Chapter 3

WHO PAYS FOR GENDER DE-INSTITUTIONALIZATION?

Shelley Wilcox

In debates about gender identities within national contexts, some feminists implicitly refer to globalization as a positive catalyst for change, while employing a one-dimensional analytical lens that obviates the diverse effects of globalization on women's lives. For instance, in feminist discussions in the United States, it is sometimes suggested that women have overcome many of the constraints once imposed upon them by traditional gender roles and expectations. Paradigmatic examples of this "de-institutionalization" of gender involve women's increased participation in the public sphere, a process facilitated by the expansion of capitalist markets. Yet, while more married, middle-class American women are employed than ever before, and women have made notable advances in professions once closed to them, an intersectional and transnational feminist analysis reveals that gender de-institutionalization under globalization is highly uneven, both within and across national boundaries. In the United States, expanding opportunities in the public sphere have enabled many white, middle-class women to develop new gender identities. How-

ever, these liberatory identities are increasingly predicated upon a "re-institutionalization" of traditional gender identities for the migrant workers who replace them in the domestic sphere.

This paper explores this paradox of paid domestic work within the global context of the feminization of labor migration, global economic restructuring, and an increasingly "international division of domestic labor."[1] It proceeds as follows. Section I describes the cultural, social, and economic contexts of paid domestic work in the United States. Sections II and III develop my normative evaluation of the practice. I begin by discussing several feminist criticisms of commodified domestic work, and then I argue that the practice contributes to the exploitation of individual domestic workers by employers, migrants by citizens, and ultimately, the global South by the global North. In Section IV, I recommend several policy reforms to remedy these injustices. Finally, Section V highlights some general conclusions concerning the themes of this collection that follow from my arguments.

DOMESTIC WORK IN THE UNITED STATES

The demand for domestic services has been rising steadily in the United States. Upper-class women have always employed domestic workers to clean their homes and provide personal care for themselves and their children. Recently, however, middle-class women also have begun to hire domestic workers as a strategy for managing the demands of the double workday. As we know, more middle-class women participate in the US labor force now than ever before, and

many have advanced in professional occupations in the technology, legal, pharmaceutical, and business and financial sectors, which have flourished under global restructuring.[2] However, stubborn patriarchal attitudes continue to shape women's choices in both the public and private spheres. Women with professional careers must conform to a masculine career model emphasizing professionalism, competition, individualism, and commitment, measured in terms of progressively longer hours on the job. Yet despite women's participation in male-modeled professions, a sexual division of labor based on traditional gender roles stubbornly persists in heterosexual households. Although most men do more childcare and housework than their fathers, the burden for these duties stills rest primarily upon women, even in dual career households.[3]

Ironically, standards for home cleanliness have increased as more middle-class women have begun to participate in the labor force.[4] Standards for proper childrearing have also changed dramatically, as middle-class professionals have become increasingly influenced by "the ideology of intensive and competitive mothering."[5] According to this model of parenting, the standards for successful mothering are measured in terms of the ability to raise children who will have a competitive advantage in a capitalist society. As Tronto explains:

> Mothers are urged to provide their children with the right music, to have them participate in the best activities, attend the right schools, and so forth, to improve their chances later on in life. . . . While mothers may unselfishly love their children and try to do the best for them, in a

> competitive society they must also try to gain and keep competitive advantage over other people's children.[6]

Intensive and competitive mothering is costly, in terms of both the money it requires and the tremendous demands it places on mothers' physical, mental, and emotional energies.

To meet the gendered requirements of the public and private spheres, many middle-class women find it necessary to delegate some of their household and caring responsibilities to other women. Historically, female family members have been available to care for the children of their working relatives. Today, however, many extended families are too geographically dispersed to share day-to-day domestic responsibilities, and many of the sisters, aunts, and grandmothers who once might have helped out are themselves working outside the home. In absence of adequate public funding for social services, such as childcare, working women increasingly turn to the market for needed domestic goods and services, including prepared meals, housecleaning services, day care, and a variety of lessons and activities for their children. However, there is a relative scarcity of affordable, convenient, high-quality childcare centers and preschools, especially those that will accept infants and toddlers. Even when such facilities are available, many parents fear that these settings do not provide a sufficiently enriching environment for their children. For many working parents, hiring a private domestic worker is an attractive alternative. Domestic workers provide convenience and flexibility not available in day care programs, and many parents believe private childcare workers offer more consistent, personal, and intensive care for their children.[7] Ironically, private domestic

workers also may be less expensive than formal service providers, especially if employers avoid paying wage and social security taxes. These savings are multiplied if a single domestic worker serves as both nanny and housekeeper.

