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#### Abstract

In the $21^{\text {st }}$ century globalized world, each country is striving to grow be it high, uppermiddle, lower-middle, or low-income countries. The regional groups; SAARC and SADC have mixed of both lower-middle-income economies and upper-middle-income economies. The abundance of labour resources and natural resources distinguishes it from all other regional groups. These regional groups face structural dualism, institutional dualism, and wage dualism as the greatest challenge. Male and female labour force participation is important for the faster growth of any economy. The economies of both regional groups show variation in female labour force participation. The study aims to examine the female labour force participation in SAARC and SADC countries. It tries to analyze the impact of access to clean fuels and technologies for cooking and access to electricity on female labour force participation in SAARC and SADC countries. The study tries to co-relate the factors and tries to look at the trend of all three; female labour force participation rate, access to clean fuels and technologies for cooking and access to electricity from 2000 to 2019. The findings derived from this study are anticipated to help the two regional blocs and other similar developing countries worldwide to partially attain the clean energy transition targets mentioned under the 2030 Sustainable Development Goals agenda of the United Nations. The move of the clean energy transition will not only improve the health of females but will save their time as well to participate in the labour force if they are willing to do so. The recommendations made in the paper will be valuable for policymakers to understand the role of females in nation-building and will push the Government's attention towards strengthening the existing policies and formulating new policies.
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## 1. Introduction

In the $21^{\text {st }}$ century globalized world, each country is striving to grow be it high, upper-middle, lower-middle or lowincome countries. To achieve high economic growth efficient use of factors for production is a must. The regional groups; SAARC and SADC have mixed of both lower-middle-income economies and upper-middle-income economies. The abundance of labor resources and natural resources distinguishes it from all other regional groups. These regional groups face structural dualism, institutional dualism, and wage dualism as the greatest challenge. Male and female labor

[^0]force participation is important for the faster growth of any economy. The economies of both regional groups show variation in female labor force participation. The study aims to examine the female labor force participation in SAARC and SADC countries. It tries to analyze the impact of access to clean fuels and technologies for cooking and access to electricity on female labor force participation in SAARC and SADC countries. The study tries to co-relate the factors and tries to look at the trend of all three; female labor force participation rate, access to clean fuels and technologies for cooking and access to electricity from 2000 to 2019. Access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy, and increase in women's empowerment and participation in decision-making/politics are core to the attainment of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) of the United Nations (UN). It highlights the importance of clean energy-based infrastructural development for the participation of females in the labor force and the prosperity of these two regional groups. This study separately estimates the effects of access to clean fuels and technologies for cooking and access to electricity on FLFPR of low-, lower-middle-, and upper-middle-income member countries of SAARC and SADC. The findings derived from this study are anticipated to help the two regional blocs and other similar developing countries worldwide to partially attain the clean energy transition targets mentioned under the 2030 Sustainable Development Goals agenda of the United Nations. The move of the clean energy transition will not only improve the health of females but will save their time as well to participate in the labor force if they are willing to do so. The recommendations made in the paper will be valuable for policymakers to understand the role of females in nation-building and will push the Government's attention towards strengthening the existing policies and formulating new policies.

## 2. Concept Methodology

South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) and Southern African Development Community (SADC); the two regional groups; one from South Asia and the other from South Africa are selected for the present study. All the Eight-member nations of SAARC and out of the fifteen-member nations of SADC nine nations are selected for the research work (The countries are selected on the basis of significant changes in FLFPR in the regional group). These regional groups represent a mix of world bank classifications of countries based on income levels. The study is based on a qualitative, analytical, descriptive and comparative study of female labor force participation from 2000 to 2019. It examines the trend of access to clean fuels and technologies for cooking (\% of the population) and access to electricity (\% of the population) in these member countries to understand the implication of changes in these two factors on female labor force participation. The data is taken from ILO Modeled Estimates and world bank database; World Development Indicators for the time period from 2000 to 2019. The two factors indicate the infrastructural development of any country. Unpaid work such as cooking is mostly the responsibility of women in almost all countries of the world. In lower-middle and upper-middle-income economies, due to poor infrastructural development, low income of individuals and lower skill, availability and affordability become barriers in accessing electricity. Accessing clean fuels and technologies for cooking and accessing electricity can reduce time spent by females on unpaid work, will provide them convenience and improve their health. It will encourage females to participate in paid work.

## 3. SAARC and SADC: Income-Based Classification

The World Bank assigns the world's economies to four income groups-low, lower-middle, upper-middle, and highincome countries.

| Table 1: World Bank Country Classifications by Income Level: <br> July 1, 2020 (Old) and July 1, 2021 (New) - (in \$) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Group | July 1, 2021 (New) | July 1, 2020 (Old) |
| Low income |  |  |
| Lower-middle income | $1,046-4,095$ | $1,035-4,045$ |
| Upper-middle income | $4,096-12,695$ | $4,046-12,535$ |
| High income | $>12,695$ | $>12,535$ |

Table 2: GNI per Capita, Atlas Method (Current US\$) in SAARC Countries

| Year | Afghanistan | Bangladesh | Bhutan | Maldives | Nepal | Pakistan | Sri Lanka | India |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AFG | BGD | BTN | MDV | NPL | PAK | LKA | IND |
| 2000 | .. | 440 | 700 | 2070 | 230 | 480 | 870 | 440 |
| 2001 | .. | 440 | 750 | 2240 | 240 | 510 | 830 | 450 |
| 2002 | .. | 440 | 810 | 2620 | 240 | 530 | 840 | 460 |
| 2003 | .. | 460 | 910 | 3400 | 260 | 570 | 940 | 520 |
| 2004 | .. | 510 | 1030 | 3770 | 280 | 660 | 1060 | 610 |
| 2005 | .. | 550 | 1200 | 3460 | 310 | 740 | 1210 | 710 |
| 2006 | .. | 570 | 1330 | 4540 | 340 | 800 | 1360 | 790 |
| 2007 | . | 610 | 1640 | 4480 | 370 | 860 | 1550 | 910 |
| 2008 | . | 660 | 1770 | 5420 | 430 | 920 | 1790 | 1000 |
| 2009 | 450 | 730 | 1860 | 5460 | 480 | 950 | 2010 | 1120 |
| 2010 | 510 | 800 | 2040 | 5960 | 540 | 970 | 2410 | 1220 |
| 2011 | 530 | 890 | 2240 | 6590 | 630 | 1030 | 2850 | 1360 |
| 2012 | 630 | 970 | 2390 | 6630 | 770 | 1120 | 3360 | 1480 |
| 2013 | 650 | 1040 | 2410 | 6800 | 860 | 1210 | 3490 | 1520 |
| 2014 | 630 | 1110 | 2460 | 7320 | 880 | 1230 | 3640 | 1560 |
| 2015 | 590 | 1220 | 2520 | 7650 | 890 | 1260 | 3760 | 1600 |
| 2016 | 550 | 1370 | 2650 | 8070 | 880 | 1310 | 3810 | 1680 |
| 2017 | 530 | 1520 | 2800 | 8600 | 990 | 1400 | 3870 | 1820 |
| 2018 | 510 | 1750 | 2970 | 9210 | 1120 | 1480 | 4040 | 2010 |
| 2019 | 520 | 1930 | 3150 | 9640 | 1230 | 1410 | 4010 | 2120 |
| 2020 | 500 | 2030 | 2840 | 6490 | 1190 | 1270 | 3720 | 1920 |

Source: World Bank| World Development Indicators

## 4. SAARC and SADC: Female Labor Force Participation Rate

Table 3 and Figure 3 show the female labor force participation rate in the SAARC countries. It is rising in Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Maldives, Nepal and Pakistan but has a declining trend in Bhutan, Sri Lanka and India. The increase in participation is the fastest in Bangladesh. The drastic fall is visible in India. In recent years this decline is almost stagnant. Since the early 1980s, India slowly and gradually embraced the market system and moved towards opening up


