



The Strategic Priorities Hub

Article

Gender Blindness in Economic Theorizing: Mainstream Trade Theory from a Feminist Perspective

Samira Rashwan

Founder and Managing Director of the Strategic Priorities Hub (SPH)

July 2025

Introduction

"The world is still out there constraining our beliefs, and may punish us for incorrect ones" (Wendt 1995:75).

Economics, a powerful social science, fundamentally revolves around the **allocation of finite resources**, an act inherently tied to power dynamics. From a feminist perspective, the mainstream economic principle that "trade can make everyone better off" overlooks the profound influence of **power relations** among individuals, societies, and countries within the economic sphere. Crucially, it also disregards the intricate interplays along the lines of **gender, race, and socioeconomic status**. It has become increasingly evident that mainstream political economy is largely **gender-blind**; it ignores the distinct situations and experiences of women and men. Instead, economic theories, methods, and models are predominantly built on the assumption that "man is the human," disregarding the shared humanity of both sexes. These male-biased assumptions are central to understanding why women face systematic exclusion and marginalization across various aspects of human life.

Currently, the global economy confronts significant challenges, impacting developed, developing, and underdeveloped nations alike. These include persistent **low and slow growth rates, an aging global population, escalating migration, and the pervasive threat of climate change**. Amidst these challenges, a growing chorus of voices, including prominent thinkers like Drucker (1993) and Mason (2015), advocates for a **post-capitalist world**, arguing that traditional means of production are under threat and "neoliberalism is busted." Concepts like **reciprocity and redistribution** are re-entering economic discourse, while innovation and information technology are fundamentally reshaping capitalism by driving production costs towards zero (Mason 2015). As scholars and international organizations increasingly emphasize, **talent is a critical resource in a post-capitalist world**. Ensuring equal opportunities for women and girls is paramount to securing a representative and diversified talent pool, a potential often squandered by systematic

exploitation or exclusion of women from equal participation in their societies within the capitalist framework.

Despite constituting half of the world's population, **women are disproportionately affected by poverty**, being more likely to be poor than men (UN Women 2016). For instance, globally, **nearly 1 in 10 women live in extreme poverty**, with roughly **383 million women and girls** living on less than \$2.15 a day, compared to 368 million men and boys (UN Women, 2023). Alarming, the latest Global Gender Gap Report from 2024 indicates that at the current pace, it will take **134 years to reach full parity**, meaning the gender gap is still closing at an incredibly slow rate, and in some areas, progress is even going backward (World Economic Forum, 2024). This trend underscores the continuing reality of unfair discrimination and marginalization faced by women and girls, who consistently have fewer opportunities than men in education, employment, social engagement, and decision-making processes.

Paradoxically, studies suggest that the increased rates of female employment have contributed significantly to global economic growth. For example, some analyses suggest that the rise in female labor force participation globally has had an economic impact comparable to or even greater than the entry of China into the World Trade Organization (The Economist, 2006). Furthermore, female students consistently achieve higher grades than their male counterparts, and more women are holding academic degrees than men. For instance, in America, for every 100 men enrolled in higher education, there are approximately **140 women**. However, women's participation in the workforce remains limited and less rewarded. For example, the **global gender pay gap stands at 13%**, meaning women earn 87 cents for every dollar earned by men, and this gap can be even larger for women of color (ILO, 2022). This highlights the urgent need for expanded opportunities for women to reach their full potential and utilize their qualifications in the most decent way (The Economist 2006). Yet, the prevailing neoliberal reality often diverges, with women frequently exploited. Their economic dependence on men often compels them to accept precarious work situations, offered by capitalists as a means of survival, working for meager wages in factories and then returning home to manage domestic chores.

Capitalist theorists have intentionally failed to incorporate the inherent asymmetries in **power, access, and control over resources** that existed between women and men, feminist economics assume. In turn, women's contributions and constrained abilities to penetrate the economy were trivialized and disregarded in mainstream economic theories. Just as capitalism created classes in societies, it entrenched the patriarchal structure in the same way. This paper argues that the **mainstream theory of trade is fundamentally androcentric**, where gendered outcomes are quite evident in the whole model, yet they are not spelled out; free individuals seeking their own self-interest, having perfect information, and equal opportunity to compete with the least governmental intervention. Free trade focuses on the market. However, as long as the household is marginalized from the analysis, what happens in the market will hardly be explainable. Hence, free trade theory is based on a defaulted understanding of the way economies work and underestimating the way the market is influenced by and influences the households.

