflected the large-scale increase in female jobs worldwide in the fields of activity and occupations belonging to this sector (Kuhn & Bluestone, 1987: 8-9). As also Hartmann points out:

"The service sector grows because the availability of cheap women labour creates a labour supply. The use of women in the labour market instead of the home provides demand for substitute services, such as replacing ready-made food with home-cooked meals. In addition, the commercialisation of individual services requires increased female participation in the labour force" (Hartmann, 1987: 55).

All these progress have also incorporated the expanding use of women's labour. For example, while the adult female population working outside the home in the US was 34 per cent in 1960, it has exceeded 60 per cent today approximately (Einstein, 2013: 34). Although the exigency for women's labour has increased as a necessity of the process, the gender-based division of labour has continued to sharpen at the global level⁵.

Women's work is frequently insecure, temporary or part-time, with little protection and few fringe benefits. Female employment has long been intensified in the informal sector, and sexual division has cut across formal and informal sectors (Scott, 1995). The removal of regulations in labour markets, fragmentation of production processes, reduction of industrial activities globally, and new spheres of export specialisation have wholly enhanced

⁵ *Partial workers, uninsured workers, and workers working under the most severe conditions in terms of worker health and safety are overwhelmingly women. In many countries in South Asia, factory doors are locked at night on women working in shifts of clothing and toys. In a fire in a toy factory near Bangkok in Thailand in 1993, 188 workers were burned to death, and 469 women were injured. This is neither the first nor the last example. According to the ILO data of 1995, 500 million people work in the informal sector in the world. It accounts for a quarter of the world's working population and 35% of the world's gross product is realized in this sector. In some countries, this rate increases even more. For example, from 1990-1994, more than 80% of all jobs created in Latin America are in the informal sector. In Africa, 60% of the urban population is employed in the informal sector, with 9 out of every 10 jobs created being unregistered. (In order to get more information, see Eđitim Sen (2005: 18-30).*

the demand for low-paid, flexible women labour. By the agency of out-sourcing and subcontracting, women of all ages are frequently employed in smaller firms, factories or at home producing for transnational companies. The results have been an abrasion of any dissociation between the formal and informal sectors as connections between the two have been strengthened, and alterations have occurred in former modes of sexual division across different models of economic activity. Women labour is growingly integrated into world production, but in a fragmented form with conflicting outcomes. The evaluations of the authors such as Carr and Chen on the subject are illuminating:

"Existing data suggest that most economically active women in developing countries work in the informal sector. Even in the once-rapidly growing economies of East and Southeast Asia, which before the recent crisis experienced a substantial growth in modern sector employment, a significant share of women workers was outside the formal sector: for example, 43 per cent of women workers in South Korea and 79 per cent of women workers in Indonesia. However, much of women's informal paid work, particularly home-based market work, is not accounted for in official statistics. If the magnitude of women's invisible paid work were to be fully counted, the share of women and informal workers in the workforce would increase (Carr et al., 2000: 126)".

"Informal employment is generally a larger source of employment for women than for men in the developing world. Other than in North Africa, where 43 per cent of women workers are in informal employment, 60 per cent or more of women non-agricultural workers in the developing world are informally employed. In sub-Saharan Africa, 84 per cent of women non-agricultural workers are informally employed compared to 63 per cent of men; in Latin America, the figures are 58 per cent of women compared to 48 per cent of men. In Asia, the proportion is 65 per cent for both women and men (Chen, 2005: 6)".

Some scholars also claimed that the devaluation of women's labour had deepened after globalisation (Beneria et al., 2000; Blossfeld & Hofmeister, 2006; Peterson, 2008). Their significant contribution to the social production of labour is incredibly disregarded. This devaluation affects their job exploitation and enhances their home responsibilities. Globalisation is aggravated for women, which translates into additional liabilities and charges for women (Seguino & Grown, 2006; Robinson, 2006). Moghadam (2005) states that neoliberal policies increase women's obligations to cope with rising prices and shrinking incomes. Moghadam asserts that losing men's jobs or falling wages attracts women more intensely to the labour market. He argues that this reinforces the feminisation of labour; it stiffens women's participation in low-wage work in industries and services. This paves the way for the *feminisation of production*. The feminisation of output is directly related to women's labour power (Berik, 2000).

In her article, Çağatay and Özler (1995) follow the effect on women of economic liberalisation policies obtruded upon countries in the grip of financial crisis throughout the 1980s and 1990s. International financial institutions enjoined an austere set of policies

targeting liberalising markets and decreasing the state's role. They highlight the effect on women and sexual relations of structural adjustment policies and macroeconomic stabilisation. She emphasises the fact that these have generally paved the way for a fiscal tightening by applying pressure on public budgets, claiming that the fiscal policies of most governments in the last few decades mirror the enhanced authority of capital vis-à-vis labour; on the one hand, and of foreign and national investors vis-à-vis the rest of the citizenry, on the other. Government expenditure on social welfare has diminished, taking off the burden of social welfare service back into the home. Since, in most societies, the sexual divisions of labour give over women with primary liability for the care of the family, cutbacks in health and public services were dramatically reduced. Social expenditures on education and sanitation expenditures challenge them to generate a substitute. These policies had prompt unfavourable welfare effects on the poor, particularly women in poor households. Furthermore, Çağatay and Berik (1990, 1992) criticise overly simple generalisations about economic development's effect on women's share in manufacturing employment. For instance, their comprehensive investigation of Turkish manufacturing employment demonstrates that Turkey's change in national development policies had no perceptible effect on women's employment but that women are most gathered in export-oriented industries.