Domestic workers perform the domestic duties assigned to women under the sexual division of labor, including cleaning, laundry, mending, gardening, cooking, and the care of children and other family members. Sociologist Pierrette Hondagneu-Sotelo distinguishes three common types of domestic jobs.[8] Live-in nanny/housekeepers live and work full-time for one family, usually doing both housework and childcare. Live-out nanny/housekeepers also work full-time for one family, doing both housework and childcare, but live in their own homes. Housecleaners clean houses, working for several employers on a contractual basis, and usually do not do childcare. My analysis will focus on live-in and live-out nanny/housekeepers.[9]

Owing to its historical legacy in slavery, native-born African-American women predominated in these domestic positions until well into the twentieth century, when the 1964 Civil Rights Act made it possible for many black women to enter occupations previously formally closed to them. In different historical periods, different groups of migrant women also have been overrepresented as domestic workers. Until the beginning of World War II, domestic work was the most common source of employment for European migrant women, most of whom initially migrated as wives or daughters of labor migrants and then were forced into wage work to supplement the low incomes of their husbands and fathers. Today, the US demand for private domestic workers is filled by growing numbers of women from Mexico, Latin

America, and the Caribbean who themselves migrate to find work, often without their families. Neo-liberal globalization has contributed to this feminization of labor migration. Trade liberalization and the associated deregulation of labor markets have increased economic inequalities between countries in the global North and those in the global South. As a result, middle-class women in developing countries often can earn higher incomes as domestic workers in the United States than as teachers, nurses, or administrative or clerical workers in their home countries. Structural adjustment policies, imposed by the IMF and WTO, have led to significant cutbacks in social services in many developing countries. These neo-liberal cutbacks have exacerbated economic insecurity, thereby impelling more women to consider labor migration as a means to support their families. Indeed, remittances sent by female labor migrants play an increasingly important role in helping national economies service their foreign debt.

EVALUATING THE PRACTICE OF PRIVATE, PAID DOMESTIC WORK

In the previous section, I described domestic work and situated it the context of the sexual division of domestic labor, ideological models of parenting, global economic restructuring, and the feminization of labor migration. While I have implied that these phenomena are morally dubious, I have not argued that practice of paid domestic work itself is unjust. In this section, I will discuss four feminist objections to domestic work, paying particular attention to the ways in which immigration

and citizenship status intersects with the axes of gender, race/ethnicity, and class to increase domestic workers' vulnerability to disrespect, mistreatment, and abuse.[10]

POOR WAGES AND LACK OF EMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

Private, paid domestic work is distinctive in being regarded as something other than real employment.[11] Cultural notions of domestic work contribute to this understanding. Domestic work takes place in the home, which is considered to be a place for kinship and leisure, and thus by nature antithetical to work. Moreover, domestic tasks are associated with women's so-called natural expression of love for their families and thus not considered "real work" at all. These cultural understandings of domestic work contribute to its low social status and market value. Hours are long for domestic workers and wages are extremely low, particularly for live-in workers.[12] Domestic workers usually do not receive health insurance, retirement benefits, worker's compensation, or paid sick leave or vacation.[13] The ambiguous, quasi-familial position of domestic workers within the household also increases their vulnerability to economic abuse.[14] Employers who view domestic workers as "just like part of the family" are less likely to think of themselves as employers, with a responsibility to pay taxes and provide employment benefits. Though rarely genuinely treated as such, domestic workers who believe they are considered to be part of the family may feel too guilty to ask for a day off, request a raise, or demand overtime pay.

Migrant domestic workers almost universally earn lower wages than native-born workers.[15] The idea that domestic

work is a "bridging occupation" is thought by some to justify this wage disparity.[16] The occupation is often described as entry-level position for migrant women, offering social mobility and the ability to move on to higher-status and better-paying jobs. Some theorists go so far as to praise domestic work for "furnishing rural, traditional immigrant women with exposure to the modern world in a protected and supervised environment" thus giving them opportunities to learn middle-class values and preparing them to enter the formal labor market.[17] The patronizing, sexist, and ethnocentric notion that "traditional" migrant women benefit from modernization belies the fact that many of the migrant women working as private domestic workers in the United States are college-educated and held relatively high status jobs in their home countries. Moreover, although domestic work was a transitional occupation for some earlier European immigrants, the class- and race-stratified US labor market ensures that most migrant women today experience domestic work not as an intermediary occupation, but rather as an occupational ghetto that neither pays the bills nor provides access to better-paying jobs.