Figure 1: GNI per Capita, Atlas Method (Current US\$) in SAARC Countries

Table 3: GNI per Capita, Atlas Method (Current US\$) in Selected SADC Countries

| Year | Botswana | Eswatini | Lesotho | Mauritius | Mozambique | Namibia | South <br> Africa | United Republic of Tanzania | Zimbabwe |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | B WA | SWZ | LSO | MUS | MOZ | NAM | ZAF | ZWE | TZA |
| 2000 | 3170 | 1670 | 580 | 3900 | 320 | 2240 | 3420 | 510 | 410 |
| 2001 | 3260 | 1700 | 640 | 3970 | 320 | 2090 | 3190 | 540 | 410 |
| 2002 | 2930 | 1570 | 590 | 3960 | 290 | 2010 | 2990 | 490 | 420 |
| 2003 | 3370 | 1700 | 670 | 4410 | 320 | 2280 | 3280 | 440 | 430 |
| 2004 | 3920 | 2160 | 810 | 5170 | 360 | 2900 | 4180 | 450 | 470 |
| 2005 | 4930 | 3080 | 1020 | 5600 | 400 | 3530 | 5610 | 460 | 500 |
| 2006 | 5440 | 3300 | 1130 | 5930 | 420 | 4030 | 6310 | 440 | 520 |
| 2007 | 5730 | 3480 | 1300 | 6490 | 460 | 4230 | 6630 | 420 | 540 |
| 2008 | 5740 | 3360 | 1290 | 7400 | 500 | 4320 | 6660 | 330 | 600 |
| 2009 | 5330 | 3320 | 1190 | 7800 | 540 | 4250 | 6510 | 480 | 670 |
| 2010 | 5610 | 3460 | 1270 | 8080 | 520 | 4500 | 6880 | 700 | 720 |
| 2011 | 6610 | 3860 | 1360 | 8400 | 540 | 5130 | 7760 | 1060 | 770 |


| Table 3 (Cont.) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Botswana | Eswatini | Lesotho | Mauritius | Mozambique | Namibia | South Africa | United <br> Republic of Tanzania | Zimbabwe |
|  | B WA | SWZ | LSO | MUS | MOZ | NAM | ZAF | ZWE | TZA |
| 2012 | 7250 | 4310 | 1500 | 9550 | 600 | 5730 | 8370 | 1260 | 810 |
| 2013 | 7570 | 4420 | 1460 | 10520 | 670 | 5950 | 8070 | 1320 | 890 |
| 2014 | 7700 | 4130 | 1350 | 10820 | 690 | 5790 | 7370 | 1370 | 970 |
| 2015 | 6780 | 3800 | 1310 | 10700 | 640 | 5310 | 6610 | 1390 | 980 |
| 2016 | 6950 | 3450 | 1270 | 10640 | 530 | 4740 | 5990 | 1390 | 970 |
| 2017 | 7050 | 3390 | 1190 | 10980 | 470 | 4620 | 5910 | 1350 | 970 |
| 2018 | 7510 | 3620 | 1230 | 12270 | 460 | 4920 | 6340 | 1350 | 1030 |
| 2019 | 7510 | 3690 | 1290 | 12890 | 490 | 5160 | 6670 | 1210 | 1100 |
| 2020 | 6640 | 3410 | 1100 | 10230 | 460 | 4500 | 6010 | 1140 | 1080 |
| Source: World Bank \| World Development Indicators |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



Table 4: SAARC and SADC: GNI per Capita (Current US\$) (2019) and Their Status in Country Classification by Income Level (2020, World Bank)

| Name of the Selected <br> SAARC Country | Country <br> Code | GNI per Capita <br> (Current US\$) <br> (2019) | World Bank Country <br> Classifications by Income <br> Level (2020) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Afghanistan | AFG | 500 | Low income |
| Bangladesh | BGD | 2030 | Lower-middle income |
| Bhutan | BTN | 2840 | Lower-middle income |
| Maldives | MPV | 6490 | Upper-middle income |
| Nepal | PAK | 1190 | Lower-middle income |
| Pakistan | LKA | 3720 | Lower-middle income |
| Sri Lanka | IND | 1920 | Lower-middle income |
| India |  |  |  |

Table 5: SAARC and SADC: GNI per Capita (Current US\$) (2019) and Their Status in Country Classification by Income Level (2020, World Bank)

| Name of the Selected <br> SAARC Country | Country <br> Code | GNI per Capita <br> (Current US\$) <br> (2019) | World Bank Country <br> Classifications by Income <br> Level (2020) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Botswana | BWA | 6640 | Upper-middle income |

the economy for private and foreign investment. It brought competitiveness on national and international fronts and faster economic growth after 2000 but it has not helped much in boosting female participation in the labor force. India's position is lowest amongst all the SAARC countries in terms of female labor force participation rate in the year 2019 (Figure 3).

SAARC countries are the region which exhibits hardships for females. It is due to geographic location, poor socioeconomic indicators, strongly rooted patriarchy, religious sentiments, veil system, caste, class and race-based
discriminatory society, poor infrastructure and gender-based wage discrimination. Females have to struggle to make their position in the family and society. Their political representation is poor due to which proper policies are lacking which can upgrade their situation. In a country like Sri Lanka, the above reported problems are not that much severe. In countries like Bangladesh and Nepal prevalence of matriarchal families is the major reason for more female participation in the labor force. The geographical hardship in the hilly areas makes females physically strong and acclimatizes them to the changing weather conditions. Klasen (2019) observes that there are powerful forces such as historical gender roles and different historical trajectories that have a powerful influence today due to which large differences in female participation across regions are visible. Rahman (2018) believes that the South Asian region has developed socially and economically over the last few decades which has provided more work opportunities for underprivileged men and

Table 6: Female Labor Force Participation Rate in (\%) (Age 15-64) in SAARC Countries

| Year | Afghanistan | Bangladesh | Bhutan | Maldives | Nepal | Pakistan | Sri Lanka | India |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2000 | 15.35 | 27.65 | 63.71 | 38.06 | 84.59 | 16.46 | 40.37 | 31.97 |
| 2001 | 15.5 | 27.85 | 64.51 | 38.1 | 84.31 | 16.36 | 40.31 | 32.25 |
| 2002 | 15.7 | 28.07 | 65.34 | 38.23 | 84.02 | 16.51 | 40.27 | 32.55 |
| 2003 | 15.92 | 28.29 | 66.17 | 38.44 | 83.73 | 17.46 | 40.25 | 32.84 |
| 2004 | 16.13 | 28.51 | 66.95 | 38.71 | 83.42 | 18.45 | 40.21 | 33.15 |
| 2005 | 16.33 | 28.72 | 67.66 | 39.01 | 83.11 | 19.04 | 40.15 | 33.46 |
| 2006 | 16.12 | 28.83 | 67.95 | 39.32 | 82.8 | 19.68 | 40.08 | 32.11 |
| 2007 | 15.91 | 29.39 | 68.25 | 39.66 | 82.49 | 20.04 | 39.97 | 30.81 |
| 2008 | 15.74 | 29.96 | 68.55 | 40 | 82.18 | 20.54 | 39.85 | 29.55 |
| 2009 | 15.65 | 30.53 | 68.85 | 40.32 | 82.23 | 21.7 | 39.72 | 28.32 |
| 2010 | 15.65 | 31.1 | 65.9 | 42.01 | 82.32 | 22.81 | 37.63 | 27.14 |
| 2011 | 16 | 31.68 | 63.35 | 43.73 | 82.45 | 23.18 | 37.47 | 25.67 |
| 2012 | 16.44 | 32.26 | 64.73 | 45.49 | 82.72 | 23.39 | 36.01 | 24.26 |
| 2013 | 17.42 | 32.84 | 59.4 | 47.3 | 83.09 | 23.62 | 38.85 | 23.85 |
| 2014 | 18.46 | 33.43 | 56.2 | 49.15 | 83.48 | 24.07 | 38.15 | 23.46 |
| 2015 | 19.55 | 34.01 | 61.2 | 47 | 83.84 | 25.09 | 39.8 | 23.1 |
| 2016 | 20.7 | 34.59 | 61.59 | 44.71 | 84.34 | 24.24 | 39.88 | 22.77 |
| 2017 | 21.91 | 37.95 | 61.9 | 44.61 | 84.75 | 23.42 | 40.76 | 22.45 |
| 2018 | 22.32 | 38.25 | 62.13 | 43.97 | 85.07 | 22.62 | 37.7 | 22.16 |
| 2019 | 22.74 | 38.48 | 62.31 | 43.05 | 85.3 | 22.63 | 37.58 | 22.26 |

[^1]