Unlike mainstream economics, feminist economics analyzes mainstream trade theory through applying gender analysis. They disagree with mainstream economics on the motivational drivers

of human behavior as well. Mainstream economics prioritizes production as the essence of economic order, while feminist economics prioritizes the social reproductive work which in their analysis deserves a central position in examining economic outcomes. Another contradictory premise between the two domains is the role of gender power relations. Feminist economics argues that power relations play a major role in distributing and redistributing the recourse among and between individuals and among and between countries. While mainstream economics leaves this role to the invisible hand of the market.

This research hopes to highlight the contradictory premises between mainstream economics and feminist economics on the trade theory. It is guided by the following question: **What are the main differences between the assumptions of mainstream economics and feminist economics on mainstream trade theory?**

Methodology

This research analyzes the mainstream trade theory adopting a broad definition. The mainstream trade theory in this research refers to the alleged beneficial gains of trade, with the free market as a prerequisite. This research relied on the insights and works of prominent feminist economists which include scholarly work from: Lourdes Beneria, Paula England, Diane Elson, and Nilufer Cagatay. The method used is adopting a feminist perspective in analyzing the selected data and information to outline the **androcentricity** of one of the main economic theories.

Androcentric Economic Theories in the Man's World

“We have, so far, lived and suffered and died in a man-made world” (Gilman 1911).

Theories in every field have never been free from **androcentric biases** (England 2002). Androcentrism can be defined as “[the] cultural perspectives where the male is generically taken to be the norm of humanness” (Macmillan Reference 2005). Charlotte Perkins Gilman was a feminist writer who outlined the concept of Androcentrism in 1911 and established its dominance in social, economic, and political studies. She argued that history was written by hands of a man. Moreover, Gilman enriched the economic analysis with her feminist insights. She argued that for economic society to be efficient a radical change has to be materialized in the patriarchal family relationships and structures, and to enable women to actively participate in economic activities and fulfill their roles (O'Donnell 1994). Assigning animals for analogy, Gilman in her book “The Man-Made World” states that an animal's sex is associated with its belligerence or nurturance. Naturally, the male animal is characterized by being belligerent, while the female version is characterized by its nurturance. Human beings share the same differences, but their life has a way more extended arena for expressing their humanity beyond these two differences. In other words, humans forget the “common humanity of the two sexes” (Egan 1989: 115). In Gilman's point of view, the commonalities between men and women are much more than the differences. She claimed that people have interpreted this sex characterization in a masculinized way that led to the creation of a male-centered human culture, history, and economy. According to Gilman, in the early stage of human existence, male-dominance was never the norm. Before male-dominance took over the world, coexistence, equality, and complementarity between the human sexes were

the shared notions. History had not been always witnessing gender inequalities. Male-dominance is a modern phenomenon. In the current stage we live in patriarchal societies, where sex differences assign roles beyond the biological determinants.

Gilman noticed men were the only individuals progressing in societies. In turn, their progress was shaping and contributing to culture building and formation which misleadingly designated men's progress as humans' progress and ignored women's subjection and their increased dependence on men. Women's contributions and progress were limited through being occupied by their reproductive work and domestic chores of serving families.

On the theoretical side, neoclassical economics is deeply androcentric. As culture was already a male-dominated domain, the trivialization of women's contributions in societies and men's well-established power were transferred to economic theorizing, modeling, and analysis.

Albeit being a contested concept, to understand the world, theory remains of utmost importance. Theories are applied to research, policy-making, and implementation. Yet, the male-domination of theories has had adverse effects on women's position in the areas where theories influence the most. Hence, excluding women from theories renders the male-centered knowledge a **partial knowledge** (Bailey et al. 2000).

