

Women in Management; Part One

Perceptions of Effectiveness in the Workplace

Dr. Ronald M. Gordon
Management Consultant
rgordon123@bellsouth.net

ABSTRACT

The perception that women are inferior to their male counterparts with regard to management skills is not new nor is it even relatively recent. In order to gain a greater understanding of this concept, one must examine the root causes that stretch to biblical dictates or commands. Biblical verse can be viewed as a timeline and history as well as a foundation for decision making and managerial doctrine. The doctrine has been perpetuated throughout the ages into today's corporate world. Examining and uncovering the myths then comparing them to realities will aid in dispelling the fallacious and ingrained beliefs of today's executive management. Perhaps the study will have a small role in how we make a manager.

The Problem - The thought of working for a woman in an executive level position has brought derision and much speculation on the part of both genders. One might expect criticism on the part of males, but frequently, in an informal environment, females are as critical as or even more so than their male counterparts. Given that women have not been in management positions for a very long period of time when compared to males, there is a paucity of statistical data that provides an accurate measurement of the effectiveness of women as managers as compared to men.

The problem addressed herein is an attempt to determine whether women are truly less effective as managers than their male counterparts or capable of being equal to or even superior managers given equal opportunities. Further, this study represents an attempt to comprehend the nature of the barriers, the consequences therein and validity, if any, of current beliefs.

An in-depth examination reveals that anti-feminine attitudes on the part of males have their roots in Christian and non-Christian bibles (Christian examples can be found in Ecclesiastes & Simon Peter, e.g., in King James editions), and other similarly respected religious missives. Using scripture as their basis and professing their interpretations as guidelines for life, the educated wise men through the ages have had a major influence on the notions and decisions that dominant males have made and still make through today. Men such as Socrates (469 B.C.), Charles Darwin (1859), and Dr. Benjamin Spock (1945), have perpetuated the beliefs and practices of those sages today. The highly influential philosopher Arthur Schopenhauer (1788-1860), stated, "Hence it will be found that the fundamental fault of the female character is that it has no sense of justice. This is mainly due to the fact, already mentioned, that women are defective in the powers of reasoning and deliberation" and "Perjury in a court of justice is more often committed by women than by men," to cite just a few of the countless opinions of many the world leaders and philosophers throughout time and who have created the policies that have dictated the ways of the world even today.

Schopenhauer attempted to justify his beliefs by commenting that women are, "by nature meant to obey and can be seen by the fact that every woman who is placed in the unnatural position of complete independence, immediately attaches herself to some man, by whom she allows herself to be guided and ruled. It is because she needs a lord and master. If she is young,

it will be a lover; if she is old, a priest.”

Christianity is not the only bible or sacred parchment from which derogatory writings originate with regard to the status of women. Similar genres include opinions reflected in passages from Buddha, The Koran, The Torah, and the Talmud, to name a few.

Of particular interest and worthy of note is the role philosophers throughout history have had regarding the formation of societies' acceptance or rejection of women's endeavors outside the home. It was the aforementioned bibles that are the primary sources that perpetuated the terms “man” and “mankind,” as opposed to the current politically correct genderless references.

Ancient religious scripture had an obvious impression on Napoleon Bonaparte (1769 – 1821), which could account at least partly for the words he spoke during his exile on the island of St. Helena (1815-1821). In 1817, a scribe (Gougaurd, 1817) noted Napoleon commenting aloud, and to no one in particular, that women are inferior beings whose lot in life is that of childbearing and nothing else. In fact, it has been either implied or simply openly claimed that women are the cause of many of the worlds' ails such as pestilence and diseases (biblical stories and modern day movies), merely because they are women.

Problem Background: In her *A History of Women in the West, Vol IV: Emerging Feminism from Revolution to World War*, Nicole Arnaud-Duc (1993), determined that Napoleon opined that, nature intended women to be men's slaves; . . . “they are our property, we are not theirs.” Napoleon felt that women belong to men in the same manner as a tree that bears fruit belongs to the gardener. Napoleon felt that to give women equal rights was a mad idea. Women's only function in life, according to Napoleon, is to produce children.

Although Napoleon did not make his comments as a matter of state policy, nevertheless, his comments carried great weight as evidenced by the philosopher Schopenhauer who supported Napoleon's Civil Code with a comment he published in one of his opinions stating, “Napoleon's saying – ‘that women have no rank’ – should be adopted as the right standpoint in determining their position in society.” Napoleon's opinions threw fat on the proverbial fire helping to perpetuate and influence western attitudes with regard to perceptions of women.

Even The Constitution of The United States of America had to add an amendment (Amendment XIX, 1920), granting women the right to vote as citizens of this country.

The fact that the *Declaration of Independence* is gender specific and a majority of the world's great religions state outright that females are either to assume a subordinate role or one that is designed to be inferior has been a point of concern for equal rights activists for many years. It is conceivable that documents such as these are the foundation that perpetuates the misogyny that was created hundreds of years ago. Not surprisingly, these documents were written, accepted, and put into place, by men.