Figure 3: Female Labour Force Participation Rate in (\%) (Age 15-64) in SAARC Countries
women in these regions, changing the employment dynamic. But women arguably have less access to these opportunities because of many social norms and a lack of education and skills. Jafrin et al. (2021) observe demographic dividend impacted the economic growth of the five SAARC countries but this economic growth is unaffected by trade openness and unemployment rates in these countries. The authors find that the rate of labor force participation is negatively related to the GDP growth rate in the aggregated model in the SAARC countries. Rahman and Islam (2013) states that in Bangladesh women's participation in the labor market is often not her own decision but a result of strong patriarchy. Male members of the family usually dictate or guide such a decision in Bangladesh. Sadaquat (2011) feels that in Pakistan mostly, women are concentrated in sectors known for a low level of productivity, less income stability and low security of employment due to their dual role at home and workplace. Moon (2019) finds that Bangladesh has witnessed a substantial increase in female employment in rural and urban areas. This growing women empowerment is evident in the fact that Bangladesh has the third highest number of female lawmakers among the SAARC countries. Maqsood (2014) investigates the effect of globalization as measured by Foreign Direct Investment (FDI), Trade Openness (TOP) and Urbanization (URBAN) on Female Labor Force Participation (FLFP) for a period of 1990-2010 in the SAARC region. The findings of his study showed that urbanization and FDI played a key role in the female labor force participation decision and had an increasing trend in the SAARC region. Kousar et al. (2019) explore social, cultural, and institutional barriers to female labor force participation in Lahore, Pakistan. Their study reveals that cultural barriers (male dominance, gender stereotype, joint family system, and the influence of relatives), social barriers (viz., children's upbringing, care of older family members, social acceptability, social isolation, and interfamily challenges), and institutional barriers (policies and procedures, opportunity biases, rewards and awards, and behavior of male colleagues) affects female labor force participation. Begam and Mujahid (2019) explore the role of economic stability through female unemployment rate, inflation rate and per capita income, and increase in productivity through human capital investment in female labor force in Pakistan. The authors find out the impact of gender disparity on female labor force participation. Their empirical finding proves a positive and significant relationship between economic globalization and FLFP in long run as well as in the short run for Pakistan. Audi and Ali (2017) explore the impact of trade liberalization on women's empowerment and utilizes the sample of five SAARC countries for the time period of 15 years, that is, from 2000 to 2014 . Their study also finds out whether trade liberalization is beneficial for the gender gap or not. The authors conclude that whenever trade
liberalization increases, it does not reduce the gender gap, which means the female to male participation rate goes down. It encourages women to actively participate in the labor market, but it does not play a role in reducing the gender gap. Education of females is essential because it creates awareness among girls and enhances their skills, which leads to empowering women, making them self-sufficient and active participants in economic activity, which can improve their standard of living.

Prakash et al. (2019) feel that the SAARC countries are striving their best to meet the millennium development goals which they have vowed to achieve. India being a large country with huge Gender Inequality looks meagre when compared to other SAARC countries that are small in size geographically and demographically as well. Rustagi et al. (2013) find that the Labor Force Participation Rates (LFPR) of women are not only low but there are also wide differences in the male-female rates across most South Asian countries. Bayanpourtehrani and Sylwester (2013) empirically examine Female Labor Force Participation (FLFP) in a cross-section of countries between 1985 and 2005 and the religion practiced in these countries. They initially find that FLFP is lower in Muslim countries. However, they feel that association between Islam and FLFP greatly diminishes once other controls are included in the regression, suggesting that Islam might not diminish FLFP as some have argued. They further add that moreover, once these additional controls are included, the association between Islam and FLFP is similar to that between Catholicism and FLFP. Countries where Protestantism is prevalent or where no religion is practiced have higher FLFP. They also find some evidence that the association between FLFP and religion is weakening over time. Jaffri et al. (2015) have empirically investigated the impact of urbanization on Female Labor Force Participation (FLFP) in Pakistan for the period 1982-2012. The findings of their study suggest that employment opportunities for females in urban areas need to be accompanied by growing urbanization in Pakistan. Ratna (2014) opines that female labor force participation rates in South Asia, with the exception of Nepal, are low compared to other regions. Wider access to education and skills training, the emergence of new industries and new work opportunities, notably in the Information Technology (IT) sector, are changing the aspirations and work-related decisions of younger and educated women, but mediated by accepted normative behavior. ${ }^{1}$ Social norms ${ }^{2}$ continue to influence work-seeking behavior. Zakir Hussain and Mousumi Dutta (2015), believe that the difficulties of balancing work and household have become a major issue in South Asian societies as the concept of household sharing of labor is yet to become popular. In particular, the responsibilities of childcare fall almost entirely on mothers. The consequent pressure on working women affects them physically and mentally and may even lead to their withdrawal from the labor market. In such situation, the potential of grandparental supply of childcare services becomes crucial in the context of retaining women in employment in developing countries.

There are considerable differences in female labor force participation rates in the countries of the Southern African Development Community (SADC). Brenton et al. (2013) opine that women play a key role in trade in Africa and will be essential to Africa's success in exploiting its trade potential. In many countries in Africa, the majority of small farmers are women, and they produce crops such as maize, cassava, cotton, and rice that have enormous potential for increased trade between African countries and with the global market. Women are also involved in providing services across borders, such as education, health, and professional services, including accountancy and legal services. Hundreds of thousands of women cross borders in Africa every day to deliver goods from areas where they are relatively cheap to areas in which they are in shorter supply.

Table 4 and Figure 4 show the female labor force participation rate in the SADC countries. The countries are selected on the basis of significant changes in FLFPR in the regional group ('regioness' speaks to the degree to which a certain space is considered distinct entity. It is the center of the new global architecture. SADC member states see regions as a way to foster accelerated sustainable socioeconomic transformation while creating favorable macroeconomic environments through indicators such as trade surpluses, low inflation rates, increased foreign investment and high employment. According to Article 5 of the SADC Treaty (1992), one of the objectives is to promote and maximize productive employment in the region Machadu and Jena (2015)). It is rising in Botswana, Eswatini, Mauritius, Namibia, South Africa, and Zimbabwe but has a declining trend in Lesotho, Mozambique and the United Republic of Tanzania.

[^2]Table 7: Female Labor Force Participation Rate in (\%) (Age 15-64) in Selected SADC Countries

| Year | Botswana | Eswatini | Lesotho | Mauritius | Mozambique | Namibia | South <br> Africa | United Republic of Tanzania | Zimbabwe |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2000 | 51.21 | 45.5 | 69.2 | 43.45 | 88.16 | 49.33 | 48.22 | 86.49 | 72.74 |
| 2001 | 51.91 | 45.77 | 68.47 | 43.63 | 88.23 | 49.86 | 48.59 | 86.48 | 74.12 |
| 2002 | 52.63 | 46.01 | 67.75 | 43.76 | 88.24 | 50.36 | 48.99 | 86.97 | 75.4 |
| 2003 | 53.37 | 46.25 | 67.04 | 43.84 | 88.2 | 50.84 | 49.43 | 87.43 | 76.58 |
| 2004 | 54.11 | 46.48 | 66.35 | 43.85 | 87.67 | 51.31 | 49.88 | 87.84 | 77.71 |
| 2005 | 54.84 | 46.67 | 65.67 | 45.43 | 87.09 | 51.78 | 50.32 | 88.23 | 77.71 |
| 2006 | 55.59 | 46.89 | 65.09 | 45.85 | 86.46 | 52.33 | 50.7 | 88.59 | 77.8 |
| 2007 | 56.62 | 47.07 | 64.51 | 44.76 | 85.77 | 52.88 | 51.07 | 87.94 | 77.9 |
| 2008 | 57.63 | 47.27 | 63.96 | 45.75 | 85.03 | 53.42 | 51.45 | 87.23 | 78.01 |
| 2009 | 58.65 | 47.46 | 63.41 | 46.15 | 84.23 | 53.96 | 49.9 | 86.45 | 78.11 |
| 2010 | 55.8 | 47.67 | 62.88 | 47.84 | 83.39 | 54.51 | 48.38 | 85.59 | 78.21 |
| 2011 | 59.85 | 48.08 | 62.57 | 47.3 | 82.49 | 55.11 | 49.11 | 84.66 | 78.41 |
| 2012 | 63.69 | 48.52 | 62.24 | 47.74 | 81.53 | 55.72 | 49.59 | 83.63 | 78.48 |
| 2013 | 67.28 | 48.94 | 61.87 | 50.05 | 80.51 | 59.68 | 50.73 | 82.5 | 78.6 |
| 2014 | 67.44 | 49.3 | 62.14 | 50.62 | 79.43 | 59.2 | 51.11 | 81.25 | 78.7 |
| 2015 | 67.61 | 49.54 | 62.34 | 52.31 | 78.27 | 58.53 | 52.6 | 81.25 | 78.77 |
| 2016 | 67.81 | 50.17 | 62.54 | 51.35 | 78.2 | 57.85 | 52.82 | 81.24 | 78.87 |
| 2017 | 68.02 | 50.66 | 62.74 | 52.12 | 78.11 | 57.34 | 53.89 | 81.2 | 78.94 |
| 2018 | 68.23 | 51.03 | 62.91 | 52.39 | 78.02 | 56.89 | 53.85 | 81.16 | 79 |
| 2019 | 68.46 | 51.34 | 63.08 | 52.81 | 77.93 | 57.21 | 54.07 | 81.1 | 79.11 |