Mainstream Trade Theory: Overview

Capitalism, the Market, and Trade

Capitalism is not the natural economic system of the world. It is argued that ancient civilizations adopted different economic systems that didn't place the market in the center of their dynamics (Mason 2015). Capitalism found its provocations in 1601, when the English East India Company started its risky voyages with huge capital investments in pursuit of large profits. As an evolving and dominating economic system, capitalism has gone through different phases and adaptations (Fulcher 2004).

For the capitalist mode of production, free trade was conducive. Karl Marx in his early writings stressed that for capitalism to function it relies on international trade and commerce (Ghorashi 1995). After decades of evolutionary steps, in the 1980s, the market conventional wisdom took over the economic discourse until with neoliberalism set as the dominant agenda.

From the perspective of traditional economists, for international trade to be balanced, it should be guided by the comparative advantage principle. Comparative advantage basically assumes that for trade to be beneficial to countries, each country that engages in trade should export the products which it can produce with lower cost than the importing partner. Mainstream trade theory is based on the assumption that all countries have comparative advantage by which they have to specialize in. These countries have to compete with each other freely to maximize their gains from trade (Ricardo 1821; Mankiw 1998).

Feminist Economics: A Challenge to Male-Stream Economics

Feminist Economics: Historical Overview

With rising inequalities, women's role of development has started to gain attention in the 1960s, especially with the decolonization movement. To face the repercussions of male-biased theorizing, since the 1970s, feminist scholars started to seek the movement of women's economic and social issues, experiences, and contributions from the periphery to the core. Its main goal was set to wreck the mainstream (which focuses on men) domain and construct a new one. Feminist economists started to challenge the granted, yet undue, factuality of the male perspective (Bailey et al. 2000).

Indeed, feminist economics finds in **alternative approaches** guidance to its main arguments against the mainstream ones. To criticize the mainstream theories, feminist economics utilized the heterodox approaches; like the Marxian and institutionalist economics, as valid entry points. The Marxian theories hold their appeal to feminist economics through their critique of the capitalist construction of classes and the formation of inequalities. And as Folbre (1982) argued that the Marxian theoretical framework can be used in explaining how the exploitation of women happens in the domestic chores scope. Another aspect appreciated by feminist economics is the due importance given by the heterodox domain to institutions' impact on economic relations.

On questioning trade. Feminist economics and heterodox domain share the inquiry about in whose benefit is trade advocated (Elson et al. 2007). The theorists from both sides spell out the role played by power structure in trade. However, in this regard, feminists theorists divert from the heterodox ones by identifying specific indicators that capture the effect of power across the lines of inequality between the sexes, individuals, societies, and countries.

Yet, this heterodox critique failed to regard the centrality of gender power relations and reproductive labor in rendering inequalities. From a feminist perspective, these theories relied on androcentric questions in their theorizing method, which led to failure to spell out the importance of gender analysis in economics relations. Adding gender to the economic analysis would highlight how the sexual division of labor assigns different roles between women and men and also how women's engagement in economic activities **double their burden** (i.e., having to work inside the household and in the market) (Matthaie 1995; Jefferson and Kind 2001; Beneria 2007).

Feminist Economics Critique of Mainstream Trade Theory

Male-biased Philosophical Grounds: The Separatist Self of the Homo Economicus

To explain the androcentrism depicted in the mainstream trade theory, first we have to understand its philosophical grounds. Philosophically, self-interest is regarded as the sole motive behind the imagined economic actor's choices and decisions in the market. In economics, all economic outcomes are rendered by a rational and free individual who is facing the scarcity problem and trying to maximize his utility through relying on equilibrium modeling and analysis (England 2002).

Feminist theorists claim that the economic assumptions are highly detached from the reality and individuals are not always maximizing their own utility. They add that it is hard to assume validity

of absence of empathy, constrained autonomy, and social influences in the traditional economic standards. These regard these assumptions as male-centered, in the sense that only male interests are given importance. This leads to a distraction from the ways in which gender relations between males and females adds to women's disadvantage in the households and labor markets. The way gender is socially organized has much to do with which parts of human experiences have been left out from the neoclassical models (England 2002).

Adam Smith in his book *The Wealth of Nations* stated that “It is the maxim of every prudent master of a family never to attempt to make at home what it will cost him more to make than to buy” (Smith 1998: 594). Moreover, Smith argues that “[i]t is not from the benevolence of the butcher, the brewer, or the baker that we expect our dinner, but from their regard to their own interest” (Smith 1998:30). This described individual is immune against the surrounding environment and the social context in which he is embedded within.