Considering the most powerful and influential people on this planet set the above attitudes in place, it is no wonder that prevailing opinions on the part of some corporations regarding women and their management abilities, or lack thereof, have such deep roots and as such, great problems in accepting women as equals.

Management principles and behavior sciences teach us that, in general, people have an innately strong resistance to any kind of change. To change opinions, no matter how deep the roots or how recently formed are nearly impossible to accomplish. Those same management principles teach us that in order to effect change in any organizational structure, the change must come from leadership.

Corporate America has to lead the way, but has yet to do so except for some token changes in a few companies. At best, one could attempt to get the attention of the power holders

in order to bring more of the berg to the surface. That can be done through scientific study and illustration of success against the odds. Obviously, women have a considerable barrier to deal with in their pursuit of acceptance as effective managers.

United States businesses and unions have experienced difficulty in avoiding discrimination in the absence of formal laws, and accordingly, Congress has weighed in with attempts to right the wayward ship of employment practices. By doing so, modern laws have added some fuel to the fire, albeit unintentionally, in that the Affirmative Action laws enacted by the United States Congress (Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title VII), which provided for non-discriminatory statutory relief for women and other minorities, have actually created new problems. As in most cases when a government body attempts to legislate morality, those laws can be misused and/or abused. That is exactly what has happened with Affirmative Action legislature. Charges of reverse discrimination have surfaced, protesting the laws that some claim gives an unfair advantage to those who are not as well qualified as experienced workers who represent the white majority.

The so-called white majority has charged reverse discrimination and favoritism, claiming quotas in hiring and promoting minorities based on race or gender as opposed to skills and knowledge. Although women are making inroads to upper-management positions, detractors claim it is because of laws as opposed to abilities. The problems become that of establishing the worthiness of employees to ascend the steps of management and the criteria used by upper-management personnel in assessing those criteria.

History: With regard to the perceptions of women's competency in the workplace, the die was cut when the major religions of the world postulated divine intervention as to the role of women. The King James version of the bible contains passages such as Ecclesiastes 7:28 in which the words, "Which yet my soul seeketh, but I find not: one man among a thousand have I found; but a woman among all those I have not found." Charles Darwin, the famed evolutionist claimed that women cannot attain the same degree of eminence that men can purely because women are women.

Philosophers with great impact on the academic and religious leaders of the world over the years have convinced modern day thinkers that there must be truth to the assumptions that women are inferior to men. One should note that all of the sage advisories regarding women over the years have been men.

As one of the most influential philosophers of the 19th century, Arthur Schopenhauer held that women are inferior to men in areas of reasoning, honor, and conscientiousness. He further asserted that women have no sense of justice and depend on craft rather than their wits in order to accomplish whatever they set out to do.

Napoleon Bonaparte is credited with making sweeping changes in society as it was known and practiced in Europe during the 18th century. However, in spite of his liberal leaning policies, he still maintained that women were nothing more than property whose only real job requirement was to bear children.

Obviously, the United States government is keenly aware of the disparity between the males and females in the workplace, specifically regarding pay. The federal government passed a law requiring equal pay for equal work (Equal Pay Act, 1963). The Department of Labor, Women's Bureau has records through 1995 that indicate women make less than 60 percent to that of their male counterpart.

More recent statistics from the United States Department of Labor indicate that the gap has narrowed somewhat in the records thru 1997. Women have shown increases in income,

especially those who have furthered their education to a bachelor's degree or higher. In 1997, those with said degrees had a starting salary of approximately \$29,781 as compared to \$19,443 in 1963. However, when comparing the same qualifications for their male counterparts covering the same criteria, the statistics indicate that men had a starting salary of \$38,496 in 1963 and \$47,426 in 1997. This represents a startling 38% difference in starting pay . . . clearly indicating that the gender gap prevails. However, the U.S. Department of Labor reports in February 2008, that in 2006, median weekly earnings of women who were full time wage and salary workers, was \$600 or 81% of that of men who earned \$743 reflecting a steadily decreasing gap.

Purpose of the study: Given the historic foundation over literally hundreds, even thousands of years, the merit of these opinions and assumptions becomes the central issue of this study. The primary purpose of this study is to examine perceptions, on the part of men and women, of the ability of women to manage as compared to men given the same set of circumstances. The secondary purpose of the study is to examine the nature of the barriers women face in advancing to top management positions.

The most prolific barrier is that which is based primarily in the form of gender discrimination based on ignorance, innuendo, rumor, and historical bias as opposed to informed rational decision-making on the part of senior level male management. Included in the study is the attempt to determine whether gender, age, education, skills, and perceptions affect the selection decisions of executive management to fill the upper-level openings when necessary.

Importance of the Study: This study is important because it examines the myths versus the realities regarding the capabilities of women in the workplace. Specifically, it examines perceptions of women in management positions, the effectiveness of their decision-making, leadership skills, and abilities to interact and/or manage others, as compared to their male counterparts.

Further, flawed thinking has created the so-called glass ceiling out of historical bias that has been written and accepted by the power structure throughout time. In many situations, male employees and managers believe minorities, especially women, have obtained their jobs thru some artificial means, i.e., affirmative action, sleeping with the boss, etc. as opposed to earning that position via merit. As is the case with all prejudices, the bias toward women managers has not been earned by actual performance or observed behavior. In other words, judgments have been made using unsupported rumor and innuendo.