Source: ZAF, ILO, Modelled Estimate, 2020

The increase in female labor force participation is the fastest in Botswana. The drastic fall is visible in Mozambique. Though in the last few years, the decline is very small. After apartheid, South Africa introduced many reforms in labor laws to bring gender-related equity in the labor market. It improved the overall situation in the labor market but not for all equally as Afro-Asians and black are still the heavily marginalized section in the country. South Africa is still facing gender and racial disparity in the labor market. Men's labor force participation rate is much higher than females. Table 1 and Figure 1 highlight that South Africa's position is average amongst all the SADC countries in terms of female labor force participation rate in the year 2019. Matandare (2018) opines that Botswana has a more stable labor market in

comparison with Namibia and South Africa. Botswana's economically active population growth is increasing significantly faster than GDP per capita growth. Regarding labor force participation, males in Botswana have higher labor force participation than females. The author feels that for Botswana, Namibia and South Africa, with further human capital formation, technological development with a focus on labor-intensive industries like textiles, construction, tourism, agriculture and manufacturing sectors, and a structural change of the economy, are important to reverse the effects of unemployment across age and gender. Gofhamodino et al. (2018) opine that trade and agricultural sectors play a key role in tsocioeconomicmic development of the SADC region. They further add that women play a vital role in trade and agriculture in SADC, yet they face enormous challenges that hinder their full potential as farmers and traders. Labor markets in SADC have undergone substantial change as a result of privatization; deregulation and liberalization of the economy. Although there are significant variances across the region, available data suggest a low labor force participation rate particularly felt amongst younger workers and women (Policy, 2014. cited ILO WB 2010). Brixiová et al. (2021) believe that persistent gender gaps characterize labor markets in many African countries. They find that women have notably lower employment rates and earnings than men, even though the global financial crisis had a less negative impact on women than it had on men in Eswatini. Both unadjusted and unexplained gender earnings gaps are higher in self-employment than in wage employment. Tertiary education and urban location account for a large part of the gender earnings gap and mitigate high female propensity to self-employment. Their findings suggest that policies supporting female higher education and rural-urban mobility could reduce persistent inequalities in Eswatini's labor market outcomes as well as in other middle-income countries in southern Africa. Smit and Tessendorf (2021) find the South African legal framework quite all right as it aimed at promoting gender equality, so that females should be sufficiently represented at
all levels of the labor force. They further add that the country's female labor force has grown exponentially over the past twenty years, the position of Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the Johannesburg Stock Exchange (JSE) is held by a female, and women constitute $46 \%$ of members of Parliament. More broadly, however, true gender equality is still far off in terms of female representation in top-level positions. In 2019, females represented only $3.31 \%$ of CEOs nationwide, despite making up 51\% of the South African population. The country has produced only one (now retired) female CEO among the top 40 JSE-listed companies. The authors opine that as females continue to be subjected to male domination in the form of patriarchy, they are automatically relegated to the realm of unpaid work, carrying a disproportionately heavy burden of child-rearing and other domestic responsibilities. Both barriers are fuelled by deep-rooted social norms and cultural traditions, which are difficult and will take time to change in South Africa.

Behera et al. (2015) observe that the majority of households in the world that uses solid fuels such as firewood and cow dung cake are located in south Asian countries. The authors opine that the age, gender and education levels of a household head influence a household's choice of energy sources. Wealthy households are found to use clean energy sources such as Liquid Petroleum Gas (LPG) and electricity, whereas poorer households tend to use solid fuels such as fuelwood and dung cake. His findings are based on three Asian countries: India, Bangladesh and Nepal. Murshed (2021) finds that economic growth, environmental pollution, financial globalization, financial development, and women empowerment are some of the major drivers of the clean cooking fuel transition across Sub-Saharan Africa. Rahut et al. (2020) find that households with a higher level of education and wealthy families mainly use clean energy, such as gas, and are less likely to use dirty solid fuels, such as cake dung and crop residue for cooking. Das et al. (2019) opine that Women are the backbone of the cooking system, as they mostly manage it. The authors observe that in most developing countries, many rural households use fuelwood and a Traditional Cook Stove (TCS). Garba (2021) examines the impact of inaccessibility to clean fuels for cooking on social development. The author finds that the household use of solid fuels has a statistically significant negative effect on primary and secondary education, as well as life expectancy.

## 5. SAARC Countries

Table 8: Afghanistan
\(\left.$$
\begin{array}{|l|c|c|c|}\hline & \begin{array}{c}\text { Female Labor Force } \\
\text { Participation Rate } \\
\text { in (\%) (Age 15-64) }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Access to Clean Fuels and } \\
\text { Technologies for Cooking } \\
\text { (\% of the Population) }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Access to } \\
\text { Electricity (\% of } \\
\text { the Population) }\end{array}
$$ <br>
\hline 2000 \& 15.35 \& 8.8 \& ··· <br>

\hline 2001 \& 15.5 \& 9.51 \& ···\end{array}\right]\)| . |
| :--- |


| Table 8 (Cont.) | Female Labor Force <br> Participation Rate <br> in (\%) (Age 15-64) | Access to Clean Fuels and <br> Technologies for Cooking <br> (\% of the Population) | Access to <br> Electricity (\% of <br> the Population) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2009 | 15.65 | 20.84 | 45.52068329 |



Figure 5: Afghanistan

Table 9: Bangladesh

|  | Female Labor Force Participation Rate in (\%) (Age 15-64) | Access to Clean Fuels and Technologies for Cooking (\% of the Population) | Access to Electricity (\% of the Population) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2000 | 27.65 | 7.24 | 32 |
| 2001 | 27.85 | 7.78 | 35.109272 |
| 2002 | 28.07 | 8.16 | 37.88195801 |
| 2003 | 28.29 | 8.73 | 40.64517975 |
| 2004 | 28.51 | 9.2 | 40.6 |
| 2005 | 28.72 | 9.74 | 44.23 |
| 2006 | 28.83 | 10.36 | 50.52510246 |
| 2007 | 29.39 | 10.92 | 46.5 |
| 2008 | 29.96 | 11.59 | 54.33111954 |
| 2009 | 30.53 | 12.2 | 57.07246017 |
| 2010 | 31.1 | 12.9 | 55.26 |
| 2011 | 31.68 | 13.63 | 59.6 |
| 2012 | 32.26 | 14.33 | 65.41366577 |
| 2013 | 32.84 | 15.06 | 61.5 |
| 2014 | 33.43 | 15.96 | 62.4 |
| 2015 | 34.01 | 16.68 | 74.44007874 |
| 2016 | 34.59 | 17.72 | 75.92 |
| 2017 | 37.95 | 18.43 | 88 |
| 2018 | 38.25 | 20.11 | 91.8 |
| 2019 | 38.48 | 22.21 | 92.2 |
| Source: World Bank \| World Development Indicators(12/16/2021) |  |  |  |



Figure 6: Bangladesh

Table 10: Bhutan

|  | Female Labor Force Participation Rate in (\%) (Age 15-64) | Access to Clean Fuels and Technologies for Cooking (\% of the Population) | Access to Electricity (\% of the Population) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2000 | 63.71 | 31.67 | 31.15 |
| 2001 | 64.51 | 33.34 | 40.09151 |
| 2002 | 65.34 | 35.16 | 44.04301 |
| 2003 | 66.17 | 36.36 | 41.1 |
| 2004 | 66.95 | 38.11 | 51.91645 |
| 2005 | 67.66 | 39.58 | 59.80811 |
| 2006 | 67.95 | 40.85 | 59.7468 |
| 2007 | 68.25 | 41.81 | 71.8 |
| 2008 | 68.55 | 43.54 | 67.56509 |
| 2009 | 68.85 | 44.98 | 71.48524 |
| 2010 | 65.9 | 46.33 | 73.28291 |
| 2011 | 63.35 | 47.2 | 81.688 |
| 2012 | 64.73 | 48.11 | 91.5 |
| 2013 | 59.4 | 49.76 | 87.37115 |
| 2014 | 56.2 | 50.65 | 91.39948 |
| 2015 | 61.2 | 51.75 | 95.44389 |
| 2016 | 61.59 | 52.5 | 99.50036 |
| 2017 | 61.9 | 53.22 | 97.7 |
| 2018 | 62.13 | 54.66 | 99.96877 |
| 2019 | 62.31 | 55.79 | 100 |
| Source: World Bank \| World Development Indicators(12/16/2021) |  |  |  |