DIFFICULT WORKING CONDITIONS, DISRESPECTFUL TREATMENT, AND ABUSE

Working conditions for private domestic workers can be as bad as the wages. Since domestic workers work in the private space of their employers, they have little power or authority within their workplace.[18] Their lack of autonomy is complicated by the asymmetrical yet personal nature of the

employer-domestic worker relationship and the inequalities based on class, race/ethnicity, and citizenship/immigration status that inevitably shape it. Domestic workers are immersed in the details of the lives of their employers, yet structural inequalities often prevent employers and workers from forming relationships of genuine mutuality and respect. Employers exercise a great deal of power over domestic workers and may change the terms of employment, act erratically, or insult or degrade workers.[19] Since there are no universally accepted standards for what counts as good housework or childcare, employers may hold workers to unreasonable standards. If the employer-worker relationship is especially personal and emotionally charged, employers may become critical of workers for reasons that have nothing to do with their job performance. Employers may even fire domestic workers whom they perceive as rivals for the affection of their children. Domestic workers are vulnerable to sexual harassment or abuse by household members.

Working conditions are especially difficult for live-in workers, who have precious little time or space to call their own.[20] Since they live with their employers, these workers are essentially on call both day and night. Some are required to share a child's bedroom, and even those who have their own private rooms report that they feel uncomfortable using other rooms of the house, including the kitchen. Ironically, although live-in domestic workers are usually surrounded by other people, many suffer from intense loneliness and social isolation. Undocumented migrants are more likely to seek live-in domestic employment than other domestic workers. Although many newly arrived immigrants choose live-in work in order to minimize their expenses and secure

urgently needed housing, undocumented immigrants, many of whom are terrified of deportation, seek live-in positions as protection against exposure to immigration officials and the police. However, the costs of live-in work may outweigh the benefits, since live-in domestic workers are especially likely to experience overwork, lack of privacy, disrespectful treatment, sexual harassment, and isolation.[21]

OPPORTUNITIES FOR RECOURSE

In most jobs, workers have several options for resisting disrespectful treatment and employer abuses. Workers can form unions, engage in collective bargaining, and ultimately go on strike. In absence of collective action, individual workers can refuse to perform the most oppressive of their assigned duties and report severe abuses to regulatory authorities. However, the private and relational nature of domestic work complicates each of these options for domestic workers. Domestic workers have few opportunities for collective action because they work in separate households. Since care is inherently relational, domestic workers cannot shirk their caring responsibilities without imposing tremendous harm on their charges.[22] Most domestic workers are reluctant to put the children they care for at risk, and especially so once they have developed ongoing caring relationships with them.

Furthermore, because domestic work takes place in the private sphere of the home, few legal protections pertain to domestic workers. Indeed, domestic workers are explicitly excluded from coverage under three of the four most important federal employment laws in the United States: the

National Labor Relations Act, which guarantees workers the right to organize and engage in collective bargaining; the Occupational Safety and Health Act, which protects workers against occupational hazards; and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibits workplace discrimination. The Fair Labor Standards Act, which guarantees the right to receive minimum wages and overtime pay, was amended in 1974 to include most private domestic workers.[23] However, it still exempts personal attendants, including nannies, from minimum wage and overtime protections, and live-in employees from overtime coverage.[24] Some state employment statutes provide partial remedies to these exclusions. New York, for instance, requires employers to pay overtime to live-in workers who work more than forty hours per week.[25] However, most state laws reinforce federal exclusions, exempting employers of domestic workers from worker's compensation requirements, state anti-discrimination protections, and state occupational safety regulations.[26]

Recent nativist immigration legislation creates additional obstacles for migrant domestic workers who wish to leave oppressive jobs. Ironically, while migrant women are increasingly chosen to reproduce traditional American families, immigrants are popularly represented as a threat to the American way of life. Critics contend that immigrants, and especially undocumented immigrants, cause severe social problems in the United States, including overburdened public schools and social welfare programs.[27] Underlying this charge is the assumption that migrant women enter the United States to obtain social services and ultimately citizenship for their children. This sexist, racist, and xenophobic rhetoric, which scapegoats migrant women for

domestic social ills, has initiated a series of legislation that bars nearly all non-citizens, both documented and undocumented, from access to most publicly funded social services. While there is no evidence that such restrictive legislation reduces the alleged social costs of immigration, these laws intensify the vulnerability of migrant domestic workers by constraining their options should they wish to leave oppressive or abusive jobs.