The developments in the information society after the 1990s, the failure of the neo-liberal and structural adjustment policies to achieve the desired success, and the universal increase in poverty paved the way for some changes in development policies. Especially in South Asia, Latin America, and Sub-Saharan Africa have been exposed to the negative impacts of the structural adjustment policies. Low growth rates and enormous increases in poverty, malnutrition, and adverse health conditions are some of these negative impacts. The widespread criticism of such consequences of structural adjustment policies throughout the 1990s forced international financial institutions and organisations to deal with the problems of countries struggling with severe socio-economic difficulties (Petchesky, 2003: 142-151). New policies have begun to be determined under the poverty reduction discourse. Some attempts have been made to create an understanding that relies on gender equality in development.

There are favoured motives because a particular focus should be on gender equality, women's economic participation and rights. First, the current stage of globalisation and neoliberal policies are specified by the feminisation of labour; the feminisation of poverty; the great numbers of women working as nursemaids or domestics; the expansion in the trafficking of women; and women's ongoing responsibility for childcare, housework, and eldercare. Second, the work of women spread both the productive and reproductive domains, or the market economy and the care economy. Third, the fragilities peculiar to world capitalism influence women unproportionally, whether in their formative or reproductive roles.

The concurrence of globalisation and gender and development includes many dimensions of women's labour and rights. Meanwhile, various approaches have been put

forward that deal with the relationship between women and development, especially since the 1980s. Most of them have been redounded to the literature by feminist theorists who are particularly interested in the problem of gender inequality. Women in Development is one of them.

The Women in Development approach accepts development and modernisation as identical and aims to include women in the development process. The policy states that women's access to financial resources, technology, and advanced services would increase their productivity, positively affecting development. The study of Ester Boserup *Women's Role in Economic Development* (1970)⁶ was published at the time when a new wave of feminists began to fight for their rights in the United States and Western Europe by bringing focus to matters such as equal rights, employment, equity and citizenship for women. Boserup launches her book with the pathbreaking statement: "The main characteristic of economic development is the progress towards an increasingly intricate pattern of labour specialisation" (Boserup, 1970: 15). She also highlights that the family's division of labour is determined by age and gender and the distribution that changes across regions and cultures. Those advancements have accelerated the debates about Women in Development.

⁶ *Her study stands for a sweeping and pioneering endeavour to give a survey of women's role in the development process. In the literature on development, the particular role of women had been greatly disregarded, especially the question of how development exerts influence on women's subordinate status in most communities. Boserup indicated a range of topics that are methodically associated with the role of women in the economy. Boserup (1970: 22) highlighted gender as a determinative element in the division of labour, which is widespread across countries and regions: "Even at the most primitive stages of family autarky there is some division of labour within the family, the main criteria for the division being that of age and sex". Both in primitive and in more developed societies, the gender division of labour within the family is ordinarily regarded as inherent. Boserup was signify that economic growth, and particularly the sprawl of capitalism in the developing and undeveloped regions and countries of the world, had not served women and men evenly. Boserup used an empirical study from Africa, Asia and Latin America to verify her results those women were being dropped back, as subsistence producers using primitive methods in the agricultural sector; as low paid workers in non-farm and urban sectors and as unpaid workers in rural domains, contributing to farm productivity subsequent to the outmigration of men. Her assertion that women especially in sub-Saharan Africa carried out much of the work required for daily subsistence generally, involving reproductive and agricultural work, whereas the men mostly were responsible for hunting, trade and warfare. Sub-Saharan Africa paves the way for the impoverishment of local women, who lost income, position and, power relative to men. She also remarks that in Africa that is common for "food production to be taken care of by women with little help from men" (Boserup, 1970: 16). She points out that "the subsistence activities usually omitted in the statistics of production and income are largely women's work" (Boserup, 1970: 163). Boserup demonstrated that particularly African rural women had experienced a great increase in their amount of work during this century, they had become the leading producers not only of subsistence food but also of cash crops. Until that time, in spite of considerable information on the determinative contribution of women in agricultural production, it was supposed that they solely supported small farmers, who were nearly conceptualized as male consistently. Besides the Boserup's study on women in agriculture, Agarwal's (1994) investigation of gender and land rights in South Asia, and research about the effects of neoliberal policies on women and rice production in the Gambia (Carney, 1992) show the gendered nature of agriculture and agrarian transformation in developing territories of the world. These researches focus attention on the social dimensions of what carves out women's and men's labour in agriculture, besides the gender segregation in the rights to land and other rural properties.*

Boserup's study infused the United Nations Decade for Women (1976-1986) and opened up a research and investigation stage about gender. Following the initiation of the United Nations, a remarkable body of literature has given attention to the unfavourable impacts of industrialisation, economic modernisation, and commercialisation on the socioeconomic position of women worldwide. Since then, their focus has been canalised to various dimensions of women and development in several regions of the Third World. After this progress, Marilyn Waring's 1988 study, *If Women Counted*, contributed to better recognising the topic. Over the past few decades, national governments and scientists, researchers and activist groups have contributed substantially using their studies and activities to this endeavour.