What makes this study important is that it can aid in examining conditions and making changes that may serve to improve the lot of the woman manager and those who aspire to ascend the steps to upper management. With an eye to the rudiments of change, and with the notion that awareness facilitates the recognition for change and subsequent initiation of it, then perhaps unsupported bias will be replaced with informed decision making. Personal feelings may take longer to adjust however, but when competent decision-making and work related performance show an improvement over previous managers, possibly male counterparts, and the personal and professional assessments should reach a similar level of acceptance.

In the current world of business there is evidence of a gradual paradigm shift with more and more women taking charge of major executive positions and having arrived there through the good old-fashioned method of earning it. However, the gender gap still exists and unfortunately, the advances made to date have not been completely due to merit. Some promotions have been based on federally mandated attempts to legislate morality using programs such as Affirmative Action. Other advances could be attributed to influence brought about by radical feminist extremism and other outside influences on upper management decision makers.

Standard media sources do not satisfactorily address the question of whether those women who have entered into the corporate boardroom made it there based on merit or some other influence. Therefore a paucity of valid current data hinders the collection of statistical data that would support or deny the state of female management successes in today's world.

This study may not answer all the questions, but it will shed light on the perceptions of those who question the validity of women's abilities as compared to men who are doing the same job.

Related Literature: The uphill battle for women in the workplace to receive equal treatment, equal pay, and equal regard is certainly not a new thing. Perceptions of females as managers by males and females are a slowly evolving paradox that seems to defy logic. Stereotyping is an American past-time that has destroyed many relationships. There are studies available from numerous sources, including the United States government (Federal Glass Ceiling Commission), The American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), private industry watchdogs such as feminists groups, high profile women magazines, various management groups and more who have reported on the disparity studied herein. Despite the damning evidence of unfair fiscal practices on the part of corporations from the smallest to the largest in the country, little has changed in the compensation packages offered to women.

As previously noted, attitudes regarding women and their role in the workplace have been around since biblical times and even the minds of some of the world's greatest thinkers have deemed women to be inferior when it comes to matters outside the home. Darwin espoused, "The chief distinction in the intellectual powers of the two sexes is shown by man attaining to a higher eminence, in whatever he takes up, than woman can attain whether requiring deep thought, reason, or imagination, or merely the use of the senses and hands."

During the same timeframe of the aforementioned 'Eleven Tips,' was one of the most influential individuals of his time. Dr. Benjamin Spock had made an observation regarding what he considered the place for women in society when he alluded to the inherent biological and temperamental makeup. Spock wrote in his book, *Dr. Spock's Baby and Child Care*, (1945) that he believed women were made to be concerned first and foremost with child care, husband care, and home care. He further claimed that girls should be brought up to think of child rearing as exciting and creative work. This comment had a huge impact and subsequent influence on the workforce environment. Spock's attitude went a long way toward perpetuating the subordination of women in society and especially in the workplace.

Spock's childcare book was immensely popular for the new mother, but drew much criticism from those women who would be professionals in the heretofore men's world. The outcry was enough to cause Spock to rethink his position and nineteen years later, he released a new book, *Raising Children in a Difficult Time* (1974), reflecting a substantial reversal in his opinions regarding women's place in American society.

Dr. Spock admitted that he had been admonished for contributing to the prejudice and brainwashing against women. Spock commented in his newer book that he should have said both boys and girls should be brought up to think of child rearing as exciting and creative work. He further admitted that he showed the so-called usual male discrimination in his earlier assumptions. Spock added a footnote to his book that reads as follows: "In my defense, I'll add that I've always believed women could do well at any job that they had a real drive to tackle, if given the opportunity."

The irony in this attitudinal reversal on the part of Dr. Spock is that when he published his negative commentary, it was news, but when he reversed himself, it was not. Nationally,

very little was made of his retraction leading one to think that it is politically more advantageous to keep the masses under the impression that women really are inferior to men and perhaps positive commentary is not news.

Among the most influential philosophers of his time was Arthur Schopenhauer (1788-1860), who had a great impact on literature and on people in general and who was the first Western philosopher to have access to translations of philosophical material from India including Buddhist writings. Schopenhauer's writings and musings are read alongside such philosophers as Jung, Kant, and Nietzsche. Schopenhauer had distinctly strong views of women and their place in society. He opined that, "the people who make money are men, not women; and it follows from this that women are neither justified in having unconditional possession of it, nor fit persons to be entrusted with its administration."

Today, about 46% of the labor force in the United States is made up of women, projected to be at 51% between the years 2004 – 2014 (U.S. Dept of Labor, 2008), yet only about 10% of all women positions are in management, with many of those in mid-level management positions with little hope of advancement (Dunn, 1997; Kelly, 1991). In fact, most studies indicate that women hold fewer than 5% of senior managerial and executive positions in large corporate organizations. Among Fortune-500 companies, only 1.7 percent of the corporate officers are women, according to a 1986 study by Mary Ann Von Glinow, a professor in the school of business at the University of Southern California.