Figure 7: Bhutan

Table 11: Maldives

|  | Female Labor Force Participation Rate in (\%) (Age 15-64) | Access to Clean Fuels and Technologies for Cooking (\% of the Population) | Access to Electricity (\% of the Population) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2000 | 38.06 | 32.18 | 83.8 |
| 2001 | 38.1 | 38.56 | 87.51950836 |
| 2002 | 38.23 | 45.18 | 88.41437531 |
| 2003 | 38.44 | 51.9 | 89.2997818 |
| 2004 | 38.71 | 58.33 | 90.17454529 |
| 2005 | 39.01 | 64.78 | 91.03765106 |
| 2006 | 39.32 | 69.74 | 91.89161682 |
| 2007 | 39.66 | 74.19 | 92.74253845 |
| 2008 | 40 | 78.36 | 93.59664154 |
| 2009 | 40.32 | 81.46 | 99.9 |
| 2010 | 42.01 | 84.43 | 99.41575623 |
| 2011 | 43.73 | 86.7 | 99.48480225 |
| 2012 | 45.49 | 88.63 | 99.53594971 |
| 2013 | 47.3 | 90.45 | 99.5657959 |
| 2014 | 49.15 | 91.71 | 100 |
| 2015 | 47 | 92.88 | 99.79016113 |
| 2016 | 44.71 | 93.83 | 100 |
| 2017 | 44.61 | 94.56 | 99.8 |
| 2018 | 43.97 | 95.45 | 100 |
| 2019 | 43.05 | 96.99 | 100 |
| Source: World Bank \| World Development Indicators(12/16/2021) |  |  |  |



Figure 8: Maldives

Table 12: Nepal

|  | Female Labor Force Participation Rate in (\%) (Age 15-64) | Access to Clean Fuels and Technologies for Cooking (\% of the Population) | Access to Electricity (\% of the Population) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2000 | 84.59 | 14.92 | 28.91624069 |
| 2001 | 84.31 | 15.45 | 24.6 |
| 2002 | 84.02 | 16.18 | 36.07150269 |
| 2003 | 83.73 | 16.96 | 42.41 |
| 2004 | 83.42 | 17.67 | 37.2 |
| 2005 | 83.11 | 18.13 | 46.73062515 |
| 2006 | 82.8 | 19.02 | 51.2 |
| 2007 | 82.49 | 19.78 | 53.7927475 |
| 2008 | 82.18 | 20.42 | 57.32546997 |
| 2009 | 82.23 | 21.25 | 60.86761093 |
| 2010 | 82.32 | 22.31 | 68.6 |
| 2011 | 82.45 | 23.1 | 67.26 |
| 2012 | 82.72 | 23.81 | 74.73197174 |
| 2013 | 83.09 | 24.59 | 77.60891724 |
| 2014 | 83.48 | 25.5 | 84.9 |
| 2015 | 83.84 | 26.56 | 83.52746582 |
| 2016 | 84.34 | 27.62 | 90.7 |
| 2017 | 84.75 | 28.45 | 89.92308044 |
| 2018 | 85.07 | 29.19 | 93.92 |
| 2019 | 85.3 | 30.98 | 89.9 |
| Source: World Bank \| World Development Indicators(12/16/2021) |  |  |  |



Figure 9: Nepal

Table 13: Pakistan

|  | Female Labor Force Participation Rate in (\%) (Age 15-64) | Access to Clean Fuels and Technologies for Cooking (\% of the Population) | Access to Electricity (\% of the Population) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2000 | 16.46 | 22.62 | 70.348991 |
| 2001 | 16.36 | 24.14 | 70.425514 |
| 2002 | 16.51 | 25.39 | 70.493744 |
| 2003 | 17.46 | 26.63 | 70.552513 |
| 2004 | 18.45 | 28.12 | 70.600647 |
| 2005 | 19.04 | 29.23 | 70.637115 |
| 2006 | 19.68 | 30.5 | 70.664452 |
| 2007 | 20.04 | 31.81 | 70.688736 |
| 2008 | 20.54 | 33.05 | 70.716202 |
| 2009 | 21.7 | 34.17 | 70.75309 |
| 2010 | 22.81 | 35.59 | 70.805641 |
| 2011 | 23.18 | 36.85 | 70.880081 |
| 2012 | 23.39 | 38.13 | 70.980942 |
| 2013 | 23.62 | 39.47 | 71.105919 |
| 2014 | 24.07 | 40.74 | 71.250984 |
| 2015 | 25.09 | 42.13 | 71.412125 |
| 2016 | 24.24 | 43.32 | 71.58532 |
| 2017 | 23.42 | 44.67 | 70.79 |
| 2018 | 22.62 | 45.87 | 72.634979 |
| 2019 | 22.63 | 46.99 | 73.91436 |
| Source: World Bank \| World Development Indicators(12/16/2021) |  |  |  |



Table 14: Sri Lanka

|  | Female Labor Force Participation Rate in (\%) (Age 15-64) | Access to Clean Fuels and Technologies for Cooking (\% of the Population) | Access to <br> Electricity (\% of the Population) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2000 | 40.37 | 15.64 | 50.45 |
| 2001 | 40.31 | 16.2 | 63.6 |
| 2002 | 40.27 | 16.94 | 80.7 |
| 2003 | 40.25 | 17.31 | 75.04403 |
| 2004 | 40.21 | 18.03 | 76.62809 |
| 2005 | 40.15 | 18.68 | 78.20049 |
| 2006 | 40.08 | 19.41 | 82.05 |
| 2007 | 39.97 | 20.01 | 80 |
| 2008 | 39.85 | 20.69 | 82.88735 |
| 2009 | 39.72 | 21.12 | 87.09 |
| 2010 | 37.63 | 21.83 | 85.3 |
| 2011 | 37.47 | 22.74 | 87.76 |
| 2012 | 36.01 | 23.37 | 87 |
| 2013 | 38.85 | 24.06 | 90.2 |
| 2014 | 38.15 | 24.76 | 92.6377 |
| 2015 | 39.8 | 25.44 | 94.33477 |
| 2016 | 39.88 | 26.33 | 97.5 |
| 2017 | 40.76 | 27.99 | 97.5 |
| 2018 | 37.7 | 28.89 | 99.58686 |
| 2019 | 37.58 | 29.9 | 100 |
| Source: World Bank \| World Development Indicators (12/16/2021) |  |  |  |



Table 15: India

|  | Female Labor Force <br> Participation Rate in (\%) (Age 15-64) | Access to Clean Fuels and Technologies for Cooking (\% of the Population) | Access to Electricity (\% of the Population) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2000 | 31.97 | 22.15 | 59.34105 |
| 2001 | 32.25 | 23.85 | 55.8 |
| 2002 | 32.55 | 25.01 | 62.3 |
| 2003 | 32.84 | 25.93 | 64.02313 |
| 2004 | 33.15 | 27.41 | 64.4 |
| 2005 | 33.46 | 28.34 | 67.09344 |
| 2006 | 32.11 | 29.74 | 67.9 |
| 2007 | 30.81 | 30.95 | 70.13076 |
| 2008 | 29.55 | 32.06 | 71.65108 |
| 2009 | 28.32 | 32.82 | 75 |
| 2010 | 27.14 | 34.4 | 76.3 |
| 2011 | 25.67 | 35.42 | 67.6 |
| 2012 | 24.26 | 36.64 | 79.9 |
| 2013 | 23.85 | 37.81 | 80.73804 |
| 2014 | 23.46 | 38.8 | 83.58521 |
| 2015 | 23.1 | 39.88 | 88 |
| 2016 | 22.77 | 41.04 | 89.53488 |
| 2017 | 22.45 | 42.45 | 92.45683 |
| 2018 | 22.16 | 43.88 | 95.1933 |
| 2019 | 22.26 | 44.67 | 97.81528 |
| Source: World Bank \| World Development Indicators(12/16/2021) |  |  |  |