TRANSNATIONAL MOTHERHOOD

Like most working mothers, domestic workers often must struggle to find good childcare for their children while they are at work. This task can be especially difficult for migrant domestic workers, since migrant women, particularly those without papers, often must leave their families behind in their home countries when they travel to the United States in search of work. Most migrant domestic workers leave their children in the care of grandmothers, other female relatives, or husbands; some hire nannies either as sole care providers or as aids to family caregivers. Feminists have demonstrated that isolationist, privatized mothering is a culturally specific model; however, this model informs many migrant women's ideals about parenting.[28] Thus, as Parreñas points out, domestic work is both a "labor of love" and a "labor of sorrow" for many migrant women.[29] Migrant domestic workers are able to send needed remittances home to their families, yet they must transgress deeply ingrained ideals about good mothering in order to do so. Migrant women sometimes are criticized for "abandoning" their families, and many report that feelings of anxiety, helplessness, loss, guilt, and loneliness are associated with their separation.[30] The emotional strains of transnational parenting can be further intensified by the caring tasks of domestic work.[31] Although children in transnational families appreciate the material gains provided by their migrant mothers, they also experience intense feelings of loneliness, insecurity, and vulnerability.[32]

PRIVATE, PAID DOMESTIC WORK AS EXPLOITATION

In the previous section, I discussed four feminist criticisms of paid domestic work. Some feminists conclude from these criticisms that hiring domestic workers is intrinsically unjust because it harms domestic workers and their children.[33] While I do not wish to deny that such harms occur, I believe that attempts to capture the injustices involved in paid domestic work solely in terms of individual morality are misguided, for three reasons. First, the claim that hiring domestic workers is *intrinsically* unjust falsely implies that employers necessarily harm the domestic workers they employ. While the practice of paid domestic work certainly involves significant moral hazards as it is currently structured, at least some employers are aware of these hazards and treat the domestic workers they employ with the appropriate professional respect.

Second, the claim that hiring domestic workers is intrinsically unjust would seem to blame individual working women for the childcare decisions of their families without acknowledging the broader, patriarchal context in which

these decisions are made. I have argued that several factors influence the decision to hire a private, domestic worker, including the masculine professional career model, the sexual division of labor, the lack of affordable, high-quality public childcare, and increased standards for home cleanliness and proper childrearing. While the ideologies underlying the latter standards arguably should be discounted or ignored, the former three factors place real structural constraints on working women with children. Failing to acknowledge the ways in which these patriarchal constraints shape childcare decisions leaves these constraints unproblematized and may play into the hands of cultural conservatives who wish to see middle-class women return to the home.

Finally, evaluating the practice of paid domestic work solely in terms of individual morality provides too narrow an account of the injustices associated with it. Since individual morality focuses on the relationship between individual employers and domestic workers, it tends to ignore the broader political and economic forces in which the practice is embedded. These realities not only constrain childcare decisions as I have mentioned, but also shape the practice itself in ways that contribute to its injustice. To evaluate paid domestic work within this broader context, it is necessary to analyze the practice in terms of its potential for exploitation. Theorizing paid domestic work as an exploitative practice is particularly conductive to the global context because it enables us to articulate its associated injustices as injustices between groups.

According to a general normative account of exploitation, such as that developed by Iris Marion Young, exploitation "occurs through a steady process of the transfer of the results of the labor of one social group to benefit another" in absence of adequate recognition or fair remuneration.[34] Furthermore, the social rules that govern the labor—the rules that determine the meaning of the work and the conditions under which it is carried out—enact relations of power and inequality between the groups. These relations of inequality are reproduced, in Young's words, "through a systematic process in which the energies of the have-nots are continuously expended to maintain and augment the power, status, and wealth of the haves."[35] Importantly, while the exploiting group is enhanced in this process, the exploited group is diminished by even "more than the amount of the transfer, because [members of the group] suffer from material deprivation and a loss of control, and hence are deprived of important elements of self-respect."[36]