The general workforce of America has generated itself into a form of vertical segregation. This can be verified by an examination of those jobs that clearly distinguish themselves between women's and men's occupations appearing at different levels in workplace hierarchies (Blau & Ferber, 1992). Occupational segregation by gender constitutes a social problem for workingwomen in that women's concentration is in lesser paying jobs, and there is a distinct wage gap (West & Zimmerman, 1987).

This study is about identifying perceptions of women in the workplace, an examination of women's management style, and developing a model for successful ascension into the field of upper management.

The Representation of Women in Management: The intention of this study is to examine how the numerical restructuring of the workforce affects the experiences of women within management and perceptions of male counterparts as to the effectiveness of female management abilities.

Research methods require that when considering numerical restructuring; a distinction should be made between the numerical representation of women and their level of perceived intrusiveness. In this study, the term 'intrusiveness' refers to the perception by male employees/managers have on the role of women managers...that of intruding on their territory as it were. The effects of these two factors on the experiences of discrimination among female managers were examined in light of the concept of relative deprivation (Runciman, 1966; Walker & Pettigrew, 1984). Moreover, relative deprivation was used to account for women's motivation to promote their personal and collective situation. Reactions from a total of 253 female managers were investigated. Structural equation modeling technique (EQS) confirmed in part the proposed model. Practical and theoretical issues are discussed.

In the late 1800s, the *U.S. Bureau of the Census* (Albelda, 1997) reached a decision that affects the American workforce today. Women working at home were neither counted as employed nor as contributing to the economy. This conflict flies in the face of logic in that one might consider that without women working in the home in the 1800s, who would have

accomplished this task and how would what was considered production then be measured?

Surely the actual production on the part of the male breadwinner would be diminished and any household chores would have gone wanting. With that scenario in mind, it becomes apparent that the Census Bureau did not consider the following situation: what if every woman who is a so-called homemaker hired another woman to do the housework, would either of them be counted as employed and productive? Becker (1965) held that there is no meaningful difference in the household situation described above. Becker argues that if women stay at home, there must also be an economic rationale calculated as an accounting of production. Becker's rationale holds that household production is as important as work done for a firm. Becker bases his theory on Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations* (Smith, 1910) which states in part that the division of labor can improve economic efficiency. In the household illustration, Smith's concept could be demonstrated using the idea that if one spouse cooks and the other one cleans, they both will become expert at their particular task, thus creating a clear division of labor that has a net result in an overall reduction in the cost of maintaining the home. This then, would reflect in a savings of time and money which ultimately can be beneficial to a corporation by virtue of the refreshed worker spouse who is in the corporation acting as the so-called, 'breadwinner.' In this illustration, the unsaid implication is that the corporate worker would be the man. This could be a matter of preference as opposed to discrimination; however, there is strong evidence (Smith) that the more likely rationale is discrimination in the modern workforce.

Additional research implies that feeling entitled to better conditions is a key element in the decision of members of disadvantaged groups to take action to improve their conditions (Crosby, 1982; Major, 1994). Individual and inter-group differences have been found in the recognition of prejudice, discrimination, and feelings of entitlement (Major). In short, studies show that not all members of disadvantaged groups express dissatisfaction with their objectively unfair situation. Women in the labor force are an interesting point in case. According to research, women are clearly targets of discrimination in the labor market (Adler, 1993; Gutek, 1993; Human Resources and Development Canada, 1995; McKeen, 1991; Morrison & Von Glinow, 1990). Despite these gender inequalities, studies have found that many women experience a paradoxical contentment (Major, 1994). In other words, although women are treated unfairly in the labor force, some women report being satisfied with their situation. Although some will take action to improve their conditions, others will favor the status quo. This study assessed some factors that lead women to evaluate gender based differential treatment as illegitimate and, consequently, to take action to improve their personal and group conditions. This analysis is conducted within a context that could be construed as conducive to perceptions of entitlement on the part of women.

Women's Double Disadvantage: Women's lives changed dramatically in the last half of the twentieth century in most industrialized nations, especially in the United States. Among current important changes has been the increase in women's participation in the labor force and in the nation. According to the U.S. Department of Labor, the labor force includes people who are employed and those looking for a job. It does not include people who are not looking for a job because they are retired, are full-time students, are full-time homemakers or have given up looking. The Department of Labor, Women's Bureau, in a study conducted thru 1997, shows that in 1950 only 30 percent of women were in the labor force; by 1994 this figure had reached 58 % and through 2006, the percentage was 59.4%. Married women with young children have historically been the least likely to be employed, but by 1992, 54 % of women who had a baby who was under one year of age were in the labor force. Among women college graduates, 65 %

of women with a baby less than a year old were in the labor force in 1992. Although many fewer women today are full-time homemakers, women continue to do the bulk of child rearing and other household work in most families. This reflects a new gender system (the typical role assigned to men and women in a society, along with the constraints, incentives, and ideological beliefs that support these arrangements). In this new gender system, women work in both the household and in paid jobs. The gender system limited and disadvantaged women severely. The current system, while giving women more choices, still disadvantages women in paid jobs and in the family.