Alongside the Women in Development approach, the Gender and Development approach came into sight in the 1980s. Unlike the Women in Development approach, gender replaced the concept of women. This approach deals with women's lives in various private and public spheres and examines women's accession to productive resources such as credit, education, and land. Within the context of the approach, development has not traditionally been considered merely in the economic aspect.

In all these contexts, it is frank that the view of women's labour in economies has chopped about in the neoliberal and globalisation process. However, although women's labour has increased in economies, women have faced many problems such as low wages and legal insecurity. Women are seen as a flexible and cheap labour factor that has significantly boosted women's employment rates in economies.

3.4. New trends in Development and Women Labour: Visualizing Economic Policy Which is (Professedly) Friendly to Women

In the late 1990s, economic and social problems such as financial crises, unemployment, increasing inequality, and poverty emerged in many developing regions where neoliberalism implemented neo-liberal economic policies. Under the current stage of globalisation in which neoliberalism stood out ideologically, financed capital is becoming ever more compelling. This paved the way for the balance of payments crises and drove the domestic economies into disorder like those experienced by a host of East and Southeast Asia countries in the 1990s. Accordingly, the fighting against poverty has started to form almost all international institutions and organisations (Massow, 2000: 45-47). Fundamental humanitarian issues such as equality and poverty in income distribution occupied more space than the macroeconomic indicators in the 1980s. The impact of international institutions and organisations on the evolution of the development paradigm is undeniable. Particularly in the World Bank, the discourse has shifted from structural adjustment to poverty reduction. The Bank's report (*Engendering Development: Through Voice, Resources, and Voice*), published in 2001, emphasises the negative impacts of gender inequality on development. Concerning the report, in the case of gender inequality in economies, economic growth and development would not be carried out effectively, which causes poverty (Kuiper & Barker, 2006: 1).

Therefore, the interest in women's labour as an element of human capital in development debates has dramatically enhanced. The Millennium Development Program started to be implemented in September 2000, which underlines that the development of countries is directly related to political, cultural, social and institutional factors and economic factors. The program has searched for solutions to problems related to the environment, education and health, which hinder the realisation of the development process in underdeveloped countries. This program targets fighting against poverty and hunger, providing the availability of essential services such as education and health for all people, ensuring gender equality and women's empowerment, reducing infant and child mortality rates, and preventing lethal and epidemic diseases such as HIV and AIDS. These goals have carried a new perspective on development. The principles of the women's empowerment program also have included a function that would change the mindset of women's labour in development and eliminate gender-based discriminations that exist in many countries. The European Employment Strategy⁷ (which dates back to 1997) is being put into effect in the European Union countries that have carried out important actions on unemployment. The main scope of the strategy is to provide entrepreneurship, employability and equal opportunities in the labour market. This framework aims to increase the quality of human capital to ensure the full implementation of the policies. In particular, promoting education policies and equality of opportunity in education have become the main objectives (Öz & Karagöz, 2015: 100-1). Another important aim of this strategy is to support the economic empowerment of poor women, particularly in underdeveloped and developing countries.

In addition, gender mainstreaming was declared on the official agenda of the European Union in 1998. It has started taking place among the candidate countries' accession criteria to the European Union. Gender mainstreaming is generally about removing gender-based barriers to access opportunities and resources in economies. This target envisages the realisation of legal measures and institutional arrangements that will eliminate gender inequalities in issues such as violence against women and political participation and the principle of ensuring equality of opportunity in the labour market (Lombardo & Meier, 2006). Gender mainstreaming has also been carried out by the World Bank since 2006 under the title of Gender Action Plan. The Plan declares women as the basis of efficiency and sustainability in economic development. It mainly includes incentive policies aimed at expanding the employability of women in labour and financial markets.

⁷ Leon (2009: 197-209) pointed out that the reconciliation of work and family life has been an evident EU policy discourse since the beginning of the 1990s. It specified the two main policy instruments for reconciling work and family life for women: childcare provision and parental leave. While the former falls within the domain of welfare provision, the latter is among mechanisms designed to enhance flexible work arrangements. Both instruments aim to support working parents. Work/family balance strategies are firstly purposed to simplify the engagement of young mothers in the labour market by proposing public childcare provision; this is done at the cost of not investigating other more far-reaching and complex understandings of the work/family conflict according to her (In order to get detailed information, See, Leon 2009:197-209).

The World's Women 2000: Trends and Statistics is the third issue in the series of reports⁸ (the other two issued in 1991 and 1995) that investigates the position of women through the objectives of statistical data and analysis. It lays out an all-inclusive study of how women live in different regions. It emphasises the primary statistical analysis findings on women's position as to men's worldwide in various domains, including families, health, education, work, human rights and politics. As indicated in the report:

"Women now comprise at least one-third of the world's labour force in all regions except Northern Africa and Western Asia, and those proportions are increasing" (UN, 2000: 109).