According to this account of exploitation, employers tend to exploit domestic workers in much the same way that housewives are exploited within the patriarchal family.[37] Like patriarchal husbands, female employers clearly benefit from the labor of domestic workers. Hiring a domestic worker frees female employers from the day-to-day execution of their culturally assigned domestic duties, thereby enabling them to participate in the public sphere as equals to men. In this way, domestic workers allow their employers to develop non-traditional gender identities outside their roles as mothers. Yet, since the "products" of commodified domestic work—clean homes and well-tended children—tend to be attributed to employers, women who hire domestic workers may also satisfy cultural expectations for good mothering. In this way, domestic workers enable employers to enjoy the

advantages of gender de-institutionalization without sacrificing the more traditional aspects of their gender identities. However, since domestic work is socially devalued as "women's work" and largely invisible, even to those who benefit the most from it, domestic workers rarely receive the compensation and recognition they deserve.

Like patriarchal husbands and housewives, employers and domestic workers enter into the employment relationship from very different social positions. Although employers and domestic workers are typically both women, they are almost invariably differentiated by class, race/ethnicity, and citizenship/immigration status. Domestic work reproduces these structural inequalities. By performing work that employers cannot or wish not to do, domestic workers enhance the labor market position and social status of their employers, yet because domestic work is socially devalued and underpaid, domestic workers receive no comparative socio-economic gain. Moreover, given the asymmetrical power relations between employers and domestic workers, their daily interactions often enact systems of domination and inequality similar to those played out in patriarchal households. Like traditional housewives, domestic workers often suffer from the dependency, social isolation, and loss of self-respect that accompanies working alone in the home.

This suggests that the practice of paid domestic work is conducive to the exploitation of domestic workers. However, the exploitation associated with domestic work is not confined to individual employers and domestic workers. Since most domestic workers are migrants and most employers are citizens, the practice also contributes to the broader exploitation of migrant workers by US citizens. Like domestic

workers, other labor migrants perform socially necessary labor; in addition to domestic work, migrants are overrepresented in the agriculture, construction, and garment industries. Yet while migrant workers perform some of the most arduous, dangerous, and degraded jobs in the country—work that citizens themselves refuse to do—they typically receive poverty-level wages and are denied health insurance, retirement benefits, and paid sick leave, while being vilified in the media for "stealing" Americans' jobs. Moreover, the rules that govern migrant labor, as codified in US employment law and immigration policy, formalize stark inequalities between migrant workers and citizens. Employment laws tend to exclude occupations in which migrants predominate, thereby providing migrant workers with fewer legal protections than citizen workers. Migrant workers are also systematically excluded from most of the civil, social, and political rights granted to citizens. This two-tiered system of rights, together with other policies designed to prevent the long-term settlement of migrant workers, enable US citizens to exploit the disempowerment and disenfranchisement of migrant workers. Undocumented migrant workers are especially vulnerable to such exploitation because the fear of discovery and deportation usually prevents them from exercising the few legal rights they possess.

The practice of paid domestic work also contributes to an international division of labor in which migrant women from the global South increasingly reproduce the families of citizens in the global North. This international division of labor is exploitative insofar as it enables citizens in the United States to benefit from the labor of migrant domestic workers while externalizing its social costs to their home

countries. Legal restrictions on the social rights of migrant workers and policies preventing family members from accompanying them facilitate this transfer. Immigration admissions policies also play an important role. Current admissions policies strongly privilege "skilled" workers, such as engineers, physicians, and academics, over "unskilled" workers, such as nannies and housekeepers. By arbitrarily limiting the number of domestic workers legally admitted, despite the increasing domestic demand for their labor, these policies leave domestic workers no choice but to migrate through irregular channels. Since undocumented immigrants have even fewer social rights than documented immigrants, virtually the entire social cost of their labor is externalized to their countries of origin.

REMEDYING EXPLOITATION

I have argued that although hiring domestic workers is not intrinsically unjust, the practice of paid domestic work is conducive to various forms of exploitation and may involve harms to individual domestic workers. In this section, I will discuss several reforms required to remedy these injustices. First, regulations must be implemented to improve the occupation for domestic workers in the United States. Formalizing and regulating domestic jobs is a necessary first step. Existing federal and state employment regulations, including minimum wage, overtime, social security, employee safety, and anti-discrimination laws, should be strengthened to provide full protection to all domestic workers, including live-in workers and personal attendants, without regard to

immigration status. Domestic workers and their employers should be informed of their legal rights and obligations under these regulations and the laws should be enforced consistently. Formalizing employment through written contracts would allow domestic workers to negotiate the terms of their employment. Moreover, by depersonalizing the employer-domestic worker relationship, formal employment contracts may also encourage employers to see themselves as employers and to treat workers more consistently and with greater respect.[38] Formalization may also enhance opportunities for labor organization and collective action in pursuit of improved wages and working conditions.

