

Rapid Economic Development and Job Segregation: The Case of Taiwan

Scott M. Fuess, Jr.¹ Jack W. Hou²

¹Department of Economics, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska, USA

²Department of Economics, California State University, Long Beach, California, USA
jackhou@csulb.edu

Abstract

Most segregation studies have focused on industrialized nations where the economic structure is stable. However, when an economy experiences rapid development, the nature of industries and occupations changes, and may have profound impact on gender segregation. This study attempts to bring attention to this issue by one particular rapidly developing economy: Taiwan. We find that gender representation has been mostly stable across industries and job status. Segregation by occupation, however, has increased dramatically, more than *doubling* since 1985 and nearly *tripling* since 1978. The literature tends to interpret this as evidence of rising gender discrimination. However, this is under the *ceteris paribus* assumption that the structure of the economy has not experienced any significant change.

As the economy has developed, it is not clear whether this rise in segregation is due to job discrimination or more benign self-selection. The Taiwan economy achieved Rostovian take-off in the mid 1980s, signifying a major break in the economic structure. Using regression analysis, we find that both economic growth and economic “development” (as measured by tertiary activities in the economy) were major causes of the rise in occupation segregation. Economic growth stylizes an income effect where women are now free to choose jobs rather than sacrificing preferences for wages. The economic development signifies a “substitution” effect as the jobs choices increased as services related jobs soared. These, combined with other variables, suggest that the sharp rise in the segregation index points to a benign, welfare improving “self-selection”, and should not be interpreted as increased gender discrimination.

China has experienced even more dramatic structural changes in its economy. This study demonstrates a method to analyze job market changes and segregation. However, is the rise in segregation in China similarly benign? We raise some conjectures, but what is clear is that much more attentive analysis is needed, especially since the appropriate data is yet to be available.

Key Words: Gender, Segregation, Discrimination, Taiwan, Occupation

1. Introduction

Gender equality has been an increasingly important issue since the mid 20th century. The differential treatment across gender can be in the form of political, cultural, or economics disparities. The former two typically result in human rights abuse, and the lesser social status for women. In terms of economics, we usually focus on earnings gap or the issue of unlevelled playing field where women suffer from disadvantaged or more restricted opportunity sets. Of which, the earnings differential has been studied extensively for the U.S. and for many other economies. The reason is obvious. It is more blatant, more sensational (headline material), and the data is far more feasible. The issue on the inequality of opportunities is less studied precisely because of the opposite; it is more subtle, harder to fit into “sound-bites”, and many of the information needed is absent.

In the last two decades, several advances have been made to analyze the issue of unequal opportunities. A growing literature has spun on ICs (Industrialized Country) and LDCs (Less Developed Country), with fairly consistent results: ICs exhibit a relatively levelled playing field compared to LDCs. However, the literature has neglected to consider the possible effect of economic development on this equality of opportunities. Most ICs reached full economic development long before the gender issue became popular; just like most LDCs remained less developed both before and after the emergence of the gender equality debate.

However, there is a new class of economies that may offer us an opportunity to examine the effect of economic development on the issue of gender equality. These economies ascended from LDCs to the rank of NICs (Newly Industrialized Countries) during the last quarter of the 20th century. By these, obviously, we imply the Four Small Dragon: Hong Kong, Singapore, South Korea, and Taiwan. As argued by many researchers (e.g. Hou 1993), the

quality of the Labor data in Taiwan is truly outstanding. In light of this, and other reason that will become more evident later, we chose to examine Taiwan as our case study for the effect of economic development on gender segregation in the labor market. However, in terms of time series, we limit ourselves to data up to 1997. The reason is two fold. First, there was a tremendous increase in the number of Bachelor granting institutions in the 1990s.¹ Which has caused havoc in the labor market (Wang 2003). Second, since 1997, Taiwan has had a stagnated economy. It started with the east Asia financial crises, followed by the stalemate/confrontation of her relationship with China. The “cold war” across the Taiwan Strait has persisted to this day. The landslide victory of the opposition Nationalist Party (KMT) in both the Legislature Yuan re-election (January 2008) and the Presidential election (March 2008) signals that the Taiwan people are frustrated with the economic stagnation and demand a new direction in her polity. Due to these, significant complications had been introduced since 1997, and we are not certain whether this can be dealt with via the macro time series data that we are employing. To limit the complication, we restrict our sample to 1997.

The remainder of the paper is organized as followed. In Section 2 we review the literature that has examined the labor market segregation in Taiwan. This is followed by a discussion of why we have chosen to study the gender segregation in Taiwan, and our proposition on the effect of economic development. An outline of the methodology and the empirical evidence will be presented in Sections 4 and 5. The final section will provide a summary, present conjectures and the need for further studies.

2. Literature Review

Taiwan's economic performance in the past few decades has been impressive. Between the early 1950s and 1990s, expansion of real gross domestic product (GDP) per capita averaged more than 6.5% per year.² Indeed, Taiwan has transformed from a developing economy to a wealthy, industrialized one. Other Asian countries have experienced rapid expansion, but Taiwan continues to sustain one of the fastest rates of growth in the world. This progress has led scholars of economic development to study Taiwan in detail, to examine the factors that caused its rapid growth. There are also relevant insights for economists in other fields. The combination of Taiwan's rapid development and its relatively unregulated labor markets (no minimum wage, nor affirmative action or anti-discrimination laws) provides an opportunity to investigate the purer aspects of labor market discrimination.

As in so many countries, the average earnings of female workers in Taiwan have been less than those of male workers. Researchers have sought to explain how much of this gender wage gap can be explained by economic factors -- for example, work experience -- with the residual illustrating the possible extent of wage discrimination. Using 1989 micro wage data for Taiwan, Kao, Polachek, and Wunnava (1994) found that the bulk of wage differentials can be explained by differences in human capital stock accumulation based on differences in expected lifetime labor force participation” (p. 369). They concluded that lifetime work incentives” explain most wage differentials and predicted that male and female wage differences will narrow as long as labor force participation rates among females are secularly increasing relative to those of males” (p. 372).