UNDP⁹ and the World Bank have revealed that gender inequalities prevent economic growth and development. For example, the World Bank's Development Report, Gender Equality and Development, published in 2012, stresses that poverty, weak economic development, and a lower standard of living are inevitable in countries with gender inequality (World Bank, 2012). According to the estimates of the World Bank, a six-point increase in the ratio of working women in any country would increase the national income by 7%. On the other hand, it would reduce poverty by 15% (World Bank, 2012).

This report provides a multidimensional analysis of increasing women's employment in underdeveloped and developing countries. Besides various issues such as high female mortality rates, girls' access to educational opportunities, sexual violence, and gender differentiation in private property ownership. Report highlights that gender-related inequalities in the labour market create negativities in the process of capital accumulation. It argues that the expansion of women's participation in employment enhances productivity. In the report, women are regarded as being merely a human capital element. As stated in the description, it aims to improve women's equipment and channel this equipment into the generation of surplus value for capital. In this respect, it is misleading to think that the World Bank has a specific priority for women's employment. Women have particular importance for capital accumulation. Women are also seen as the ideal labour force for flexible production, which has recently not fallen off the agenda. As stated in the report, gender inequality reduces a country's ability to compete internationally, primarily if that country

⁸ In order to get further information, see UN Statistics Division (UN Stats), *Statistics and indicators on women and men: The World's Women 2000, Trends and Statistics*, <<http://unstats.un.org/unsd/demographic/products/indwm/wwwpub.htm>> and <<http://unstats.un.org/unsd/demographic/products/indwm/indwm2.htm>>, 05.04.2022).

⁹ *The UNDP Gender Equality Strategy 2018-2021, the third such strategy, ensures a road map to amplify and associate gender equality into all dimensions of UNDP's work to decrease poverty, build strength and reach peace in communities and territories, helping to trigger progress towards the 2030 Agenda. Especially, the strategy describes the UNDP's strategy about strengthening interventions handling structural changes that accelerate gender equality and women's empowerment and exalt the integration of gender equality into its work on the environment, energy and crisis response and recovery (In order to get more information, see: <<https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/womens-empowerment/undp-gender-equality-strategy-2018-2021.html>>, 12.11.2019).*

specialises in the export of goods and services that are equally suitable for producing male and female workers.

Officials of the World Bank and other international financial institutions insist that women's education and employment in the labour market are essential for economic development. The World Bank official stated that women continue to exist as a vast, untapped economic resource in the Middle East and North Africa. More women workers must transform economies that rely on enhancing private-sector exports to compete worldwide. While women constitute half the 325 million people in those regions, and some countries, as many as 63 per cent of university students, they make up only 32 per cent of the labour force, about the report, "Gender and Development in the Middle East and North Africa: Women in the Public Sphere." "No country can promote the standard of living and raise the well-being of its people "without the participation of half of its population" said Christiaan Portman, World Bank's vice president. He continues: "Experience in other countries has repeatedly demonstrated that women are fundamental actors in development". However, the insistence of international financial institutions on this issue paradoxically goes hand in hand with other neoliberal beliefs that require the withdrawal of public resources and institutional support from the social services that families and women need most¹⁰.

4. Conclusion

To grasp the status of women's labour in the economies and its evolution and contribution to the development process, it is essential to investigate that in the different economic theories and the capitalist system. The assignment of hierarchically structured tasks to men and women relates to the patriarchal system that allows men to control women's labour and bodies. Capitalism has been intertwined with the patriarchal system since its early emergence. The patriarchal inequality permeates the cells of social fabrics and continues to exist by gaining new and specific appearances through capitalism. Male domination itself is a system that dominates women. On the other hand, capitalism oppresses women in particular ways by being promoted by patriarchy. These forms of oppression can be encountered in the household, in the process of unpaid labour, and the work-life.

From the point of view of classical and neoclassical economics, women are expected to be the primary caregivers in families. Mainly neoclassical economics contends that women are preponderating over men in domestic work through their instinctive maternal senses and skills. The presence of women in the world is frequently not discerned by neoclassical economics, which takes a strangely reductionist and seriously trite shape. Economic theory interesting in inequality between the genders gives attention to inequality in wages, job recruitment, promotion and firing for women and men with indistinguishable qualifications and availability. Neoclassical theory clarifies these inequalities as an outcome

¹⁰ In order to get more information visit: <<https://www.nytimes.com/2003/09/17/world/women-called-mideast-s-untapped-resource.html>>, 18.03.2022.

of free and rational choice, relying on the biological distinctions between the sexes. The founders of neoclassical economics rummily argued that women's involvement in economic life would harm family life. The likely adverse outcomes that may arise if women are included in the labour market have also been expressed.

It could be argued that Marxist economic thought does not regard domestic labour as productive. On the other hand, it has a gender-based structure. Unpaid work is unproductive. Thus, it would be hard for them to argue that women undertook fundamental political or economic roles. Women's unpaid domestic labour includes the generation's production, the care of the elderly and patients, and the reproduction of wage labour-power. In this process, women produce objects of need and use values. However, it is a fact that these labour activities are not related to the nature of women. Women undertake pregnancy, childbirth, and lactation due to their biological characteristics in the reproduction of the human generation. However, there is no biological reason for women to provide care beyond this. These activities are imposed on women by patriarchal social relations. In other words, it is socially determined. However, in *Grundrisse* and *Capital*, Marx did not examine women's domestic production as an essential component of social output, which constitutes an important component of social production.