Figure 12: India

Table 13: SAARC Countries: Understanding FLFPR Concerning Access to Clean Fuels and Technologies for Cooking and Access to Electricity

|  | Afghanistan <br>  <br> figure 5) | Bangladesh <br> (Table 6 \& figure 6) | Bhutan <br>  <br> figure 7) | Maldives <br> (Table 8 \& figure 8) | Nepal <br>  <br> figure 9) | Pakistan <br> (Table 10 \& figure 10) | Sri Lanka <br>  <br> figure 11) | India <br> (Table 12 \& figure 12) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Access to clean fuels and technologies for cooking (\% of population) | Moderate increase | Moderate increase | Moderate increase | Very High increase | Low increase | Moderate increase | Moderate increase | Moderate increase |
| Access to electricity (\% of population) | Very High increase | Very High increase | Very High increase | Already very high which increased marginally further | High <br> increase | Already very high which increased marginally further | Very High increase | High <br> increase |
| Female Labor force <br> Participation Rate in (\%) (Age 1564) | Low increase | Low increase | Low decrease | Low increase | Already very high FLFPR which decreased marginally | Low <br> increase | Low decrease | Low decrease |
| Result/ finding | Both the above factors had brought positive change as FLFPR increased in 2019 in comparison to 2000, but the impact was not very strong as the increase in FLFPR was much slower than the increase in the two factors in Afghanistan. | Both the above factors had brought positive change as FLFPR increased in 20019 in comparison to 2000 , but the impact was not very strong as <br> the increase in FLFPR was much slower than the increase in the two factors in Bangladesh. | Both the above factors had brought no positive change as FLFPR decreased in 20019 in comparison to 2000 . <br> The impact was not visible as there was a decrease in FLFPR in Bhutan. | Both the above factors had brought positive change as FLFPR increased in 20019 in comparison to 2000, but the impact was not very strong as the increase in FLFPR was much slower than the increase in the two factors in Maldives. | Both the above factors had brought no positive change as FLFPR decreased in 20019 in comparison to 2000 . <br> The impact was not visible as there was already a very high FLFPR in Nepal. | Both the above factors had brought positive change as FLFPR increased in 20019 in comparison to 2000, but the impact was not very strong as the increase in FLFPR was slower than the increase in Access to clean fuels and technologies for cooking in Pakistan but it was greater than the increase in access to electricity in Pakistan. | Both the above factors had brought no change as FLFPR has decreased in 20019 in comparison to 2000 . <br> The impact was not visible as there was decrease in FLFPR in Sri Lanka. | Both the above factors had brought no positive change as FLFPR has decreased in 20019 in comparison to 2000 . <br> The impact was not visible as there was decrease in FLFPR in India. |

Note: In comparison to 2000 if in 2019: Below $10 \%$ increase: it is considered as low In between $10 \%$ to $30 \%$ increase: it is considered a moderate In between $30 \%$ to $50 \%$ increase: it is considered a high Above $50 \%$ increase: it is considered a very high (vice-versa in the case of decrease).

## 6. SADC Countries (Selected)

| Table 16: Botswana |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Female Labor Force Participation Rate in (\%) (Age 15-64) | Access to Clean Fuels and Technologies for Cooking (\% of the Population) | Access to <br> Electricity (\% of the Population) |
| 2000 | 51.21 | 45.12 | 27.27221 |
| 2001 | 51.91 | 46.53 | 24.8 |
| 2002 | 52.63 | 47.72 | 31.68865 |
| 2003 | 53.37 | 49.24 | 33.88326 |
| 2004 | 54.11 | 50.64 | 36.06723 |
| 2005 | 54.84 | 52.01 | 38.23954 |
| 2006 | 55.59 | 53 | 40.40271 |
| 2007 | 56.62 | 54.39 | 42.56283 |
| 2008 | 57.63 | 55.38 | 44.5 |
| 2009 | 58.65 | 56.73 | 43.36 |
| 2010 | 55.8 | 57.59 | 51.78107 |
| 2011 | 59.85 | 58.72 | 53.24 |
| 2012 | 63.69 | 59.92 | 55.87431 |
| 2013 | 67.28 | 61.05 | 57.89069 |
| 2014 | 67.44 | 62.12 | 59.9404 |
| 2015 | 67.61 | 63.15 | 62.13 |
| 2016 | 67.81 | 64.08 | 64.29515 |
| 2017 | 68.02 | 65.44 | 67.4 |
| 2018 | 68.23 | 66.67 | 68.35866 |
| 2019 | 68.46 | 67.89 | 70.18318 |
| Source: World Bank \| World Development Indicators(12/16/2021) |  |  |  |



Table 17: Eswatini

|  | Female Labor Force <br> Participation Rate in (\%) (Age 15-64) | Access to Clean Fuels and Technologies for Cooking (\% of the Population) | Access to Electricity (\% of the Population) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2000 | 45.5 | 27.24 | 25.234 |
| 2001 | 45.77 | 28.72 | 26.9 |
| 2002 | 46.01 | 29.98 | 25.87891 |
| 2003 | 46.25 | 31.63 | 28.69206 |
| 2004 | 46.48 | 32.96 | 31.49458 |
| 2005 | 46.67 | 34.57 | 34.28542 |
| 2006 | 46.89 | 35.93 | 35.2 |
| 2007 | 47.07 | 37.26 | 39.84581 |
| 2008 | 47.27 | 38.78 | 42.62766 |
| 2009 | 47.46 | 40.01 | 38.6 |
| 2010 | 47.67 | 41.57 | 45.55234 |
| 2011 | 48.08 | 42.82 | 51.05468 |
| 2012 | 48.52 | 44.49 | 54.21105 |
| 2013 | 48.94 | 45.73 | 57.4631 |
| 2014 | 49.3 | 47.15 | 65 |
| 2015 | 49.54 | 48.52 | 64.13185 |
| 2016 | 50.17 | 49.7 | 63.43 |
| 2017 | 50.66 | 50.67 | 73.5 |
| 2018 | 51.03 | 51.67 | 74.10944 |
| 2019 | 51.34 | 52.88 | 77.16964 |
| Source: World Bank \| World Development Indicators(12/16/2021) |  |  |  |



Figure 14: Eswatini

Table 18: Lesotho

|  | Female Labor Force Participation Rate in (\%) (Age 15-64) | Access to Clean Fuels and Technologies for Cooking (\% of the Population) | Access to Electricity (\% of the Population) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2000 | 69.2 | 18.14 | 4.25876011 |
| 2001 | 68.47 | 19.03 | 1.27018034 |
| 2002 | 67.75 | 20.61 | 3.40366483 |
| 2003 | 67.04 | 21.48 | 5.52768517 |
| 2004 | 66.35 | 23.05 | 6.8 |
| 2005 | 65.67 | 24.1 | 9.74278164 |
| 2006 | 65.09 | 25.29 | 9.7 |
| 2007 | 64.51 | 26.69 | 13.9248991 |
| 2008 | 63.96 | 27.63 | 16.0176182 |
| 2009 | 63.41 | 28.78 | 17 |
| 2010 | 62.88 | 29.86 | 17 |
| 2011 | 62.57 | 30.68 | 22.3772469 |
| 2012 | 62.24 | 31.96 | 20.56 |
| 2013 | 61.87 | 32.99 | 26.7335815 |
| 2014 | 62.14 | 33.93 | 27.8 |
| 2015 | 62.34 | 34.74 | 31.7840767 |
| 2016 | 62.54 | 35.61 | 35.1815109 |
| 2017 | 62.74 | 36.77 | 33.7 |
| 2018 | 62.91 | 37.89 | 47 |
| 2019 | 63.08 | 38.29 | 44.6406784 |
| Source: World Bank \| World Development Indicators(12/16/2021) |  |  |  |



Figure 15: Lesotho

Table 19: Mauritius

|  | Female Labor Force <br> Participation Rate in (\%) (Age 15-64) | Access to Clean Fuels and Technologies for Cooking (\% of the Population) | Access to Electricity (\% of the Population) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2000 | 43.45 | 87.35 | 99 |
| 2001 | 43.63 | 87.68 | 99.24628 |
| 2002 | 43.76 | 88.69 | 99.4 |
| 2003 | 43.84 | 89.24 | 99.21391 |
| 2004 | 43.85 | 90.09 | 99.18236 |
| 2005 | 45.43 | 90.43 | 99.13914 |
| 2006 | 45.85 | 91.17 | 99.08678 |
| 2007 | 44.76 | 91.43 | 99.03138 |
| 2008 | 45.75 | 91.64 | 98.97916 |
| 2009 | 46.15 | 92.23 | 98.93636 |
| 2010 | 47.84 | 92.27 | 99.58998 |
| 2011 | 47.3 | 92.56 | 99.6 |
| 2012 | 47.74 | 92.62 | 99.49635 |
| 2013 | 50.05 | 92.74 | 99.41929 |
| 2014 | 50.62 | 92.94 | 99.37556 |
| 2015 | 52.31 | 93.11 | 99.42982 |
| 2016 | 51.35 | 93.34 | 99.54343 |
| 2017 | 52.12 | 93.88 | 99.61 |
| 2018 | 52.39 | 94.21 | 99.42007 |
| 2019 | 52.81 | 94.33 | 100 |
| Source: World Bank \| World Development Indicators(12/16/2021) |  |  |  |