The finding that females in Taiwan earn less than males mostly because they invest less in human capital raises another question about possible discrimination. Have women invested less in human capital because they face unfavorable employment opportunities? The profile of work changes greatly as an economy experiences rapid development. The focus of economic activity shifts from agriculture to manufacturing and then to services, especially information-based services. As the nature of industries and occupations has changed in Taiwan, how have employment patterns been affected? Part of the gender wage gap -- even that part which can be explained by differences in work experience -- could be due to job segregation. Women working in a particular industry or occupation may be paid on an equal basis with men. Nevertheless, women may tend to select or be crowded into industries or occupations that pay relatively low wages.

Using survey data for 1982, Gannicott (1986) reported that at least one-third of the gender wage gap could be explained by male-female differences in work endowments,” which include differences in industries and occupations worked. He also reported that 40% of the unexplained portion of the wage gap could be accounted for by gender-specific differences in work endowments. Consequently, he argued that a sizable component of gender wage differentials could be due to job segregation.

1 In 1985, there were just 27 such institutions, but it increase by 70% to 46 in 1990, and further increased to 60 in 1995. In 1995, the Ministry of education further “reformed” higher education regulations, which resulted in a surge of new bachelor granting institutions, resulting in 127 universities and 4-year colleges by 2000.

2 Accounting for the relative expansion of transaction costs, Fuess and van den Berg (1996) found that Taiwan nevertheless experienced substantial total factor productivity growth.

Gannicott's study reflects only a single point in time, 1982, a year in which Taiwan's economic growth was comparatively slow. Besides the 1974 oil shock, in 1982 Taiwan registered its worst yearly growth rate in more than three decades. Gannicott's findings could reflect the relatively sluggish nature of the economy. In other rapidly growing Asian economies (for example, South Korea and Japan) female labor has been used as a buffer stock. During periods of economic expansion employment for women may rise relatively quickly as employers seek to avoid labor shortages, especially in manufacturing. Conversely, during periods of sluggish growth or recession employers may discriminate against women by adjusting female employment more than that of men.³ By focusing on a slow-growth year for Taiwan, when job discrimination against women might have been pronounced, Gannicott's study may overstate the role of workplace segregation in wage discrimination.

With data covering a longer time period, 1978-1985, Hou (1991) reported a different result about the influence of job discrimination. He found that little of the unexplained portions of the gender wage gap could be attributed to occupational segregation or concentration of women in relatively low paying industries. Over this eight-year period, Taiwan's averaged a relatively brisk 7.5% (1982 notwithstanding) annual growth rate, with 9.6% expansion in 1984. If the buffer stock relationship holds, there should have been comparatively little job segregation over this stretch.

3. Methodology and Propositions

Differential treatment across gender can be in the form of political, cultural, or economics disparities. The former two typically result in human rights persecution abuse, and the lesser social status for women. In terms of economics, we usually focus on earnings gap or the issue of unlevelled playing field where women suffer from worse or more restricted opportunity sets. The earnings differential has been studied extensively for the U.S. and for many other economies. The reason is obvious. It is more blatant, more sensational (headline material), and the data is far more feasible. The issue on the inequality of opportunities is less studied precisely because of the opposite; it is more subtle, harder to fit into "sound-bites", and many of the information needed is absent.

Nevertheless, several advances has been made. One of the more popular methods is to measure the degree of segregation in the job market via the Duncan & Duncan Index or DDI (Duncan and Duncan 1955). The technical details of the DDI are discussed in the next section. The objective here is to point out its the handicap. As many economic indices, the DDI is subject to the *ceteris paribus* assumption. Among others, the Index is a good measure of gender segregation if and only if both the job market structure and gender preferences remain stable. Though the latter may change over time, the concern here is the former.

Since its inception, the DDI has been used extensively to study the gender segregation for industrialized countries (IC) and for the less developed countries (LDC). The results were as expected, ICs tend to have a more integrated labor market compared to the LDCs, U.S. has less segregation compared to Japan, but is not as good as many Western European countries. This is essentially sound for the ICs, as their economic structures have long matured (stabilized). It is somewhat suspect for the LDCs, but generally acceptable if it has not progressed significantly during the sample period.

However, the DDI can be very misleading for the NICs (Newly Industrialized Countries), as they have undergone dramatic structural change: namely, they evolved from LDCs to become "industrialized". As of now, the NICs typically refer to Hong Kong, Singapore, South Korea, and Taiwan, but there are many candidates waiting in the wing. Thus, the accounting for "economic development" in the interpretation of the DDI has its immediate relevance, and ever increasing importance for the future as the LDCs strive for industrialization. In addition, this study will also further the understanding of another category of countries: the former Socialist or Communist nations. As they would have undergone a radical "political" (rather than economic) structural change, and the status of women in such economies is an open field for waiting and needing investigative research.

It is well known that the "net" birth rate ("crude" birth rate minus infant mortality rate) exhibits an inverse U relationship with respect to socioeconomic development. Poor and less developed (a step above poor nations) economies have a much higher "crude" birth rate, but the poor economies also have a very high infant mortality rate. Thus making the "net" birth rate for the less developed economies higher than that of the very poor nations. However, as the economy industrializes, the infant mortality rate continues to improve, but the "crude" birth rate drops substantially, thus leading to the aforementioned inverse U shape.

³ On female labor as a buffer stock in South Korea, see Fuess and (1994). In the case of Japan, see Hashimoto (1990), or Houseman and Abraham (1993).

We suspect that the occupation segregation may have similar traits. When the economy is under-developed, most jobs are in factories, where both men and women work together. As the economy develops and take-off (i.e. industrialize), the service sector emerges. Service jobs tend to have less overtime, "cleaner" working conditions, and involve more personal contacts. These are all characteristics that, perhaps females value more than males. Then, we will see females leaving the factory for the service sector, while men may disproportionately choose to stay. This would account for the observed segregation. It is likely that as the economy continues to develop, the manufacturing sector will decline as the service sector continues to grow, and the occupation distribution across gender may once more converge.