Occupational Sex Segregation: As more and more women have entered the job market, they generally have not entered jobs typically held by men. Although the extent of occupational sex segregation has declined since 1970 as more women have entered traditionally male managerial and professional jobs, occupations are still quite segregated by gender (Reskin & Hartmann, 1989). If we examine fairly detailed occupational categories, we see that most jobs are filled almost entirely by one sex or the other (Bielby & Baron, 1984). Occupations staffed mainly by women include assembly-line workers in industries such as electronics, toys, textiles, and garments; maids; clerks in retail stores; secretaries; receptionists; residential real estate agents; elementary school teachers; nurses; waitresses; and librarians. Jobs filled mainly by men include the higher levels of management; crafts (such as plumbers, carpenters, and electricians); assembly line jobs in durable manufacturing (such as autos, steel, and tires); truck driving; engineering; and outdoor manual labor. Female and male jobs require approximately equal amounts of education, on average, and there are “men jobs” and “women jobs” requiring very high and very low levels of education (England, 1992). Nonetheless, the jobs in which women are concentrated tend to pay less than male jobs do. Another disadvantage of female jobs is that they are often dead-end positions in which there is little opportunity for promotion into higher-level positions (Rosenbaum, 1980).

The Sex Gap in Pay: Based on various surveys and studies, but for our purposes, the Department of Labor, Women’s Bureau indicates that it is safe to conclude that women have substantially lower earnings than men based on the available data. A common way to measure the sex gap in pay is to take a ratio of the median earnings of women to the median earnings of men, limiting the comparison to full-time workers. Ratios of 0.60 means that women earn 60 % of what men earn. From 1960 to 1980, this figure was in the neighborhood of 60 % for women. Since about 1980, white women have shown gains, earning 71 % of what white men earned in 1995. Black women have shown more steady progress relative to black men since 1955, and by 1995 they were earning 85 percent of what black men did. However, the high female/male ratio of earnings among blacks does not mean that black women earn more than white women earn. Rather, it means that black women earn a higher proportion of the amount earned by men of their race than white women do. Black women’s pay is much lower than that of white men. Despite the trend toward narrowing the sex gap in pay, the difference is still substantial. A look at the causes of this pay gap reveals some historical foundations.

Socialization and the Social Construction of Gender: Socialization refers to the lifelong processes through which members of a society are encouraged to hold beliefs, values, and habits that are consistent with the dominant ideologies and power arrangements in that society. Sometimes psychologists view socialization as including only influences on children (Runciman, 1966). Sociologists take a broader view, seeing experiences during the teens and the adult years as part of the socialization process. This broader view of how a society’s gender system comes to be accepted is referred to by sociologists as the social construction of gender. It includes the

socialization of children and adults and the exercise of the power of various groups to make the values, understandings and practices, which they favor, predominate in society.

During childhood, sons and daughters are often given different toys, and their parents have different expectations about their occupational futures. Girls are given nurse kits, dolls, and play dishes, while boys are given soldiers, cars, trucks, baseballs, and pieces for construction. This gives girls and boys different messages about what activity adults see as appropriate for them and give them practice developing different preferences and skills. The fact that play groups are often segregated by sex reinforces these different directions. Also, when children see men and women in different types of jobs, they infer that this is how things should be. Schoolbooks subtly reinforce stereotyped career preferences through their pictures, stories, and examples. For example, pictures of teams of scientists, business leaders, or engineers working together often include few, if any, women. In contrast, typists, nurses, child-care workers, grade school teachers, and homemakers are almost always portrayed as female. Television, movies, and advertisements also depict traditional careers for men and women. In adulthood, sex-segregated voluntary organizations (such as Lions Clubs, sororities, fraternities, charitable groups, and sports teams) give men and women access to different information about jobs through their informal networks (Smith-Lovin & McPherson, 1993).

Discrimination: When people think of discrimination, they often think of lack of equal pay for equal work in the same job. However, this type of discrimination, which is clearly illegal, is not a major factor in the sex gap in pay. Different types of discrimination can be more significant and are examined below.

Discrimination by employers in hiring and placement has made it difficult for many women to enter jobs filled largely by men. Since the traditionally female jobs tend to pay less, this discrimination also affects the sex gap in pay. Many employers have not been willing to hire women as managers, carpenters, plumbers, bus drivers, pilots, or lawyers, even when women have had the job qualifications. Such discrimination has been illegal since Title VII of the Civil Rights Act was passed in 1964, outlawing discrimination on the basis of sex as well as race. This law has reduced discrimination, but has not eliminated it.

Employers engage in such sex discrimination for a number of reasons. Some fear that women are more likely than men to quit a job after receiving extensive training. However, women's turnover rates differ little from men's. Although women are more apt to leave paid employment to raise children, men change firms more often than women do. As a result, turnover rates for men and women are very similar (Waite & Berryman, 1985, Barnes & Jones, 1974, Haber, James, Lamas & Green, 1983, Viscusi, 1980).

Discrimination may also occur because employers think it is inappropriate for women to work in traditionally male jobs. For example, they may consider it "unladylike" for women to get their hands dirty on a construction site, argue a case in court, drive a truck, or attend an out-of-town sales convention. Employers may also believe that women are incapable of doing traditionally male jobs. The socialization process that was discussed earlier contributes to these beliefs.