On the other hand, the subordinate position of women in economies can be considered a derivative of the relations among different social classes. Analysis of household relations also has an important place in investigating ties between social classes. However, as Hartmann (1979: 13) points out, it "gives no clues about why women are subordinate to men inside and outside the family and why it is not the other way around. Marxist categories, like capital itself, are sex blind. The categories of Marxism cannot tell us who will fill the empty places".

Feminist economic thought exhibits a critique of mainstream economics by questioning the perspective of women in economies. It criticised the exclusion of women from economic, social and political life due to some ongoing social, patriarchal and cultural norms in economies. Feminist economics criticised the neoclassical theory of economics and the gender phenomenon that has come to the fore in almost every domain. For this reason, it cannot be expected that feminist economics would have a utopia that excludes men and sets sight to constitute women's dominance in economies. Feminist scholars and activists worldwide carry on that any benefits or enhanced demand for women's labour and entrepreneurship have been equilibrated by worsening work conditions and wages, burdens on women-owned businesses, ongoing sexual-based segregation, and powerlessly compulsory or insufficient labour law-making. Aside from demonstrating the extent of women's integration in the world economy, feminist scholars have also advanced theoretical models clarifying why and how this has occurred. They give viewpoints from a broad series of fields, such as development theory which highlights the masculinisation of the development process. All these are essential contributions to recognising the place of women's labour in economies and the development process.

By the way, institutionalists associate gender norms with critical economic institutions. It is possible to acknowledge that gender norms as exemplary for how historical and cultural patterns influence the position of women labour in economies. A typical property of labour markets worldwide is that particular jobs are carried through only men, while others are fulfilled only by women. Feminism desires to bring women into sociality as individual actors with rights equal to those equal to exclusive adult men. Feminist economic thought ideologically encourages women to be individuals rather than members of families or communities. In the 1960s, especially with the influence of second-wave feminism, issues such as domestic production and childcare by women began to find a place in the economics literature.

On the other hand, it would be fundamental to look at development economics and its evolution within the historical process to find out the sight of women's labour in the development process.

In the period of import substitution industrialisation, when Keynesian economic thought and modernisation theory was dominant, the importance of women's labour was low. Boserup's study on women's contribution to economic development showed the momentum for the concern for women in action.

On the other hand, neoliberalism has become the dominant economic thought globally since the late 1970s. Neoliberal policies have made themselves felt through the practices such as export-oriented industrialisation, the flexibility of production processes, limitation of social government expenditures, and privatisation. Changes in the development theories through the neoliberal policies since the 1980s have had an expressive impact on women's lives, who have become enhanced articulated as actors in the world's the production and consumption processes. At this time, globalisation has also influenced women in the most diverse dimensions of their lives and the outmost reaches of the world. The globalisation and deregulation of the labour market and the commodification of basic needs led to the transfer of the burden of work such as education, health and care to the family.

On the other hand, women have become voluntary carriers of these burdens due to the sexual division of labour in world economies. In a patriarchal capitalist society, when women participate in paid work regarded as male work, the burdens of housework and care continue for them, though it lessens. Although the presence of women in working life has continued for centuries, no significant change has been observed in men's duties in sharing domestic chores.

After the 1990s, by way of the emergence of the human development perspective, the importance of the human factor in development dawned on, and the difficulty of women labour in economies became prominent. On the other hand, within the basic framework of the Millennium Development Program being introduced in the 2000s, some policies were put into practice, aiming to provide gender equality and augmentation with the gravity of

women's labour worldwide. Gender has been a frequently mentioned subject in a significant part of the reports being published by international institutions and organisations. But the words offer a description rather than a structural or historical analysis of gender inequalities. The World Bank's 2012 World Development Report is one of the most important examples.

Today, the existence of a male-dominated society stands before us as an undeniable fact based on the exploitation of women's labour, adorned with patriarchal remnants. Besides that, it is easier for men to earn a regular income, access social resources, and participate in artistic and scientific activities. This is the main obstacle preventing women from working paid jobs, participating in various activities, and having a self-developing occupation. Social policies should be designed to empower women and consider their unequal position in society. This moment is inevitable for the emancipation of women and the construction of a new community.

Last but not least, the principal driver that stakes out the development process is humans. Accordingly, it is ineluctable that the primary purpose of development is to provide equal opportunities to everyone and increase their living standards without creating gender apartheid in health, education, and income. Societies that do not invest in women and where women are not brought into the economy would always be incomplete concerning development.