The methodology is standard. For the measurement of segregation, we will use the popular DDI or Duncan and Duncan Index. We will then use regression analysis to examine the "determinants" of segregation. The explanatory variables will include two binary dummy variables to account for the structural change of Pre- and post- economic take off, the real GDP growth rate to filter out business cycle effects. The main focus will be on the "development" variables: service sector as % of GDP.

As shown in the previous section, the results of the Gannicott and Hou studies indicate that there is an unresolved question about the extent of job segregation over time in Taiwan. Yet the degree of job segregation should be instrumental in assessing the extent of wage discrimination. This study analyzes employment patterns for women and men in Taiwan for a longer time frame than has been studied, namely 1978-1997. The sample period covers distinct phases in Taiwan's economic development. Although there had been relatively rapid growth before the mid-1980s, real GDP expansion accelerated greatly between 1984 and 1987, culminating in dizzying growth rates of 10.6% in 1986 and 12.4% in 1987. Given such frenzied expansion, we refer to the 1984-1987 stretch as Taiwan's "super boom", or the Rostovia take-off (Rostow 1960). The economy has since experienced less feverish growth, averaging 6.7% per year for 1988-1997. Thus, our study is more than a mere update of earlier research, as we can also examine how the gender distribution of employment across industries/occupations response to phases of economic development (in contrast to economic "growth"). Starting with figures for female and male employment in general industrial categories, we calculate an index of segregation for each year between 1978 (the first year in Hou's original study) and 1997 (the year before the Asian financial crisis).⁴ We investigate how female representation in industry groups changed over this twenty-year span.

Even if female employment has not been confined to specific industries, jobs for women may have been concentrated in particular occupations. Using very broad categories for different types of work, we calculate an index of occupational segregation, examining how female representation changed in paid employment versus other, lower status work. Measuring segregation with the most general work status categories available provides a "lower bound" indicator of job discrimination. Suppose the proportion of females in regularly paying jobs increased, women still may have been confined to lower paying or otherwise less prestigious jobs. Using data for occupational groups, we compute another segregation measure to evaluate the concentration of women across fields of work.

4. Segregation in the Labor Market

4.1. Measuring Segregation

To gauge crowding in different types of work, we use the well-known segregation measure developed by Duncan and Duncan (1955). For time period t , the index S_t is given by

$$0 \leq S_t = \sum_i |w_{it} - m_{it}| / 2 \leq 100, \quad (1)$$

where w_{it} (m_{it}) is the percentage of women (men) in job category i . The index shows the percentage of women (or men) that would have to be reassigned to accomplish gender balance in each category. If the index is 100, there is absolute segregation; if it is 0, females and males are equally represented in each group.⁵

The segregation measure is sensitive to the extent work categories are aggregated, with greater aggregation resulting in a lower measure. For comparisons over time, the same number of similarly aggregated categories should be used (Beller 1985).

4.2. Segregation by Industry

To see whether employment patterns have changed across industrial sectors, we used equation (1) to calculate an index of industrial segregation (SII_t). In order to identify segregation at the broadest possible level, we used the most

⁴ The Asian financial crisis has had profound impact across the region, and indeed worldwide. We did not want the effect of this event to bias our estimates or conclusions.

⁵ For discussion of the index and its properties, see Beller (1985), Fuchs (1989), and King (1992).

general industrial categories available over time. Taiwan's government publishes employment data in its *Yearbook of Manpower Survey Statistics*.⁶ This publication reports annual observations for the number of women and men working in each of eleven industrial sectors.⁷ Extending Hou's original sample period as far as possible, while avoiding the Asian Financial Crisis, we used yearly observations for 1978-1997.

TABLE 1
Job Segregation in Taiwan by Industry --1978, 1986, 1995, and 1997^a

| Industrial Category | 1978 | | 1986 | | 1995 | | 1997 | |
|--|------------------|----------------|-----------|---------|-----------|---------|--------|---------|
| | % of Females in: | % of Males in: | % Fem. | % Males | % Fem. | % Males | % Fem. | % Males |
| Agriculture, etc | 22.79 | 25.95 | 14.29 | 18.69 | 7.75 | 12.31 | 7.03 | 11.22 |
| Mining and Quarrying | 0.44 | 1.24 | 0.02 | 0.58 | 0.09 | 0.23 | 0.06 | 0.30 |
| Manufacturing | 37.97 | 27.19 | 39.70 | 30.67 | 28.29 | 26.32 | 27.79 | 28.16 |
| Electricity, Gas, Water | 0.10 | 0.55 | 0.14 | 0.62 | 0.14 | 0.56 | 0.14 | 0.54 |
| Construction | 1.66 | 10.16 | 1.55 | 9.69 | 3.70 | 15.73 | 2.85 | 14.04 |
| Commerce | 16.79 | 14.27 | 20.30 | 16.22 | 25.73 | 18.39 | 26.18 | 18.86 |
| Transportation | 1.95 | 6.31 | 2.10 | 7.22 | 2.32 | 6.98 | 2.44 | 6.76 |
| Finance | 1.32 | 1.10 | 2.13 | 1.45 | 4.76 | 2.61 | 5.23 | 2.90 |
| Business Services | 1.03 | 0.69 | 1.34 | 1.08 | 2.96 | 2.16 | 2.99 | 2.37 |
| Services | 13.57 | 8.72 | 15.11 | 9.56 | 21.00 | 11.07 | 22.03 | 11.24 |
| Public Administration | 2.39 | 3.82 | 3.19 | 4.23 | 3.27 | 3.65 | 3.27 | 3.70 |
| Index of Segregation (SII _i) | 18.70 | | 19.59 | | 22.19 | | 21.06 | |
| Index of Segregation (SII) | 1978-1997 | | 1978-1986 | | 1987-1997 | | | |
| Mean | 20.20 | | 19.60 | | 20.70 | | | |
| Standard Deviation | 0.98 | | 0.64 | | 0.87 | | | |

^aAnnual employment figures (measured in thousands of persons) by industry are reported in Directorate-General of Budget, Accounting and Statistics, Executive Yuan, *Yearbook of Manpower Survey Statistics* (Taipei: Republic of China, 1996, 1998). The index of segregation is calculated according to the formula: $SII_i = \sum_i |w_i - m_i| / 2$, where w_i (m_i) is the percentage of women (men) working in industry i .