Based on this, one basic assumption is always present in the introductory textbooks to economics. All human beings – the entrepreneur, the employer, the worker, and the consumer – pursue their own gain maximization; hence they are rational. This is inferred also from Adam Smith's establishment of a linkage between the individuals' pursuit of gain maximization on one hand and the creation of the wealth of nations on the other, and this, in his view, made possible through the **invisible hand of the market**. Since then, mainstream economics has based its consequent assumptions, models, and arguments on this premise, without any regard to the impact on the human behavior (Beneria 1999). Hence in the mainstream trade model, the individual is depicted according to the aforementioned.

However, feminist economics suggests alternative human behavior which is different than the individualistic self-interested one. Currently, given this background, the economies are tested and examined from the self-interest lens. The feminist scholars criticize how all other motivations and drivers of human behavior (e.g., altruism, love, respect, norms, traditions, and others) are disregarded, thus trivializing many of women's contributions in the economic field.

Adding to that, from a feminist perspective, to understand the underlying behavior of the economic actor in the free trade model, **gender power relations** have to be analyzed. Women do not always have the same choice to enter into economic activities the same as men. Education, skills, and experiences are all important assets for any person to engage in economic activities.

But access to these assets is not equal for women as it is for men. School enrollment all over the world is lower among girls than among boys, especially in Sub-Saharan and South Asian countries, where specific social norms about gender roles regulate the relationships in these societies (World Bank Group 2012). For example, globally, approximately **129 million girls are out of school**, with **32 million in primary school**, **30 million in lower-secondary school**, and **67 million in upper-secondary school** (UNESCO, 2023).

Why is this economic actor free? And to what extent is the social reproductive work freeing him? Are both important questions that feminist economists poses. The engagement in trade requires time and effort. For a man to engage in trade there should be a woman (his wife or his mother)

which facilitates this engagement through preparing food and undertaking social reproductive roles, that saves him time and effort. Hence what women offer here is an **enabler** for men to spend more time in their trade relations.

The Marginalization of Social Reproductive Work in the Analysis of the Market

Albeit the strategic influence of reproductive work on people's life and decisions (BRIDGE 2009), in the free market, where trade takes place, a commodity is of a twofold nature; use value and exchange value. According to Adam Smith, "[t]he value of any commodity, therefore, to the person who possesses it, and who means not to use or consume it himself, but to exchange it for other commodities" (Smith 1998). The assumption here is that productive work is only the work that produces commodities for exchange. Hence for a work to be productive it should be remunerated in cash or in kind. While on the other side, unlike the remunerated work, social reproductive work is not driven by gain maximization and doesn't poses an exchange value. What drives women's unpaid work is altruism and nurture or to other spiritual beliefs (Beneria 1999). Hence in the view of the mainstream economics only productive work is worth analyzing. From this point the trivialization of women's role in the economy is widely materialized.

However, women attach to the markets in a different way than men (Beneria 1999). While markets have been expanding through the past millennia with the accelerated globalization, the deepening of women's unpaid care work has been ignored. **Women disproportionately undertake unpaid care work more than men.** For instance, the International Labour Organization (ILO) reported in 2018 that women perform **76.2% of total hours of unpaid care work globally**, which is **3.2 times more than men**. This amounts to **16.4 billion hours of unpaid care work every day** (ILO, 2018). Because the productive work was only regarded to be the paid one, women's integration and contribution to the transformation of markets was ignored, albeit rising. For that reason, women's reproductive work has been assumed to have no link with the market. The market was depicted as a male area. A public sphere that was only accessible to men, for them to engage, interact, and render economic outcomes. On the other hand, women were limited to exercise their reproductive role within the boundaries of households. And indeed, these geographic and functional assignments are **socially constructed**, Beneria (1999) argues.

Moreover, Beneria (2007) sheds light on the centrality of the social reproductive work appears in the interplay between fertility rates and women's integration in the labor markets. Women have a great hold on the declining fertility rates, especially in the North side of the world, where the crisis is very tangible. Yet discussing the importance of the policies that would encourage women to strike the balance between their work and undertaking their reproductive activities is neglected from economic books, conferences, and international economic debates.