Table 20: Mozambique

|  | Female Labor Force Participation Rate in (\%) (Age 15-64) | Access to Clean Fuels and Technologies for Cooking (\% of the Population) | Access to <br> Electricity (\% of the Population) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2000 | 88.16 | 3.07 | 6.089136 |
| 2001 | 88.23 | 3.08 | 5.7 |
| 2002 | 88.24 | 3.13 | 8.486649 |
| 2003 | 88.2 | 3.09 | 8.1 |
| 2004 | 87.67 | 3.11 | 10.8463 |
| 2005 | 87.09 | 3.21 | 12.00915 |
| 2006 | 86.46 | 3.25 | 13.16286 |
| 2007 | 85.77 | 3.25 | 12.4 |
| 2008 | 85.03 | 3.3 | 13.57122 |
| 2009 | 84.23 | 3.28 | 15 |
| 2010 | 83.39 | 3.4 | 18.8376 |
| 2011 | 82.49 | 3.46 | 20.2 |
| 2012 | 81.53 | 3.48 | 21.23672 |
| 2013 | 80.51 | 3.56 | 22.40603 |
| 2014 | 79.43 | 3.56 | 24.8 |
| 2015 | 78.27 | 3.62 | 24 |
| 2016 | 78.2 | 3.69 | 26.26931 |
| 2017 | 78.11 | 3.78 | 24.3 |
| 2018 | 78.02 | 3.8 | 31.1 |
| 2019 | 77.93 | 3.91 | 29.61616 |
| Source: World Bank \| World Development Indicators(12/16/2021) |  |  |  |



Figure 17: Mozambique

Table 21: Namibia

|  | Female Labor Force Participation Rate in (\%) (Age 15-64) | Access to Clean Fuels and Technologies for Cooking (\% of the Population) | Access to Electricity (\% of the Population) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2000 | 49.33 | 32.51 | 36.5 |
| 2001 | 49.86 | 33.22 | 35.98637 |
| 2002 | 50.36 | 33.76 | 36.96955 |
| 2003 | 50.84 | 34.64 | 37.94327 |
| 2004 | 51.31 | 35.13 | 38.90635 |
| 2005 | 51.78 | 35.87 | 39.85777 |
| 2006 | 52.33 | 36.52 | 40.80005 |
| 2007 | 52.88 | 37.31 | 43.7 |
| 2008 | 53.42 | 37.72 | 42.68171 |
| 2009 | 53.96 | 38.34 | 44.1 |
| 2010 | 54.51 | 38.88 | 44.60104 |
| 2011 | 55.11 | 39.59 | 42.3 |
| 2012 | 55.72 | 40.11 | 46.60624 |
| 2013 | 59.68 | 40.53 | 47.4 |
| 2014 | 59.2 | 41.25 | 48.70618 |
| 2015 | 58.53 | 41.32 | 51.6 |
| 2016 | 57.85 | 42.2 | 49.7 |
| 2017 | 57.34 | 42.89 | 52.5 |
| 2018 | 56.89 | 43.21 | 53.96954 |
| 2019 | 57.21 | 43.66 | 55.19512 |
| Source: World Bank \| World Development Indicators(12/16/2021) |  |  |  |



Figure 18: Namibia

Table 22: South Africa

|  | Female Labor Force <br> Participation Rate <br> in (\%) (Age 15-64) | Access to Clean Fuels and <br> Technologies for Cooking <br> (\% of the Population) | Access to <br> Electricity (\% of <br> the Population) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2000 | 88.16 | 3.07 | 6.089136 |
| 2001 | 88.23 | 3.08 | 5.7 |
| 2002 | 88.24 | 3.13 | 3.09 |
| 2003 | 87.67 | 3.09 | 3.211 |



Figure 19: South Africa

Table 23: United Republic of Tanzania

|  | Female Labor Force Participation Rate in (\%) (Age 15-64) | Access to Clean Fuels and Technologies for Cooking (\% of the Population) | Access to Electricity (\% of the Population) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2000 | 86.49 | 1.08 | 9.056112289 |
| 2001 | 86.48 | 1.1 | 9.996443748 |
| 2002 | 86.97 | 1.15 | 10.92848778 |
| 2003 | 87.43 | 1.2 | 11.1 |
| 2004 | 87.84 | 1.28 | 11.4 |
| 2005 | 88.23 | 1.35 | 13.66328144 |
| 2006 | 88.59 | 1.36 | 14.55442524 |
| 2007 | 87.94 | 1.44 | 15.44251728 |
| 2008 | 87.23 | 1.53 | 11.5 |
| 2009 | 86.45 | 1.54 | 11.2 |
| 2010 | 85.59 | 1.66 | 14.8 |
| 2011 | 84.66 | 1.74 | 14.2 |
| 2012 | 83.63 | 1.85 | 15.3 |
| 2013 | 82.5 | 1.93 | 16.4 |
| 2014 | 81.25 | 2 | 23.5 |
| 2015 | 81.25 | 2.15 | 26.34278107 |
| 2016 | 81.24 | 2.16 | 32.8 |
| 2017 | 81.2 | 2.18 | 32.41840363 |
| 2018 | 81.16 | 2.19 | 35.22945023 |
| 2019 | 81.1 | 2.87 | 37.7 |
| Source: World Bank \| World Development Indicators(12/16/2021) |  |  |  |



Table 24: Zimbabwe

|  | Female Labor Force Participation Rate in (\%) (Age 15-64) | Access to Clean Fuels and Technologies for Cooking (\% of the Population) | Access to Electricity (\% of the Population) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2000 | 72.74 | 32.4 | 33.8507 |
| 2001 | 74.12 | 32.25 | 34.21405 |
| 2002 | 75.4 | 32.18 | 34.2 |
| 2003 | 76.58 | 32.01 | 34.91471 |
| 2004 | 77.71 | 31.77 | 35.24966 |
| 2005 | 77.71 | 31.64 | 35.57295 |
| 2006 | 77.8 | 31.34 | 37.2 |
| 2007 | 77.9 | 31.17 | 36.19822 |
| 2008 | 78.01 | 30.97 | 36.51251 |
| 2009 | 78.11 | 30.81 | 43.36908 |
| 2010 | 78.21 | 30.46 | 40.45818 |
| 2011 | 78.41 | 30.27 | 36.9 |
| 2012 | 78.48 | 30.02 | 44 |
| 2013 | 78.6 | 29.88 | 38.33635 |
| 2014 | 78.7 | 29.63 | 32.3 |
| 2015 | 78.77 | 29.36 | 33.7 |
| 2016 | 78.87 | 29.05 | 39.67623 |
| 2017 | 78.94 | 30.21 | 40.14428 |
| 2018 | 79 | 30.23 | 40.61636 |
| 2019 | 79.11 | 30.54 | 41.08911 |
| Source: World Bank \| World Development Indicators(12/16/2021) |  |  |  |



Table 25: Selected SADC Countries: Understanding FLFPR Concerning Access to Clean Fuels and Technologies
for Cooking and Access to Electricity