Figure 1 Segregation Index by Industry (SII)

6 For the annual employment figures (thousands of persons) used in this study, see Directorate-General of Budget, Accounting and Statistics, Executive Yuan, *Yearbook of Manpower Survey Statistics* (Taipei: Republic of China, 1996, 1998).

7 Each industrial category includes paid employees and self-employed workers (with unpaid family workers counted as self-employed).

Table 1 presents the percentage of females and that of males in each industrial category and the segregation indices (SII_i) for those years. The table presents employment and segregation index numbers for the starting year (1978), the ending year (1997); to spotlight any intermediate trends, 1986 and 1995 (the first and tenth years following Hou's sample) are also presented. For 1978 the segregation index is 18.70, indicating that nearly 19% of female workers would have to have changed industries to achieve gender balance across industrial categories. Figure 1 shows that how the gender distribution of workers across industries changed after 1978. As the economy slowed in 1982 gender segregation jumped, but then fell shortly thereafter. From the mid-1980s the SII measure rises, peaking in 1995 at 22.19 before dipping to 21.06 in 1997.

The employment data presented in Table 1 can be used to determine which industries were most segregated. In 1978 four sectors accounted for the bulk of gender imbalance across industries. More than 51% of all working women were in manufacturing or services (excluding business services), but less than 36% of men worked in these areas, meaning these two sectors alone accounted for more than two-fifths of measured segregation. Construction and transportation were male-oriented industries, employing over 16% of men but less than 4% of women, which accounts for more than one-third of the SII measure. The segregation pattern for 1986 is similar to that for 1978, with the same four industrial sectors accounting for most industrial segregation.

By 1997 the pattern of employment had changed. After 1986 women became much less likely to work in manufacturing, with the proportion of women dropping from 39.7% to 27.8%. Meanwhile, the representation of women in services jumped dramatically, to 22%, to nearly double the proportion of men in the sector. Furthermore, by the late 1990s the commerce sector became more female-oriented. In 1978 there was a slight disparity in commercial employment, with 16.8% of women working in this sector compared to 14.3% of men. By 1997 the gender gap in commerce had widened considerably, with 26.2% of Taiwanese women working there compared to only 18.9% of men. Construction also became more segregated. So by 1997 imbalances in services, construction, and commercial employment accounted for more than two-thirds of the SII measure.

4.3. Segregation by Status of Work

Although industrial segregation appears to be unrelated to economic “diversification,” there is evidence that segregation is directly related to economic growth. Moreover, the rise in the SII measure over the sample period may mask more dramatic changes in the gender distribution of employment. Even if the proportions of women and men across industries had been stable, there may have been changes in the representation of females in different types of occupations. To observe occupational segregation at the broadest possible level, that is, to establish a “lower bound” measure for job discrimination, we focused on the most general work categories used by Taiwan's government: (1) self-employment, (2) employer, and (3) paid employment. These categories distinguish between broadly different types of work.

A self-employed person operates an enterprise for profit. This category also includes casual and informal endeavors, which are regarded as less prestigious than regularly paying jobs. Furthermore, self-employment includes unpaid family work. A family worker toils in an enterprise owned and operated by a relative from the same household. Because such work is performed under family direction for no pay, it is considered to be of relatively humble status. Self-employment in Taiwan typically signifies different types of work by gender. Men often manage small family businesses or shops. In contrast, women frequently serve as unpaid family workers.

Employers own and operate their own business enterprises and hire paid employees. Paid workers are employed by firms and receive regular compensation. This last category includes full-time workers earning salaries, so it encompasses relatively prestigious jobs. It also includes paid employees in part-time or temporary jobs, many of whom are women. If female representation in paid work increases, it may reflect a concentration in lower paying and or casual/part-time jobs. Nevertheless, if the proportion of women in paid employment increases, there is movement away from unpaid or irregularly compensated work.

We distinguished between paying jobs in the private and public sectors. The public sector may be seen to “lead by example” for fair labor standards (Hou 1993). If the government does indeed set a good example, either by discriminating less against women or providing preferable job characteristics, then female representation may be greater than that of males in public sector paying jobs. Table 2 presents the percentages of women and men in each work status category for selected years. Using equation (1), we calculated measures of segregation by status of work (SIS_i), which are also presented in the table.

Gender distribution across work status appears to have been fairly stable in Taiwan. Throughout the sample period

there has been a greater proportion of women than men in paying jobs: 84%–88% of women have held paying jobs, compared to 65%–69% for men (see Table 3). Males have been more likely than females to be employers or self-employed. The SIS measures seem steady, averaging 20.07 for 1978–1986 and 19.87 for 1987–1997. A reallocation of one-fifth of female workers would have been necessary to achieve balanced gender representation. But there have been fluctuations across the job status groups.