Ignoring Power Relations: The Dynamics that Shape Economic Outcomes

According to the mainstream trade theory, economists assume a perfect competition through the market dynamics. But Shaikh (2007) indicated that power struggle plays an important role in diverting the alleged perfect competition. Inequalities between men and women, when analyzed from the mainstream point of view, it disregards gender, rather it focuses only on the market

dynamics. Feminist economics analyzes inequalities utilizing gender and its power dynamics. Gender power relations affect the division of labor.

“Gender [...] is defined as inequalities, divisions, and differences socially constructed around assumed distinctions between female and male” (Acker 2004:20). For feminist scholars, gender dictates roles, responsibilities, access and control and power among members of societies. It organizes all units of analysis; starting from the individual level up to the societal level in specific way. An integral part of feminist analysis is the assumption that women are predominantly subordinated to men within gendered relations. Yet gender is not static, it has its own dynamics which is elastic according to time, place, events, and circumstances. There is an unjust generalist view that analyzing men’s situation means analyzing the general situation. This is a conceptual problem in itself that faces the mainstream economics. But it was formed as a result of male domination of institutions and the research world (Acker 2004). Thus, gender is not a biological construct; rather it is a **socially constructed notion**.

The comparative advantage from the feminist angle is decidedly gendered. Many scholars have observed the phenomenon of the “feminization of the labor market”, which is correlated with freer trade and rapid integration of the developing countries in the world economy (Standing 1999). Women tend to be mobilized in labor intensive jobs to be exploited in **low-wage labor** due to gender stereotyping of their characterization to be fit into the labor intensive industries (e.g., textile and garments or electronic assembly). For example, women represent about **80% of the global garment workforce**, often working in factories with poor conditions and low pay (Clean Clothes Campaign, 2023). Also, women’s bargaining position pushes them into accepting the precarious working conditions with the low remuneration due to their higher vulnerability to poverty (Acker 2004; Jaquette and Standt 2006).

Conclusion

To challenge mainstream economic theories, feminist economics take heterodox theories as a mere starting point. They develop the counterarguments against the mainstream arguments and provide alternative approaches to analyze economic relations and outcomes.

In that sense, a feminist stance in analyzing the world appreciates radical thinking. The struggle between the classes is no longer the way for the capitalism’s demise. Feminist economics argues, logically, that the struggle is between the sexes. **Gender structures are unfair and unjust**. Gender equality matters to societies’ prosperity, balance, and soundness.

In analyzing mainstream trade theory, feminist economics and mainstream economics hold different assumptions. On the philosophical basis, mainstream economics advocates rationality, selfishness, and male as the sole human-being, while feminist economics outlines altruism, values and social norms, and women’s critical role in development. Feminist economics places the **social reproductive work** into the central of its analysis to economic outcomes (**women’s invisible hand**). While on the other hand, mainstream economics emphasizes the market’s invisible hand. In addition, feminist economics highly emphasized the role of **gender power relations** in rendering different economic outcomes between men and women. This is a different story for

mainstream economics, which assume that the perfect competition is the main distributor of economic outcomes.

This research has touched on how the shift from a political economic system to another has its own implications on gender issues. As societies incline more towards capital accumulation, the role of women as labor producers is becoming more undermined. For future research, it would be of value to study the impact of **automation and accelerated commercialization of domestic labor on gender (in)equality**.

In the old age societies, gender discrimination was never the norm. Capitalism was never the sole economic system as well. Then why gender inequality is so tangible? The justification is simple. As societies become more and more capitalistic, money is gaining an utmost spell. People are becoming money hunters and commodities start to dominate/dictate social relations. The worker is alienated from the product he/she produces. The society members are alienated from each other. In this environment, what women produce is of less value, if we refrained from saying of no value at all. The only thing the system appreciates is money. The system and its measurements are a male creation.

Considering the persistent gender gaps and the profound impact of gender blindness in economic theory, how can think tanks and policymakers in Egypt practically integrate feminist economic perspectives to foster more equitable and sustainable development paths?