References

- Agarwal, B. (1994), "Gender and command over property: A critical gap in economic analysis and policy in South Asia", *World Development*, 22(10), 1455-1478.
- Altınbaş, D. (2006), "Feminist Tartışmalarda Liberal Feminizm", *Kadın Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 9, 21-52.
- Amin, S. (1974), *Accumulation on a World Scale: Critique of the Theory of Underdevelopment*, Monthly Review Press U.S.
- Anker, R. (1997), "Theories of Occupational Segregation by Sex: an Overview", *International Labour Review*, 136(3), 315-339.
- Baran, P.A. (1958), "The Political-economy of Growth", *Economist*, 186(8), 658-658.
- Beneria, L. et al. (2000), "Introduction: Globalization and Gender", *Feminist Economics*, 6(3), vii-xviii.
- Berik, G. & N. Çatayay (1992), "Industrialization Strategies and Gender Composition of Manufacturing in Turkey", in: N. Folbre et al. (eds.), *Women's Work in the World Economy* (41-60), New York: New York University Press.
- Berik, G. (2000), "Mature Export-led Growth and Gender Wage Inequality in Taiwan", *Feminist Economics*, 6(3), 1-26.
- Blau, F. & C. Jusenius (1976), "Economists' Approaches to Sex Segregation in the Labor Market: An Appraisal", *Signs*, 1(3), 181-199.
- Blossfeld, H.P. & H. Hofmeister (2006), *Globalization, Uncertainty and Women's Careers: an International Comparison*, Edward Elgar Publishing.

- Bodkin, R.G. (1999), "Women's Agency in Classical Economic Thought: Adam Smith, Harriet Taylor Mill, and J.S. Mill", *Feminist Economics*, 5(1), 45-60.
- Brown, H. (2014), "Marx on Gender and the Family: A Summary", *Monthly Review*, 66(2), 48-57.
- Brown, L. (1984), "Neoclassical Economics and the Sexual Division of Labor", *Eastern Economic Journal*, 10(4), 367-379.
- Çağatay, N. & G. Berik (1990), "Transition to Export-led Growth in Turkey: Is There a Feminization of Employment?", *Review of Radical Political Economics*, 22(1), 115-134.
- Çağatay, N. & Ş. Özler (1995), "Feminization of the Labor Force: The Effects of Long-term Development and Structural Adjustment", *World Development*, 23(11), 1883-1894.
- Carney, J.A. (1992), "Peasant Women and Economic Transformation in the Gambia", *Development and Change*, 23(2), 67-90.
- Carr, M. et al. (2000), "Globalization and Home-based Workers", *Feminist Economics*, 6(3), 123-142.
- Chen, M. (2005), "Rethinking the Informal Economy: Linkages with the Formal Economy and the Formal Regulatory Environment", (No. 2005/10), *WIDER Research Paper*.
- Delphy, C. (1977), *The Main Enemy*, London: Women's Research and Resources Centre.
- Delphy, C. (1999), *Baş Düşman Patriyerkinin Ekonomi Politigi*, (Trs. L. Aykent-Tunçman), İstanbul: Saf.
- Doeringer, P.B. & M.J. Piore (1971), *Internal Labor Markets and Manpower Analysis*, Lexington, MA, Heath.
- Dos Santos, T. (1970), "The Structure of Dependence", *The American Economic Review*, 60(2), 231-236.
- Edgeworth, F.Y. (1922), "Equal Pay to Men and Women for Equal Work", *The Economic Journal*, 32(128), 431-457.
- Eğitim Sen (2005), "Kapitalist Küreselleşme ve Kadın Emeği", içinde: *Eğitim Sen 1. Kadın Kurultayı, Sorgulamak ve Değiştirmek İçin*, Eğitim Sen Publications, Ankara.
- Einstein, H. (2013), "Feminizm ve Neoliberal Küreselleşme Arasında Gizli ve Tehlikeli Bir İlişki Mi Mevcut?", içinde: A. Özügürlü (ed.) *21. Yüzyıl Feminizmine Doğru: Neoliberalizmin Ötesinde Bir Kadın Hareketi İçin Tartışmalar* (29-67), Ankara: Notabene.
- Elson, D. & R. Pearson (1981), "Nimble Fingers Make Cheap Workers": An Analysis of Women's Employment in Third World Export Manufacturing", *Feminist Review*, 7(1), 87-107.
- Engels, F. & K. Marx (1968), "Manifesto of the Communist Party", in: K. Marx & F. Engels, *Selected Works* (35-63), London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Engels, F. (1972), *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, New York: International Publishers.
- Engels, F. [1968 (1884)], *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- England, P. & N. Folbre (2001), "Reforming the Social Family Contract: Public Support for Child Rearing in the United States", in: G.J. Duncan & P.L. Chase-Lansdale (eds.), *For Better or Worse: Welfare Reform and the Well-Being of Children and Families* (290-306), New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