TABLE 2

Job Segregation in Taiwan by Status of Work --1978, 1986, 1995, and 1997^a

| Work Status | 1978 | | 1986 | | 1995 | | 1997 | |
|--|------------------|----------------|-----------|---------|-----------|---------|--------|---------|
| | % of Females in: | % of Males in: | % Fem. | % Males | % Fem. | % Males | % Fem. | % Males |
| Self-employed | 13.88 | 29.72 | 12.24 | 27.96 | 10.04 | 23.24 | 9.81 | 22.57 |
| Employer | 1.28 | 4.55 | 1.60 | 6.40 | 2.19 | 7.78 | 2.35 | 8.09 |
| Paid Employment: | | | | | | | | |
| Private Sector | 71.85 | 51.84 | 73.37 | 52.05 | 74.15 | 57.69 | 74.05 | 58.18 |
| Public Sector | 12.99 | 13.90 | 12.80 | 13.59 | 13.63 | 11.29 | 13.79 | 11.16 |
| Index of Segregation (SIS _i) | 20.01 | | 21.32 | | 18.79 | | 18.50 | |
| Index of Segregation (SIS) | 1978–1997 | | 1978–1986 | | 1987–1997 | | | |
| Mean | 19.80 | | 20.07 | | 19.87 | | | |
| Standard Deviation | 0.81 | | 0.76 | | 0.82 | | | |

^aAnnual employment figures (measured in thousands of persons) by work status are reported in Directorate-General of Budget, Accounting and Statistics, Executive Yuan, *Yearbook of Manpower Survey Statistics* (Taipei: Republic of China, 1996, 1998). The index of segregation is calculated according to the formula: $SIS_i = \sum_i |w_i - m_i| / 2$, where w_i (m_i) is the percentage of women (men) working in job status i .




Figure 2 Segregation Index by Job Status (SIS)

Over the twenty-year sample period both self-employment and private sector paying jobs became somewhat more gender balanced (see Table 3). This improvement, however, is offset by increased segregation among employers and public sector workers. Whereas the classification “employer” became more male-oriented, public sector work indeed became more female-oriented. In 1978 government employment was practically gender balanced; since then the female employment share has increased while that of males has dropped.

4.4 Segregation by Occupation

Taiwan's government also reports employment figures for men and women for seven broadly defined occupational

groups. To measure the extent to which women have been concentrated in certain fields of work, we used equation (1) to calculate segregation by occupation (SIO_i). Table 3 presents the share of women and of men in each occupational group for 1978, 1986, 1995 and 1997. It also reports the SIO measures. The figures in the table show that there have been *dramatic increases* in occupational segregation, especially in recent years.

For 1978 the measure of occupational segregation is only 9.66: less than 10% of the female workforce required relocation to accomplish gender balance across occupational groups. There was nearly equal representation in professional and technical jobs (with 11.2% of women and 9.9% of men working in these fields). In service occupations there also was little disparity (respective shares for females and males, 15.6% and 13.2%). Among laborers and machine operators, male representation somewhat exceeded that of females (43.1% compared to 39.9%). As symmetric as the gender distribution 1978, some disparities are notable. Men were four times more likely than women to work in executive or managerial jobs. In contrast, women were more than twice as likely to work in clerical jobs than men.

TABLE 3

Job Segregation in Taiwan by Occupation --1978, 1986, 1995, and 1997^a

| Occupation Group | 1978 | | 1986 | | 1995 | | 1997 | |
|----------------------------------|------------------|----------------|-----------|---------|-----------|---------|--------|---------|
| | % of Females in: | % of Males in: | % Fem. | % Males | % Fem. | % Males | % Fem. | % Males |
| Management | 1.12 | 4.04 | 1.37 | 5.37 | 1.63 | 6.82 | 1.69 | 6.45 |
| Professionals | 4.68 | 3.25 | 5.05 | 3.75 | 7.31 | 4.43 | 7.91 | 4.94 |
| Technicians | 6.54 | 6.69 | 9.20 | 8.42 | 15.11 | 14.58 | 15.36 | 15.64 |
| Clerical | 9.85 | 4.04 | 11.67 | 4.17 | 18.78 | 4.00 | 19.73 | 4.04 |
| Sales | 15.61 | 13.20 | 18.92 | 14.79 | 22.22 | 12.67 | 22.86 | 13.03 |
| Farmers, etc. | 22.34 | 25.65 | 14.18 | 18.48 | 7.66 | 12.15 | 6.92 | 11.06 |
| Production Workers | 39.85 | 43.10 | 39.62 | 45.01 | 27.29 | 45.37 | 25.54 | 44.83 |
| Index of Segregation (SIO_i) | 9.66 | | 13.70 | | 27.75 | | 28.48 | |
| Index of Segregation (SIO) | 1978-1997 | | 1978-1986 | | 1987-1997 | | | |
| Mean | 18.02 | | 12.19 | | 22.78 | | | |
| Standard Deviation | 6.63 | | 1.53 | | 5.11 | | | |

^aAnnual employment figures (measured in thousands of persons) by industry are reported in Directorate-General of Budget, Accounting and Statistics, Executive Yuan, *Yearbook of Manpower Survey Statistics* (Taipei: Republic of China, 1996, 1998). The index of segregation is calculated according to the formula: $SIO_i = \sum_i |w_i - m_i| / 2$, where w_i (m_i) is the percentage of women (men) working in occupation i .




Figure 3 Segregation Index by Occupation (SIO)

Between 1978-1986 the segregation index averaged 12.19, but by 1986 it had climbed to 13.70. This trend is mild compared to the remarkable increase after 1986 (Figure 3). Between 1987 and 1995 the SIO measure more than *doubled*, climbing to 27.75. By 1997, 28.48% of workingwomen would have to have been in different occupations to

achieve gender balance. Over the entire sample period, segregation by occupation nearly *tripled*.

The segregation index rose so dramatically because of growing disparities in three occupational categories. Between 1986 and 1997 the gap in clerical employment continued to widen, with the female share of such jobs rising to 19.7% while remaining at 4.0% for men. There also were dramatic shifts among production workers and service workers. In 1978 services were fairly gender-balanced; by 1997 female representation far exceeded that of males (employing 22.9% of women but only 13.0% of men). Similarly, in 1978 the male share of production jobs was greater than the female share by 3.2 percentage points (43.1% versus 39.9%); by 1997 male dominance had grown to 19.3 percentage points (44.8% versus 25.5%). Indeed, gender imbalances in clerical, service, and production jobs accounted for more than three-fourths of the SIO measure.