REFERENCES

- Acker, Joan. 2004. "Gender, Capitalism and Globalization." *Critical Sociology* 30(19–41). Retrieved June 2, 2018 (<http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1163/156916304322981668>).
- Bailey, Barbara, Elsa Leo-Rhynie, and Jeanette Morris. 2000. "Why Theory?" Pp. 1–22 in *Theoretical Perspectives on Gender and Development*, edited by V. E. B. Jane L. Parpart, M. Patricia Connelly. Ottawa: International Development Research Centre.
- Beneria, Lourdes. 1999. "Globalization, Gender And The Davos Man." *Feminist Economics* 5(3):61–83. Retrieved June 3, 2018 (<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/135457099337815?needAccess=true>).
- Beneria, Lourdes. 2001. "Shifting the Risk: New Employment Patterns, Informalization and Women's Work." *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society* 15(1):28–53.
- BRIDGE. 2009. *Gender and Care*. Brighton: BRIDGE.
- Egan, Maureen L. 1989. "Evolutionary Theory in the Social Philosophy of Charlotte Perkins Gilman." *Hypatia* 4(1):102–19. Retrieved May 25, 2018 (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3809937%0D>).
- Elson, Diane, Caren Grown, and Nilufer Cagatay. 2007. "Mainstream, Heterodox, and Feminist Trade Theory." in *The Feminist Economics of Trade*, edited by N. Cagatay, I. Stavern, D. Elson, C. Grown. New York: Routledge.

- England, Paula. 2002. "The Seprative Self: Androcentric Bias in Neoclassical Assumptions." in *Readings in Economic Sociology*, edited by N. W. Biggart. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers.
- Feiner, Susan F., and Bruce B.Roberts. 1990. "Hidden by the Invisible Hand: Neoclassical Economic Theory and the Textbook Treatment of Race and Gender." *Gender and Society* 4(2):159–81.
- Folbre, Nancy. 1982. "Exploitation Comes Home: A Critique of the Marxian Theory of Family Labour." *Cambridge Journal of Economics* 6(4):317–29. Retrieved June 2, 2018 (https://www.jstor.org/stable/23596518?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents).
- Forum, The World Economic. 2017. *The Global Gender Gap Report 2017*. Geneva: The World Economic Forum. Retrieved May 26, 2018 (http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_GGGR_2017.pdf).
- Fulcher, James. 2004. *Capitalism: A Very Short Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ghorashi, Reza. 1995. "Marx on Free Trade." *Science & Society* 59(1):38–51.
- Gilman, Charlotte Perkins. 1911. *The Man-Made World: Or, Our Androcentric Culture*. New York: Charlton.
- Gunawardana, Samanthi J. 2011. "Gender and Global Labour. Reflections on Reading Donna L Chollett's 'Renegotiating Genderand Class in the Berry Fields of Michaoacan, Mexico.'"

Dialectical Anthropology 35(2):171–77. Retrieved May 25, 2018
(<http://www.jstor.org/stable/29791008>).

Harriss-White, Barbara. 2005. “Female and Male Grain Marketing Systems: Analytical and Policy Issues for West Africa and India.” Pp. 190–215 in *Feminist Visions of Development: Gender Analysis and Policy*, edited by and R. P. Cecile Jackson. London: Routledge.

Jaquette, Jane S., and Kathleen Standt. 2006. “Women, Gender, and Development.” Pp. 17–52 in *Women and Gender Equity in Development Theory and Practice: Institutions, Resources, and Mobilization*, edited by J. S. J. and G. Summerfield. North Carolina: Duke University Press.

Jefferson, Therese, and John King. 2001. *Never Intended to Be a Theory About Everything: Domestic Labour In Neoclassical & Marxian Economics*. Perth: Curtin University of Technology. Retrieved May 25, 2018
(https://www.researchgate.net/publication/24081225_Never_Intended_to_be_a_Theory_Of_Everything_Domestic_Labor_in_Neoclassical_and_Marxian_Economics).

Lourdes, Beneria. 2007. *Gender, Development and Globalization: Economics As If All People Mattered*. New York: Routledge.

Macmillan Reference USA. 2005. *Encyclopedia of Religion*. 2nd ed. New York: Macmillan Reference USA.