- England, P. et al. (2001), "The Public Benefits and Private Costs of Caring Labor", *Unpublished Manuscript*, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.
- Evans, J. (1995), *Feminist Theory Today: an Introduction to Second-Wave Feminism*, London: Sage Books.
- Ferber, M.A. (1995), "The Study of Economics: A Feminist Critique", *The American Economic Review*, 85(2), 357-361.
- Fernández-Kelly, P. & D. Wolf (2001), "A Dialogue on Globalization", *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 26(4), 1243-1249.
- Folbre, N. (2001), *The Invisible Heart: Economics and Family Values*, New York: New Press.
- Folbre, N. (2006), "Measuring Care: Gender, Empowerment, and the Care Economy", *Journal of Human Development*, 7(2), 183-199.
- Frank, A.G. (1966), "The Development of Underdevelopment", *Monthly Review*, 18(4), 17-31.
- Frobel, F. et al. (1980), *The New International Division of Labour: Structural Unemployment in Industrialised Countries and Industrialisation in Developing Countries*, Cambridge University Press.
- Gillis, S. & R. Munford (2004), "Genealogies and Generations: The Politics and Praxis of Third Wave Feminism", *Women's History Review*, 13(2), 165-182.
- Günday, P.D. (2011), "Ekonomik Kalkınmada Kadın'ın Önemi ve Katkısı", *Doctoral Dissertation*, Dokuz Eylül University, Institute of Social Sciences.
- Hartmann, H. (1976), "Capitalism, Patriarchy, and Job Segregation by Sex", *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 1(3), 137-169.
- Hartmann, H.I. (1979), "The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism: Towards a More Progressive Union", *Capital & Class*, 3(2), 1-33.
- Hartmann, H.I. (1987), "Changes in Women's Economic and Family Roles in Post World War II United States", in: L. Beneria & C. Stimpson (eds.), *Women, Households, and the Economy* (33-64), Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick.
- Hekman, S. (1992), "John Stuart Mill's The Subjection of Women: The Foundations of Liberal Feminism", *History of European Ideas*, 15(4-6), 681-686.
- Işık, E. ve U. Serdaroğlu (2015), "Kadın Emeği Feminist İktisadın Yol Haritası Üzerinden Bir Okuma", *Türk Tabipleri Birliği Mesleki Sağlık ve Güvenlik Dergisi*, 15(56), 6-14.
- Jenkins, R. (1984), "Divisions Over the International Division of Labour", *Capital & Class*, 8(1), 28-57.
- Jevons, W.S. (1883), *Methods of Social Reform And Other Papers*, London: Macmillan.
- Jones, G.W. (2007), "Delayed Marriage and Very Low Fertility in Pacific Asia", *Population and Development Review*, 33(3), 453-478.
- Kalaycı, İ. (2017), "Feminist İktisat: Toplumsal Cinsiyet Eşitliğine Seçenek Bir Bakış", *Avrasya Sosyal ve Ekonomi Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 4(12), 533-542.
- Konca, B. (2016), "İktisatta Feminist Bir Bakış: 2000 Sonrası Dönemde Kadın İşgücünün Ekonomideki Yeri", *Master's Thesis*, Bilecik Şeyh Edebali University, Institute of Social Sciences.
- Kotef, H. (2009), "On Abstractness: First Wave Liberal Feminism and the Construction of The Abstract Woman", *Feminist Studies*, 35(3), 495-522.

- Kuhn, S. & B. Bluestone (1987), "Economic Restructuring and the Female Labour Market: The Impact of Industrial Change on Women", in: L. Beneria & C. Stimpson (eds.), *Women, Households, and the Economy* (3-32), Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick.
- Kuiper, E. & D.K. Barker (2006), *Feminist Economics and the World Bank History, Theory and Policy*, Routledge: New York.
- Leon, M. (2009), "Gender Equality and the European Employment Strategy: the Work/Family Balance Debate", *Social Policy & Society*, 8(2), 197-209.
- Lombardo, E. & P. Meier (2006), "Gender mainstreaming in the EU: Incorporating a feminist reading?", *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 13(2), 151-166.
- Luxton, M. (2014), "Marxist Feminism and Anticapitalism: Reclaiming Our History, Reanimating Our Politics", *Studies in Political Economy*, 94(1), 137-160.
- Marshall, A. (1890) *Principles of Economics*, London: Macmillan.
- Marshall, A. (1901), *Elements of Economics of Industry*, (3rd Edition), London: Macmillan.
- Marshall, A. (1930), *Principles of Economics*, London: Macmillan.
- Marx, K. & F. Engels (1848), *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Marx, K. (2018), *The Communist Manifesto: & Selected Writings*, Boxtree.
- Marx, K. [1867 (1976)], *Capital*, Volume I. New York: Penguin Books.
- Massow, F.V. (2000), "We Are Forgotten on Earth: International Development Targets, Poverty, and Gender in Ethiopia", *Gender & Development*, 8(1), 45-54.
- Mill, J.S. (2000), *The Subjection of Women*, Peterborough, Broadview Press.
- Mitter, S. (1986), *Common Fate, Common Bond: Women in the Global Economy*, London: Pluto Press.
- Moghadam, V.M. (2005), "Women's Economic Participation in the Middle East: What Difference Has the Neoliberal Policy Turn Made?", *Journal of Middle East Women's Studies*, 1(1), 110-146.
- Molyneux, C. (2012), "Ev Emeği Tartışması ve Ötesi", içinde: G. Acar-Savran & N. Tura-Demiryontan (eds.), *Kadının Görünmeyen Emeği* (115-157), İstanbul: Yordam.
- Molyneux, M. (2001), "Mobilisation without Emancipation? Women's Interests, the State and Revolution in Nicaragua", in: *Women's Movements in International Perspective* (38-59), Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- Moser, C.O.N. (1992), "Adjustment from Below: Low-Income Women, Time and the Triple Role in Guayaquil, Ecuador", in: H. Afshar & C. Dennis (eds.), *Women and Adjustment Policies in the Third World* (87-116), Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Nelson, J.A. (1995), "Feminism and Economics", *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 9(2), 131-148.
- North, D.C. (1990), *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- North, D.C. (1994), "Economic Performance Through Time", *American Economic Review*, 84(3), 359-368.
- Nurkse, R. (1952), "Some International Aspects of the Problem of Economic Development", *The American Economic Review*, 42(2), 571-583.
- Öz, C.S. & S. Karagöz (2015), "Avrupa 2020 Hedeflerinin Avrupa İstihdam Stratejisi Çerçevesinde Değerlendirilmesi", *Bilgi*, 31, 99-122.