5. Factors Affecting Segregation

The figures reported in Table 1 indicate that the measure of industrial segregation increased almost one-fifth between 1978 and 1997, with most of that jump occurring after 1986. For segregation by job status, Table 2 showed a very slight decrease over the sample period, but a rise in the early and the drop came in the second half. Of course, clearly what is most interesting is the occupation segregation, as the SIO almost tripled over the sample period. Based on the literature, this leads one to conclude that gender discrimination has dramatically worsened in Taiwan, and serious concerns should be raised. We disagree, and will propose an alternative interpretation.

To examine possible determinants of labor market segregation, we performed simple least squares regression analysis, using the three segregation indices (SSI, SIS, and SIO) as the dependent variables. With observations only for 1978–1997, there are not sufficient degrees of freedom to develop elaborate econometric specifications. Nevertheless, results from a simple specification can be instructive.

The explanatory variables include measures of Taiwan's economic growth and development. To account for the economy's growth, we use the logarithm of Taiwan's real GDP. The distribution of employment may be affected by more than just expansion of the economy, as we have argued earlier. Our sample period encompasses the "take-off" of Taiwan's rapid economic development (Hou 1996). When an economy's basis shifts from agricultural production (initial phase) to manufacturing (secondary phase) and then to services (tertiary phase), the profile of work changes dramatically. To account for structural shifts in the economy, we use as an explanatory variable the percentage of GDP accounted for by "tertiary-type" activities. Specifically, we used the percentage of GDP due to construction, commercial and financial activities, transportation, business and personal services.

It is not clear whether the coefficients on the growth and structural shift variables will be positive or negative. Economic growth and development create new jobs, possibly opening new career opportunities for women. Consequently, growth and development may have a negative impact on (i.e. reduction of) the segregation measure. When Taiwan's economy was less developed the spectrum of work was relatively narrow, limiting employment choices. For example, in the early years of industrialization it was common for both men and women to perform assembly line work in manufacturing. As economic progress occurred work became much more diversified, which may have led employment patterns of men and women to diverge. For example, job discrimination may have channeled women to work in particular industries/occupations. Even without discrimination, women and men may have exhibited different preferences for job characteristics. Then as job diversity became a reality it is conceivable that self-selection contributed to gender segregation. Consequently, economic growth and development may exert a positive influence on the segregation measure.

Over the 1979–1983 interval, Taiwan's economy was afflicted first by a rise in oil prices (1979–1980) and then recession in its major export markets (1982). Economic growth slowed steadily. Then during the "super boom" of 1984–1987 the economy's stock market soared and real economic growth accelerated sharply. Thereafter Taiwan pulled back from its frantic growth but the economy still continued to expand. To see if the comparatively slow growth before and after the super boom contributed to labor market segregation, we used the indicator variables "pre-super Boom" (activated for 1979–1983) and "post-super Boom" (activated for 1988–1997).

The simple regression equation we estimated is:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Segregation Index} = & \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Log of Real GDP} + \beta_2 \text{Tertiary Activities as Percentage} \\ & \text{of GDP} + \beta_3 \text{Pre-Super Boom} + \beta_4 \text{Post-Super Boom} + \varepsilon \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where ε is the disturbance term.⁸ We present the estimated equation in Table 4.

⁸ We used the augmented Dickey-Fuller (ADF) test to test the stationarity of the time series. For the segregation indices used in this study, the logarithm of real GDP, and the economic development variable we were unable to

For industrial segregation, economic development or diversification (Tertiary Activities) shows no significant impact on segregation. Other things equal, GDP growth is associated with greater gender segregation by industry (significant at the 10% level). Segregation was more pronounced for the relatively sluggish years of 1979-1983 than for other years. The gender gap widened prior to the “super boom.” In contrast, segregation was not significantly greater after the boom. As Taiwan’s economy has matured, perhaps female labor has become less of a buffer stock during episodes of slower growth.

TABLE 4
Factors Affecting Labor Market Segregation

| Dependent ^a Variable | SII | SIS | |
|---|-----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Constant | -26.5369 (-1.3019) | 20.8713 (1.2620) | -158.3234*** (-4.7946) |
| Log of Real GDP ^b | 2.9164* (1.8152) | 0.6460 (0.4955) | 9.3282*** (3.5840) |
| Tertiary Activities as % of GDP ^b | 0.0569 (0.5786) | -0.2229** (-2.7949) | 0.7520*** (4.7223) |
| Pre-Super Boom (= 1 for 1979-83; 0 otherwise) | 1.2884* (1.9193) | -1.0409* (-1.9111) | 1.5868 (1.4591) |
| Post-Super Boom (= 1 for 1988-97; 0 otherwise) | -0.7615 (-1.4821) | 0.1198 (0.2874) | -1.3314 (-1.5995) |
| F-statistic | 12.1766*** | 14.2305*** | 296.1687*** |
| Durbin-Watson statistic | 1.4024 | 1.7921 | 1.7150 |
| Adj. R ² | 0.7018 | 0.7359 | 0.9842 |

^aRefer to tables 1, 2, and 3 for the calculation of the segregation indices.

^bFigures for Taiwan's real GDP and components thereof are reported in Directorate-General of Budget, Accounting and Statistics, Executive Yuan, *Quarterly Economic Trends* (November 1995, 1996, 1997 issues, Taipei: Republic of China, 1996, 1997, 1998). Tertiary activities include construction, commercial and financial activities, transportation, business and personal services.

***Significant at the 0.10, 0.05, 0.01 level of significance, respectively.

Turning to segregation by work status (SIS), the distinguishing finding is that the relative expansion of tertiary-type activities inhibits gender segregation by work status. The coefficient estimate on the Tertiary Activities variable is negative and significant at the five percent level. As Taiwan’s economy has developed new “types” of work -- more office and service-oriented jobs relative to informal or unpaid family work -- segregation by work status has fallen significantly.