Mankiw, N.Gregor. n.d. *Principles of Economics*. Fort Worth: Dryden Press, Harcourt Brace College Publisher.

Mankkwi, N.Gregory. 2010. *Macroeconomics*. New York: Worth Publishers.

Matthaie, Julie. 1996. “Why Feminist, Marxist and Anti-Racist Economists Should Be Feminist-- Marxist--Anti-Racist Economists.” *Feminist Economics* 2(1):22–42.

May, Ann Mari. 2002. “The Feminist Challenge to Economics.” *Challenge* 45(6):45–69. Retrieved (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/40722173>).

O'Donnell, Margaret G. 1994. “Early Analysis of the Economics of Family Structure: Charlotte Perkins Gilman’s ‘Women And Economics.’” *Review of Social Economy* 52(2):86–95.

Pyle, Jean L., and Kathryn B.Ward. 2003. “Recasting Our Understanding of Gender and Work during Global Restructuring.” *International Sociology* 18(3):461–89.

Raynolds, Laura T. 1998. “Harnessing Women’s Work: Restructuring Agricultural and Industrial Labor Forces in the Dominican Republic.” *Economic Geography* 74(2):149–69. Retrieved May 22, 2018 (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/144280>).

Ricardo, David. 1821. *On the Principles of Political Economy and Taxation*. 3rd ed. Ontario: Batoche Books. Retrieved May 22, 2018 (<https://socialsciences.mcmaster.ca/econ/ugcm/3ll3/ricardo/Principles.pdf>).

Shaikh, Anwar. 2007. “Globalization and the Myth of Free Trade.” in *Globalization and the Myth of Free Trade*, edited by A. Shaikh. London: Routledge.

- Shaw, Linda. 1996. "World Trade Is a Women's Issue: Report of a Conference 20-21 April 1996." *Gender and Development* 4(3):65–67. Retrieved May 22, 2018 (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/4030533>).
- Smith, Adam. 1998. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. London: The Electric Book Company. Retrieved May 22, 2018 (www.elecbook.com).
- Standing, Guy. 1999. "Global Feminization Through Flexible Labor: A Theme Revisited." *World Development* 27(3):583–600.
- Staveren, Irene van, Elson, Diane, Caren Grown and Niliifer Iagata. 2007. *The Feminist Economics of Trade*. New York: Routledge.
- Strassmann, Diana, and Livia Polanyi. 1997. "The Economist as Storyteller." Pp. 94–104 in *Out of the Margin: Feminist Perspectives on Economics*, edited by Z. T. Susan Feiner, E. Kuiper, N. Ott, J. Sap. London: Routledge.
- The Central Intelligence Agency. 2016. "Population Pyramid." *The World Factbook*. Retrieved May 22, 2018 (<https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/index.html>).
- The Economist. 2006. "The Future of the World Economy Lies Increasingly in Female Hands." *The Economist*. Retrieved May 21, 2018 (<https://www.economist.com/node/6802551>).
- The World Bank Group. 2012. *World Development Report 2012*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- UN. 2015. *The World's Women 2015*. New York: UN.

- UN Women. 2016. *Progress of the World's Women 2015-2016*. New York: UN Women. Retrieved May 22, 2018 (http://progress.unwomen.org/en/2015/pdf/UNW_progressreport.pdf).
- Wacker, John G. 1998. "A Definition of Theory: Research Guidelines for Different Theory-Building Research Methods in Operations Management." *Journal of Operations Management* 16(1):61–385.
- Wendt, Alexander. 1995. "Constructing International Politics." *International Security* 20(1):71–81. Retrieved May 22, 2018 (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2539217>).
- White, Marcelline A. 2004. "Engendering Global Justice: Women First: A Tool for Prioritizing Women in Trade Deals." *Race, Poverty & the Environment* 11(1):67–69. Retrieved May 22, 2018 (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/41554435>).
- White, Marcelline, Carlos Salas, and Sarah Gammage. 2003. *Trade Impact Review: Mexico Case Study*. Washington, D.C.: Women's Edge Coalition. Retrieved May 22, 2018 (<http://www.eldis.org/document/A22235>).
- The World Bank Group. 2012. *World Development Report*. Washington, DC: World Bank.