Male workers sometimes attempt to persuade their employers to discriminate against female interlopers in order to keep women out of "their" jobs (Reskin & Roos, 1990) or, if women are hired for what has been traditionally considered male jobs, the male workers may harass them in some form. Examples would include men making sexual comments with a menacing or degrading tone, or be overly tough on the women they are working with, or refuse to provide women with the informal training they would give a new male worker. The federal

courts have viewed Sexual Harassment as a form of sex discrimination under Title VII, and the employers are legally responsible for preventing it in the workplace.

By engaging in sex discrimination, employers often create hostility between groups of workers. Such hostility may prevent workers from having a sense of solidarity that would lead them to form a union or support a political party or social movement to improve conditions for all workers. When discrimination has this effect, it serves to divide and conquer workers (Reich, 1981).

Whatever the motive, there is substantial evidence of discrimination that keeps women out of men's jobs despite their efforts to enter those fields (Rosen & Jerdee, 1978). Although such discrimination has declined in recent decades, it has not been eliminated.

Setting Wages for Male and Female Jobs: Predominantly female jobs generally require as much education as do predominantly male jobs. However, even after statistical adjustment for their educational and other skill requirements, as well as adverse working conditions, predominantly female jobs generally pay substantially less than predominantly male jobs do. Thus, research indicates that female jobs typically are not paid as highly as comparable male jobs (Treiman & Hartmann, 1981, Hill & Killingsworth, 1989), in spite of the Title VII law concerning comparable worth.

Comparable worth refers to efforts to remove this gender bias from wage-setting practices. The idea behind comparable worth is that male and female jobs should pay the same if they are comparable in their requirements for skill, training, effort, and the ability to cope with unpleasant working conditions, i.e., two jobs should not be paid differently simply because one is filled mainly by men and the other filled mainly by women (Treiman & Hartmann, 1984).

At first glance, the issues sound much like the more familiar issue of equal pay for equal work, which refers to men and women in the same job, with the same seniority, performing the same work equally well but being paid differently. Comparable worth is a related but distinctly different issue. It refers to comparisons between the pay in different jobs that entail different (although sometimes overlapping) tasks, between jobs that are predominantly male and jobs that are predominantly female. Assessments of which jobs are comparable are made by means of a technique called job evaluations in which job points are assigned on each of a number of factors, such as skill requirements, responsibility, and onerous working conditions. Two jobs that are very different will be considered comparable if they have the same number of points (Steinberg and Haignere, 1984).

For example, one comparable worth court case involved nurses working for the city of Denver, who were paid less than the city paid predominantly male tree trimmers and sign painters, even though the nurses had to have much more education and made life-and-death decisions in their work. In another case, secretaries for the city of San Jose discovered that they were generally earning less than were workers in male jobs that required not more than an eighth grade education, including men who washed cars for the city. A later job evaluation study showed that nurses earned \$9,120 a year less than fire truck mechanics and that legal secretaries made \$7,228 less than equipment mechanics. In 1985, the California School Employees Association complained that school librarians, many with a master's degree, were paid less than custodians and groundskeepers even though the men's jobs did not require even a high school diploma (Steinberg, 1990). The comparisons above all refer to what people in male and female jobs were paid when they had the same seniority. Studies based on national samples of all workers indicate that these patterns of paying female jobs less than comparable male jobs are pervasive throughout both government and the private sector.

An example of the use of job evaluation as a means to detect the type of discrimination involved in comparable worth is found in jobs filled by the state of Washington, their pay level, and whether a job was filled primarily with women or with men. A job evaluation was performed to give a score to each job in terms of four factors: the requirement for knowledge and skills, mental demands, accountability (responsibility for supervising other workers or being in charge of a budget or department), and difficult working conditions (noise and hazards). Male jobs pay more than female jobs that require the same or more job evaluation points. These findings, together with political pressure and a court case, led the state to make an out-of-court settlement to raise the pay in the female jobs so as to lessen the pay disparity between female-dominated and male-dominated jobs with the same job evaluation points.

So far, the courts have not interpreted Title VII of the Civil Right Act of 1964 to require that employers follow comparable worth principles in setting wages. Some states and localities, however, have passed laws mandating job evaluation for government jobs, with adjustments made if women's jobs are found to be underpaid (Steinberg & Acker, 1989; Evans & Nelson, 1989). However, most have not remedied this type of discrimination. At present, law in the private sector is not remedying this type of sex discrimination, where most people work. Let us not overlook another federal law that was enacted in 1963. That was the Equal Pay Act that requires equal pay for men and women performing substantially the same work. The act has not had a noticeable impact on today's society else there would be little or no gap in the compensation packages that is being offered in today's workplace.

It is the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), as the major agency involved in investigating issues regarding employment discrimination which includes wage issues. EEOC is an independent agency composed of five members appointed by the president of the United States and confirmed by the Senate. No more than three members of the commission can be from the same political party. Members serve for seven years. In addition, the EEOC has a staff of lawyers and investigators who do investigative and follow-up work for the commission (Mathis, 1997).