From the above, we found that in Taiwan women have become more likely than men to work in paying jobs. Furthermore, economic development has tended to reduce segregation by work status. These findings may tempt one to conclude that job discrimination in Taiwan has not increased in recent years.⁹ Such a conclusion may be misguided. After all, women may have been concentrated in relatively low paying, non-supervisory jobs/occupations. Such crowding would not show up in SIS measures, which only reflect segregation by status of work.

Focusing on segregation by occupation, the regression results are markedly significant and different than the previous two sets of estimates. The coefficients on the economic growth and economic development variables are both significantly positive. Slower economic growth has not resulted in greater occupational segregation. Unlike some

reject the null hypothesis of a unit root, that is, the null hypothesis of nonstationarity. But, as discussed by Enders (1995), if there is structural change, then the ADF test is biased toward nonrejection of a unit root (see pp. 243-245). Considering the transformation of Taiwan's economy over the sample period, because of structural change we may be unable to confirm stationarity of the time series of interest. But if the series are cointegrated, then OLS regression can still be implemented. Using the cointegration testing procedure developed by Johansen (1991), we found that each segregation index was cointegrated with the GDP and development variables, so we proceeded with OLS regression analysis.

9 Even the measure of industrial segregation (SII) drops after 1995.

other Asian economies, female labor in Taiwan apparently has not been used as a buffer stock when the economy has slowed. Moreover, the more diversified Taiwan economy has become, segregation by occupation has become much more pronounced.

It remains a crucial matter to explain why Taiwan economic development has been associated with increased occupational segregation. Could it be that industrialization, and the consequent diversification of work, has created new opportunities to discriminate against women, crowding them into secretarial or otherwise less prestigious service jobs? Or could it be that a rising segregation index is not a sign of discrimination *per se*, but is actually indicative of welfare-improving, occupational self-selection?

In the earliest stage of Taiwan industrialization jobs were concentrated in manufacturing, where both men and women toiled as production workers in factories, hence the relatively low degree of occupational segregation. As the economy passed through its "take-off" stage, service-type tertiary occupations became more predominant. Such white-collar jobs tend to have less overtime and more flexible work schedules, cleaner and safer working conditions, and provide capacity for more responsible interactions. They also may not have an established reputation for discrimination. If women have a relatively strong preference for such characteristics, then we will observe a disproportionate shift of females from assembly line work as they select office or other service-type jobs. In fact, by 1997, female representation in "professional" occupations had become three-fifths greater than that for men (Table 5).

With aggregated data, it is not obvious which is the better explanation for the increase: job discrimination or more benign self-selection? If the "occupational discrimination" hypothesis is true, we would expect occupational gender gaps to persist, with worsening imbalances in the clerical (more female-oriented) and managerial (more male-oriented) categories. As shown in Table 5, the crowding of females into clerical jobs has continued unabated. But the gender gap for executive jobs, though still extant, has not widened noticeably since the mid-1980s.

If the "self-selection" hypothesis were true, then we would not expect gender imbalances to worsen in the future. As the economy continues to develop and manufacturing declines relative to information-based office work, we would expect men to be shifted into white collar, service-type jobs. Indeed, there is also some support for this view. *Technicians* became more prevalent over the sample period and were gender balanced (Table 5). Between 1988-1997, *ceteris paribus*, occupational segregation did not increase: in Table 6 the coefficient estimate on the Post-Super Boom variable is actually negative, though insignificant.¹⁰ Looking at the time path of occupational segregation depicted in Figure 3, it is tempting to speculate that the gender segregation has stabilized since 1995, possibly tapering off.

It may be worth pointing out that after controlling for the effects of economic growth and economic development, the segregation index is actually decreasing over time. This is shown by the two binary dummy variables, as the sign of the coefficients switched from positive to negative, implying that the average segregation index was higher in the pre-super boom period than the post boom. Though the estimates are not very significant, but they are significant at a 10% (one-tailed test) level. Perhaps, again, signaling the more benign nature of this dramatic hike in gender segregation.

6. Summary and Concluding Remarks

This study has examined employment patterns for women and men in Taiwan for 1978-1997, calculating an index of job segregation by (1) industry, (2) status of work, and (3) occupation. Gender representation has become more unbalanced across industries, with most of the gender gap occurring between 1986 and 1995. Women have tended to concentrate more than men on paid employment; self-employment and business ownership have been more male-oriented. Nevertheless, segregation by status of work has been stable. Segregation by occupation has soared, however, more than *doubling* over the 1986-1995 span and nearly *tripling* for 1978-1997. Gender gaps in clerical, service, and production jobs also have widened substantially.

In an earlier study, Hou (1991) reported that hardly any of the observed gender wage gap in Taiwan could be explained by occupational segregation. His analysis covered the 1978-1985 period. This study has shown that there was comparatively little occupational segregation over this span. Thus, it should not be surprising that Hou's study attributed little influence to job segregation as a determinant of wage discrimination.

The evidence presented in this study also showed the dramatic increase in the gender segregation in terms of occupation since then. As the increase in occupation segregation occurred around the same time as the economic take-off of Taiwan, we hypothesized that the increased diversity of jobs as a result of economic development (in contrast to

¹⁰ If sufficiently detailed microeconomic data were available for Taiwan over time, then the issue of occupational selection could be analyzed in more detail.

the economic growth) may have led to the observed apparent “deterioration” of gender segregation. Indeed, regression analysis supports this hypothesis. After controlling for economic “growth” and structural change (to account for the economic take-off), the data exhibits a strong positive association between economic development and the increase in gender segregation across occupation. Due to data limitations, we cannot proclaim a definitive conclusion. However, the evidence we have shown here is certainly tantalizing.