- Pearce, K.C. (1999), "The Radical Feminist Manifesto as Generic Appropriation: Gender, Genre, and Second Wave Resistance", *Southern Journal of Communication*, 64(4), 307-315.
- Petchesky, R.P. (2003), *Global Prescriptions: Gendering Human Rights*, London-New York: Zed Books.
- Peterson, V.S. (2008), "New Wars' and Gendered Economies", *Feminist Review*, 88(1), 7-20.
- Pigou, A.C. (1960), *The Economics of Welfare*, London: Macmillan.
- Pujol, M. (1984), "Gender And Class in Marshall's "Principles of Economics", *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 8(3), 217-234.
- Pujol, M.A. (1992), *Feminism and Antifeminism in Early Economic Thought*, Aldershot, Edward Elgar.
- Pujol, M.A. (1995), "Into The Margin", in: E. Kuper & J. Sap (eds.), *Out of The Margin: Feminist Perspectives On Economics* (17-34), New York: Routledge.
- Pyle, J.L. & K.B. Ward (2003), "Recasting our Understanding of Gender and Work During Global Restructuring", *International Sociology*, 18(3), 461-489.
- Reich, M. et al. (1973), "Dual Labor Markets: a Theory of Labor Market Segmentation", *The American Economic Review*, 63(2), 359-365.
- Robinson, F. (2006), "Beyond Labour Rights: the Ethics of Care and Women's Work in The Global Economy", *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 8(3), 321-342.
- Rosenstein-Rodan, P.N. (1943), "Problems of Industrialisation of Eastern and South-Eastern Europe", *The Economic Journal*, 53(210/211), 202-211.
- Rostow, W. (1952), "A Historian's Perspective on Modern Economic Theory", *The American Economic Review*, 42(2), 16-29.
- Rostow, W. (1960), *The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schulman, B. (2004), "Effective Organizing in Terrible Times: The Strategic Value of Human Rights for Transnational Anti-Racist Feminisms", *Meridians*, 4(2), 102-108.
- Schweitzer, M.M. (1980), "World War II and Female Labor Force Participation Rates", *The Journal of Economic History*, 40(1), 89-95.
- Scott, B.K. (1995), *Refiguring Modernism: Women of 1928* (Vol. 1), Indiana University Press.
- Seguino, S. & C. Grown (2006), "Gender Equity and Globalization: Macroeconomic Policy for Developing Countries", *Journal of International Development*, 18(8), 1081-1104.
- Serdaroğlu, U. (1995), "İktisatta Kadın Bakış Açısını Değiştirecek Bir Yaklaşım Postmodernist Olabilir Mi?", *Ekonomik Yaklaşım*, 6(15), 53-74.
- Serdaroğlu, U. (1997), *Feminist İktisat'ın Bakışı Postmodernist mi?*, İstanbul: Sarmal.
- Smith, A. [1776 (1976)], *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Smith, E.S. (2001), "John Stuart Mill's The Subjection of Women A Re-Examination", *Polity*, 34(2), 181-203.
- Snyder, R.C. (2008), "What is Third-Wave Feminism? A New Directions Essay", *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 34(1), 175-196.
- Standing, G. (1989), "Global Feminization through Flexible Labor", *World Development*, 17(7), 1077-1095.

- Strassmann, D. (1995), "Creating a Forum for Feminist Economic Inquiry", *Feminist Economics*, 1(1), 1-5.
- Strober, M.H. (1994), "Rethinking Economics through a Feminist Lens", *The American Economic Review*, 84(2), 143-147.
- Thompson, B. (2002), "Multiracial Feminism: Recasting the Chronology of Second Wave Feminism", *Feminist Studies*, 28(2), 337-360.
- Toksöz, G. (2011), *Kalkınmada Kadın Emeği*, İstanbul: Varlık.
- Truman, H.S. (1949), *Inaugural Address: Thursday, January 20, 1949*, Western Standard Publishing Company.
- Waring, M. & G. Steinem (1988), *If Women Counted: a New Feminist Economics*, San Francisco: Harper and Row.
- Wilber, C.K. & K.P. Jameson (2013), *Socialist Models of Development*, Oxford: Pergamon.
- World Bank (2012), *World Development Report 2012: Gender Equality and Development*, Washington DC: World Bank.

Sari-Aksakal, B. (2022), "Women Labour: What Was It? What Is It Now? A Theoretical Analysis Based on Different Economic Perspectives", *Sosyoekonomi*, 30(53), 49-85.