Human Capital: Economists refer to education and job experience as human capital. This term conveys the idea that skills and productive capabilities are gained through "investing" in schooling and on-the-job learning. However, despite the fact that additional years of education increase earnings for both men and women, the relative amounts of this type of human capital that men and women have do not explain the sex gap in pay, because the often-heard claim that men have more education than women is incorrect. There has been less than a year of difference between the median education of men and women in the U.S. in every year since 1940. Among those who are employed, while a higher percentage of white men than white women have college degrees, the reverse is true for blacks. And, among both whites and blacks, a higher percent of men than women are high school dropouts.

Job experience is a factor in the gender gap in pay. On average, men have more job experience than do women, and most employers pay more to workers who have been with the firm longer. The experience gap explains between 25 and 45 percent of the sex gap in pay (Corcoran & Duncan, 1979, England, Christopher & Reid, 1996). But why do women have fewer years of job experience? In part, this is caused by the forms of discrimination that were discussed earlier. When people have low earnings, they have less of an incentive to stay employed continuously. If women have financial support from a husband or from other sources so that their employment is not absolutely necessary, the decision whether to be employed continuously is affected by how great the rewards of employment are. Thus, lower wages caused

by discrimination are in part, the cause of women's lesser experience. Another reason for women having fewer years of paid job experience is that many women are responsible for a different kind of work: parenting and homemaking. Although women spend fewer years at home than they used to, some still spend a number of years in full-time homemaking and child-care.

Household Work and Child Rearing: People often refer to women who are employed outside the home as "working women" and refer to full-time homemakers as "women who don't work." Historians and sociologists say that the industrial revolution separated "work" from home, as most men and some women moved from working on the family farm to working in factories or offices. In fact, however, much work remained in the home and is still done there today, including cooking, dishwashing, cleaning, laundry, yard work, child-care, and the coordination of family members' schedules. It is important to recognize that household work really is work. The tendency not to recognize household work as real work is an example of the devaluation in our culture of activities done primarily by women. As we have seen, this devaluation extends to paid employment and is one cause of the low pay in predominantly female occupations.

Who does most of the household work? If one partner is a full-time parent and homemaker, it is usually the woman (Ehrensaft, 1990). But what about the more common contemporary pattern of couples in which both partners are employed? As more women have taken paid jobs, reducing the number of hours they have available for household work, men have increased their participation in household tasks only marginally (Berk & Berk, 1985). Men typically resist doing housework, and women either do have the power to change this arrangement or accept the situation (England & Farkas, 1986, Ross, 1987). The idea that women rather than men should do household work is an example of how gender has been socially constructed. Thus, while most men have only one job, today many women have two: one for pay and one in the household. Women's household work can be seen as a "second shift" for employed women after they come home from their paid jobs. As a result, employed married women usually get less sleep and have less leisure time than men do (Hochschild, 1989).

Emotional Work: In studies of household work, time spent interacting with small children is usually treated as work. However, activities such as a conversation between husband and wife tend to be regarded as leisure. While these activities are partly leisure, there is a kind of emotional work involved in listening carefully, encouraging a partner to finish his or her story, being able to understand and empathize with the thoughts and feelings of the other, and articulating one's own thoughts and feelings.

Women do more of this kind of work, leading to a greater degree of dissatisfaction on their part about the emotional quality of male-female relationships. Not only do men typically do less of the emotional work of articulating feelings, they also do less "active listening" to their partners. This leads to an "empathy gap" in marriages. That is, women report that they are not well understood by their marriage partners more often than men do (Scanzoni, 1970). Women typically ask questions ("What happened then?") or make other supportive responses ("Oh really?"). Such responses indicate that one is listening and interested and thus encourage the continuation of the partner's topic. In contrast, men are more apt to interrupt, change the topic, or offer a minimal response that does not encourage the woman to continue the topic she has introduced (Kramarae, 1980, Pfeiffer, 1985; Thorne & Henley, 1975). Thus, women often feel that they have not been encouraged to share their thoughts and feelings.

The notion that it is more appropriate for women to reveal their feelings and encourage others to express themselves while men should control the topic of conversation is another example of how the gender system has been socially constructed in ways that disadvantage

women.

Marital Power: Another important aspect of family life is decision-making. This includes decisions about where to live, how to coordinate schedules, how much time to devote to careers, who does household tasks, how money is to be spent, how often the couple will have sex and what sexual activities will be practiced, and how children are to be raised. What is the relative power of men and women in making these decisions?

Studies generally find that on average, husbands have more power than wives and male power is stronger when the wife is exclusively a homemaker than it is when she is employed outside the home, and that male power is less extreme when women have higher earnings (Scanzoni, 1979, Duncan & Duncan, 1978, McDonald, 1980, Blumstein & Schwartz, 1990).

Thus, domestic contributions don't "count" much toward marital power, another example of how our culture devalues traditionally female activities. Even though their earnings increase employed women's bargaining power, men typically have higher earnings, and thus retain greater power.