|  | Botswana (Table 13 and figure 13) | Eswatini <br> (Table 14 and figure <br> 14) | Lesotho (Table 15 and figure 15) | Mauritius <br> (Table 16 and figure 16) | Mozambique (Table 17 and figure 17) | Namibia (Table 18 and figure 18) | South Africa (Table 19 and figure 19) | United <br> Republic <br> of <br> Tanzania <br> (Table 20 <br> and <br> figure 20) | Zimbabwe <br> (Table 21 and figure 21) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Access to clean fuels and technologies for cooking (\% of population) | Moderate increase | Moderate increase | Moderate increase | Already very high which increased marginally further | Almost <br> stagnant <br> (Already <br> low) | Moderate increase | High increase | Almost <br> stagnant <br> (Already <br> low | Low decrease |
| Access to electricity (\% of population) | High increase | Very High increase | High increase | Already very high which increased marginally further | Moderate increase | Moderate increase | Moderate increase | Moderate increase | Low increase |
| Female <br> Labor <br> force <br> Participation <br> Rate <br> in (\%) <br> (Age 15- <br> 64) | Low increase | Low increase | Low decrease | Low increase | Low decrease (Already very high FLFPR.) | Low increase | Low increase | Low decrease (Already very high FLFPR.) | Already very high which increased marginally further |
| Result/ finding | Both the above factors had brought positive changeas FLFPR increased in 20019 in comparison to 2000, but the impact was not very strong as the increase in FLFPR was much slower than the increase in the two factors in Botswana. | Both the above <br> factors had brought positive changeas FLFPR increased in 20019 in comparison to 2000 , but the impact was not very strong as the increase in FLFPR was much slower than the increase in the two factors in Eswatini. | Both the above factors had brought no positive change as FLFPR decreased in 20019 in comparison to 2000 . <br> The impact was not visible as there was decrease in FLFPR in Lesotho. | Both the above factors had brought positive changeas FLFPR increased in 20019 in comparison to 2000, but the impact was not very strong as the increase in FLFPR was slow in Mauritius. | Both the above factors had brought no positive change as FLFPR has decreased in 20019 in comparison to 2000 . <br> The impact was not visible as there was already very high FLFPR in <br> Mozambique. | Both the above factors had brought positive changeas FLFPR has increased in 20019 in comparison to 2000 , but the impact was not very strong as the increase in FLFPR was much slower than the increase in the two factors in Namibia. | Both the above factors had brought positive changeas FLFPR has increased in 20019 in comparison to 2000 , but the impact was not very strong as the increase in FLFPR was much slower than the increase in the two factors in South Africa. | Both the above factors had brought no positive change as FLFPR has decreased in 20019 in comparison to 2000 . <br> The impact was not visible as there was already very high FLFPR in United Republic of Tanzania. | Access to electricity had brought positive change as FLFPR has increased in 20019 in comparison to 2000 even when there was decrease in percentage of population accessing to clean fuels and technologies for cookingin Zimbabwe. |

Note: In comparison to 2000 if in 2019: Below $10 \%$ increase: it is considered as low In between $10 \%$ to $30 \%$ increase: it is considered a moderate In between $30 \%$ to $50 \%$ increase: it is considered a high Above $50 \%$ increase: it is considered a very high (vice-versa in the case of decrease).

## 7. Results and Findings

### 7.1. The Two Regional Groupings; SAARC and SADC and FLFPR

Table 26: SAARC

| Name of the <br> Selected SAARC <br> Country | Country <br> Code | GNI per Capita <br> (Current US\$) <br> (As per the year 2019) | World Bank Country <br> Classifications by <br> Income Level (As per <br> July 1, 2020, old) | Female Labor Force <br> Participation Rate in <br> (\%) (Age 15-64) <br> (As of the year 2019) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Afghanistan | AFG | 500 | Low income | 22.74 |
| Bangladesh | BGD | 2030 | Lower-middle income | 38.48 |
| Bhutan | BTN | 2840 | Lower-middle income | 62.31 |
| Maldives | MDV | 1190 | Lower-middle income | 43.05 |
| Nepal | PAL | 1270 | Lower-middle income | 85.3 |
| Pakistan | LKA | 1920 | Lower-middle income | 22.63 |
| Sri Lanka | IND |  |  | 37.58 |
| India |  |  |  | 22.26 |

Table 27: SADC

| Name of the Selected SADC <br> Country | Country Code | GNI per Capita (Current US\$) <br> (As per the year 2019) | World Bank Country <br> Classifications by <br> Income Level (As per <br> July 1, 2020, old) | Female Labor Force Participation Rate in (\%) (Age 15-64) (As of the year 2019) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Botswana | BWA | 6640 | Upper-middle income | 68.46 |
| Eswatini | SWZ | 3410 | Lower-middle income | 51.34 |
| Lesotho | LSO | 1100 | Lower-middle income | 63.08 |
| Mauritius | MUS | 10230 | Upper-middle income | 52.81 |
| Mozambique | MOZ | 460 | Low income | 77.93 |
| Namibia | NAM | 4500 | Upper-middle income | 57.21 |
| South Africa | ZAF | 6010 | Upper-middle income | 54.07 |
| United Republic of Tanzania | ZWE | 1140 | Lower-middle income | 81.1 |
| Zimbabwe | TZA | 1080 | Lower-middle income | 79.11 |

FLFPR in most of the SADC Countries is much higher than in SAARC countries except Nepal which has the highest FLFPR amongst all the member countries of the two regional groupings. This is a significant factor which distinguishes SADC from SAARC. The table below is used to show the distinction:

### 7.2. FLFPR and Accessing to Clean Fuels and Technologies for Cooking and Accessing to Electricity in SAARC and SADC Countries

### 7.2.1. SAARC

Increase in the percentage of the population in accessing clean fuels and technologies for cooking and accessing electricity brought an increase in FLFPR though small in Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Maldives and Pakistan. In Bhutan,

Table 28: FLFPR (Age 15-64) in \%

| SAARC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Afghanistan | Bangladesh |  | Bhutan | Maldives | Nepal | Pakistan | Sri Lanka | India |
|  | Low <br> Income | Lower -middle Income |  | Lowermiddle Income | Upper- <br> middle <br> Income | Lower- <br> middle <br> Income | Lower- <br> middle <br> Income | Lowermiddle Income | Lower- <br> middle <br> Income |
| 2000 | 15.35 | 27.65 |  | 63.71 | 38.06 | 84.59 | 16.46 | 40.37 | 31.97 |
| 2019 | 22.74 | 38.48 |  | 62.31 | 43.05 | 85.3 | 22.63 | 37.58 | 22.26 |
| SADC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year | Botswana | Eswatini | Lesotho | Mauritius | Mozambique | Namibia | South Africa | Tanzania | Zimbabwe |
|  | Upper- <br> -middle <br> Income | Lower -middle Income | Lower -middle Income | Upper- <br> middle <br> Income | Low <br> Income | Uppermiddle Income | Upper- <br> middle <br> Income | Lowermiddle Income | Lowermiddle Income |
| 2000 | 51.21 | 45.5 | 69.2 | 43.45 | 88.16 | 49.33 | 48.22 | 86.49 | 72.74 |
| 2019 | 68.46 | 51.34 | 63.08 | 52.81 | 77.93 | 57.21 | 54.07 | 81.1 | 79.11 |

Nepal, Sri Lanka and India FLFPR decreased in 2019 in comparison to 2000. The fastest decline was visible in India. Thus, the two factors were not very significant in the context of these four countries.

### 7.2.2. SADC

Increase in the percentage of the population in accessing clean fuels and technologies for cooking and accessing to electricity brought an increase in FLFPR though small in Botswana, Eswatini, Mauritius, Namibia and South Africa.

In Lesotho, Mozambique and the United Republic of Tanzania FLFPR has decreased in 2019 in comparison to 2000. Thus, the two factors were not very significant in the context of these three countries. Mozambique and the United Republic of Tanzania are entirely unique in the respect that these two countries have already very high FLFPR even though a negligible percentage of the population accessing to clean fuels and technologies for cooking and accessing to electricity. Zimbabwe also exhibited similar characteristics even when there was a decrease in the percentage of the population accessing to clean fuels and technologies for cooking.

## 8. Conclusion

The integrity of the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) and the Southern African Development Community (SADC) can create enormous opportunities for females by engaging in diplomatic relations and treaties for sustainable development of clean fuel and accessing electricity in the remotest regions. Both the regional blocs can work together on fostering economic diplomacy for benefit of female labor. SAARC countries should learn from SADC countries about the factors which have pushed the regional group to a higher level in achieving improved levels of Gross National income Per Capita and female labor force participation rate. Murshed (2021) feels that the associated governments should implement policies that can expedite the rate of energy efficiency improvement, speed up the economic growth rate, restrict the influx of unclean foreign direct investment develop the financial sector, and ensure greater empowerment of women for facilitating clean cooking fuel transition across the regions of Sub-Saharan African Regions. Rahut et al. (2020) suggest that looking at the expansion of middle-class households and anticipating their demand for clean fuel for cooking, it is important to ensure an adequate supply of clean sources of energy to meet future demand as well as augment the affordability and awareness among households who are still dependent on solid fuels. Guruswamy (2015) writes that Around 2.8 billion people globally, also known as the "Other Third" or "Energy Poor," have little or no access to beneficial energy that meets their needs for cooking, heating, water, sanitation, illumination,
transportation, or basic mechanical power. Both the regional blocs should focus on policies that can deliver, reliable, safe, clean fuels and technology mainly for cooking to enhance female health and their participation in the labor force. Mutually beneficial cooperation between SAARC and SADC in the direction of encouraging female participation in the labor market and harnessing clean fuel energy for cooking and supply of electricity will be a boon for both the regional groups as the two economically important regional groups are the potential platform for their member nations. The strong ties between the two can give opportunities to member nations to compete with the globally competitive markets by recognizing the strength of huge female labor force potential. The need of the hour is to tap the potential of these economies.
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