However, formalizing and regulating paid domestic work will not suffice to remedy the problems of structural injustice that leave domestic workers vulnerable to exploitation. Racial, ethnic, gender, and class stratification in the labor market disadvantage domestic workers, as does discrimination on the basis of immigration status. Acknowledging the real social and economic value of domestic work may help to ease these contributing factors. Formalization is a first step toward improving wages, working conditions, and benefits for domestic workers. Yet as many feminists have argued, domestic work will not be properly valued as long as the sexual division of domestic labor remains firmly in place. Of course, men must do their fair share of housework and childcare in order to eliminate this division of labor. Policies to help equalize the care burden along gender lines, such as more generous parental leave allowances, and increased state funding for the provision of childcare may also play an important role in increasing the perceived social and economic value of domestic work.

Since current US immigration policy increases the vulnerability of migrant workers to exploitation, preventing the exploitation of domestic workers will also require progressive immigration reform along the following four lines. First, access to publicly funded social services should be restored to all long-term immigrants and their dependents, regardless of their immigration status. Such access would remove one important obstacle to leaving exploitative jobs. However, merely extending social rights to migrant domestic workers will not sufficiently diminish the existing inequalities between migrant workers and citizen employers. As long as civil and political rights are linked to citizenship, migrant workers will be vulnerable to exploitation unless they have access to naturalized citizenship. Thus, second, a short path to citizenship should be established for all long-term immigrants, including undocumented immigrants and immigrants who originally entered on temporary worker visas. This policy should include full "amnesty" for undocumented workers already living in the United States. Third, immigrant admissions policies should index employment visas to the national demand for domestic labor. This would increase the number of visas available to domestic workers, thereby ensuring that workers who migrate to the United States to meet domestic labor demands are able to do so through regular channels. Fourth, family reunification policies should be expanded to allow migrant parents to bring their children with them to the United States.

Finally, a comprehensive remedy to the injustices involved in domestic work must acknowledge that global economic restructuring, and particularly neo-liberal structural adjustment policies, play a large role in stimulating

labor migration. The decision to migrate for work should reflect a voluntary choice, not a desperate response to avoidable local poverty. Thus, global economic policies should be revaluated from the standpoint of the global poor and reformed to meet their needs.

CONCLUSIONS

I have argued that in absence of broad reforms, the practice of paid domestic work is unjust. I would like to conclude this essay by relating my arguments more explicitly to the topic of gender identity and globalization. As I have argued, the practice of paid domestic work, which is necessitated by the lack of publicly funded childcare and facilitated by the feminization of labor migration, enables some class-privileged American women to meet the gendered demands of the public and private spheres. Hiring a domestic worker allows female employers to participate in the public sphere as equals to men while ensuring that their culturally imposed domestic duties are fulfilled. Employers of domestic workers are thus able to develop new, more liberatory gender identities while retaining some of the positive aspects of traditional gender identities, specifically, the identification as good mothers. However, since the sexual division of labor remains firmly in place, the oppressive aspects of traditional gender identities have not been abolished, but rather transferred to the migrant women who replace these privileged women in the private sphere. Paradoxically, the positive aspects of traditional gender identities may be unavailable to domestic workers since the job often entails long separations from their own families.

Two general conclusions can be drawn from my analysis, each of which is itself an invitation to further discussion. First, I have shown that gendered ideologies, social structures, and juridical systems continue to shape the identities of women. Since gender is mediated by other systems of inequality, including class, race/ethnicity, and importantly, citizenship/immigration status, it follows that gender de-institutionalization is an uneven process. Second, my analysis suggests that gender identities are no longer formed solely within distinct nation-states, but rather in relation to global politics and economic restructuring. Within this context, women's gender identities are developed not only in relation to men and masculinity, but also in relation to other women, and increasingly to women of different nationalities. Thus, under globalization, the gender identities that some women experience as liberatory may depend upon the imposition of oppressive gender identities upon other women. While gender de-institutionalization is certainly a worthwhile feminist goal, we ought not fully embrace its instantiations without first subjecting them to an intersectional and transnational feminist analysis.