In addition, Figure 3 does seem to suggest that the magnitude of gender segregation by occupation may be on the down swing. Whether this is genuine, or simply in the eyes of the beholder, is too early to tell. If it is decreasing, then it does raise another interesting prospect: an inverted U-shaped segregation curve. In other words, the degree of segregation (by occupation) rises with industrialization, and when the economy is fully industrialized and matured, segregation begins to decline. This is merely speculation at this point, as we have even weaker evidence to substantiate this. However, if this relationship does exist, it may be more real than some of the other inverted U-shaped relationships that has been presented in the literature, as we are using a pure time series data.¹¹

Another important aspect of gender discrimination is in the wage gap. Kao, Polachek, and Wunnava (1994) found that differences in lifetime work incentives were largely responsible for the gender wage gap observed in Taiwan. They predicted that as labor force participation of females increased relative to that of males, the gender wage gap would narrow. Indeed, female labor force participation has grown relative to that of males. But what if occupational segregation (as we have found) leads women to be crowded into relatively low-paying occupations?

Given the recent dramatic rise in occupational segregation, previous studies of the extent of job and wage discrimination in Taiwan should be reconsidered.¹² We would expect future research to examine whether the significant shift in occupational patterns occurring during Taiwan? rapid economic development can be attributed to pernicious job discrimination or some purposeful but benign change in labor supply behavior. It also remains to be seen whether increased job segregation has resulted in wage discrimination against women.

We also should examine whether the Taiwan pattern is shared with the other three Tigers (Hong Kong, South Korea, and Singapore). If the answer is yes, then it would be overwhelming evidence supporting our welfare-improving self-selection hypothesis. If the patterns in these other countries are counter to the pattern seen in Taiwan, then further study is needed to answer the question of why Taiwan is unique.

In addition to the NICs, the economies in transition also present a unique opportunity to study the effect of economic structural change on the gender segregation (and other forms of discrimination) in the labor market. We believe that a dramatic rise in the segregation index must be present. The reason is simple. Gender equality was politically imposed by the “classless” idealism of the Communism ideology. With the fall of communism, the labor market is perhaps returning to its “discriminating” nature. In other words, the rise in gender segregation is most likely benign than what we observed in Taiwan. The degree may vary. For example, it is perhaps more discriminatory in Russia, while the cause in China may be more mixed (i.e. real discrimination combined with some degree of self-selection).

References

- [1]Beller, A.H., “Changes in the Sex Composition of U.S. Occupations, 1960-1981”, *Journal of Human Resources*, Vol. 20, pp.235–250, 1985
- [2]Duncan, O.D., and B. Duncan, “A Methodological Analysis of Segregation Indexes”, *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 20, pp.210–217, 1955
- [3]Enders, W. (1995). *Applied Econometric Time Series*, New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1995
- [4]Fuchs, V.R., (1989). “Women's Quest for Economic Equality”, *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Vol. 3, pp.25–41, 1989.
- [5]Fuess, S.M. Jr., and B.S. Lee, “Government Reforms, Economic Restructuring, and the Employment of Women: South Korea, 1980–92”, in Aslanbeigui, N., Pressman, S., and Summerfield, G. (Eds.), *Women in the Age of Economic Transformation*, Routledge, London, pp. 145–159, 1994

11 The celebrated Kuznets Curve is perhaps the most well known. Though the original work of Kuznets (1955, 1963) was based on time series data, most of the ensuing research have relied on mostly cross section data and hence much more suspect as one can sometimes reverse the result simply by eliminating one or two countries (the outliers) from the sample.

12 With women concentrated more in clerical and service occupations and men tending to work more in executive and production jobs, the gender wage gap may well have widened. This prediction is supported by preliminary findings of Hou and Huang (2007), which can be viewed as a follow up of Hou (1991).

- [6]Fuess, S.M. Jr., and H. van den Berg, "Transactional Activities and Total Factor Productivity Growth in Taiwan", *Journal of Asian Economics*, Vol. 7, pp.635–650, 1996.
- [7]Gannicott, K., "Women, Wages, and Discrimination: Some Evidence from Taiwan", *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, Vol. 34, pp.721–730, 1986
- [8]Hashimoto, M., *The Japanese Labor Market in a Comparative Perspective with the United States*, W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, Kalamazoo, MI, 1990.
- [9]Hou, J.W., "Wage Comparison by Gender and the Effect of Job Segregation: the Case of Taiwan", *China Economic Review*, Vol. 22, pp.195-214, 1991.
- [10]Hou, J.W., "Public-Private Wage Comparison: The Case of Taiwan," *Journal of Asian Economics*, Vol 4, No. 2, pp.347–362, 1993.
- [11]Hou, J.W., "The 'Engine' of Taiwan's Economic Growth: A Path Analysis Approach", *Singapore Economic Review*, Vol. 41, No. 1, pp.25–46, 1996.
- [12]Hou, J.W. and Y.L. Huang, "Gender Wage Gap: Real vs. Potential Experience", working paper, 2008.
- [13]Houseman, S.N., and K.G. Abraham, "Female Workers as a Buffer in the Japanese Economy", *American Economic Review*, Vol. 83, pp.45–51, 1993.
- [14]Johansen, S., "Estimation and Hypothesis Testing of Cointegration Vectors in Gaussian Vector Autoregressive Models", *Econometrica*, Vol. 59, pp.1551–1580, 1991.
- [15]Kao, C., Polachek, S.W., and P.W. Wunnava, "Male-Female Wage Differentials in Taiwan: a Human Capital Approach", *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, Vol. 42, pp.351–374. , 1994.
- [16]King, M.C., "Occupational Segregation by Race and Sex, 1940-88", *Monthly Labor Review*, Vol. 115, pp.30–37, 1992.
- [17]Kuznets, S., "Economic Growth and Income Inequality", *American Economic Review*, Vol. 45, No.1, pp.1–28, 1955.
- [18]Kuznets, S., "Quantitative Aspects of the Economic Growth of Nations", *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, Vol. 11, No. 1, pp.1–80, 1963.
- [19]Rostow, W.W., *The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960.
- [20]Wang, R.J., "From Elitism to Mass Higher Education in Taiwan: The Problems Faced", *Higher Education*, Vol. 46, No. 3, pp.261–287, 2003.