The Economic Risk of Divorce: When women marry, they put themselves at risk for the economic losses of divorce in a way that men do not. This risk is greater if the woman has children, stays home to care for them, and contributes toward building her husband's earning power rather than her own. As long as the couple stays together, a woman may suffer the inequities of marriage, but at least has the advantage of sharing the economic security made possible by her husband's earnings. However, in a divorce, she and her children typically suffer a large decline in family income (Espenshade, 1979).

The Double Disadvantage: Overall, although women are disadvantaged in both paid employment and the family, there are exceptions to this pattern. Some men are unemployed or have low earnings. Some women never marry. Some women are in nontraditional jobs with high wages, earning more than their husbands do. Some couples share housework and child rearing relatively equitably.

However, the general pattern is that women have lower earnings even when their jobs are skilled, do more than their share of household work even when they work for pay as many hours as their male partners, receive less emotional satisfaction from marriage, and have less marital power.

Women's disadvantage in the labor market contributes to their disadvantage in the family, and vice-versa. For example, because women are expected to take care of children, they are more likely to interrupt their careers than men are, perpetuating the sex gap in pay. Because women are discriminated against by employers and thus have lower earnings, they tend to have less marital power.

Were women better off when they were full-time homemakers and thus had only one job rather than two? While individuals' assessments of which system is better vary, it is important to realize the extent to which women were subordinate to men under the old gender system. Women were less able to leave unhappy marriages because fewer women had job experience and their earnings were even lower than today, the imbalance in marital power was probably greater, men were not expected to talk about their feelings and be emotionally empathic, and there was greater ignorance about women's sexuality. Although women have made progress in terms of employment opportunities and relative earnings, the current gender system restrains important features of male privilege in both employment and the household.

Can the Double Disadvantage be Changed? The systematic nature of women's disadvantage in both employment and the family makes gender inequality a serious social problem. Most

sociologists do not believe that individuals can change societal patterns single handedly, but they do believe that collective action by groups that come to see their situation in a new way can create change.

Two strategies for improving women's earnings are to give women access to traditionally male jobs with high wages and to make sure traditionally female jobs are paid in a nondiscriminatory way according to the demands of the job. This requires action to rid place of employment discrimination. Lack of equal pay for equal work in the same job and discrimination in access to positions are prohibited by federal law, yet different administrations dedicate different amounts of resources for the enforcement of these laws. Stricter enforcement would increase gender equity. For the most part, discrimination involving comparable worth is not prohibited. Since the federal courts have not interpreted Title VII to mandate comparable worth, it can be achieved only through new legislation. Such law would require employers to award equal pay to predominantly male and female jobs whenever a job evaluation awards them the same number of points for skills and working conditions, even though they entail very different tasks.

Women's burden in the household would change if men were expected to do their share of household work and if people believed that women deserve as much decision-making power and leisure with the family as men. One form of public action that would encourage such changes would be governmental educational campaigns that encouraged men to take responsibility for an equal share of the work of family life and to respect women's rights in the family.

Gender equality would be enhanced if child rearing came to be seen as a public, collective responsibility. Today most Americans assume that the education of children from kindergarten through high school is the collective responsibility of the community, through public schools financed by taxes. It is the next generation that will provide the labor to run factories and offices and to finance the Social Security and pension systems that allow older generations to retire. If we recognized this, Americans would be less likely to see child rearing as the private responsibility of each mother and mothers only.

Opposition comes in the form of institutional inertia and resistance from organized groups who feel that their material interests or their values are threatened by such changes. The women's movement, pro-feminist men's groups, advocacy groups for children, unions, and other groups could all contribute to making these changes. Such change does not come only through passing laws. It also happens through individual and collective action that contests the sexist ideologies and practices of many different institutions, leading to changes in the social construction of gender and the gender system.

SUMMARY

Part one of this study identifies many of the origins of today's perceptions of the effectiveness, or lack, of women's management skills and the reasons underlying pay inequities. Parts two and three examine the cultural differences between males and females as well as the alleged "Glass Ceiling," and ways women can improve their chances for advancement in the male dominated management community. The series concludes with an analysis of executive women and leadership. This is not to say that this series represents the entire spectrum of women in management, but it does help to answer the why and the how the role of women in the workplace has evolved. To know is to understand and to understand is to aid in finding solutions.

REFERENCES

- Adler, N. (1993). *An internal perspective on the barriers to the advancement of Women Managers*. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 42, 289-300.
- Albelda, R., Drago, R., Shulman, S. (1997). *Unlevel playing fields: Understanding inequality and discrimination*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Arnaud-Duc, N. (1993). A History of Women in the West, Vol IV: *The Law's Contradictions. Emerging Feminism from Revolution to World War*. 98-99, Harvard.
- Becker, G. (1965). *The Theory of The Allocation of Time*. Chicago; University Press
- Becker, G. (1965). Human capital, effort, & the sexual division of labor. *Journal of Labor Economics*.
- Berk, S. & Berk, W. (1985). *The Gender Factory: The Apportionment of work in American households*. Plenum, New York.
- Bible, Old Testament, King James Version. (1972). New York: Thomas Nelson Publisher.
- Bielby, W & Baron, J. 1984). *Sex Segregation in the Workplace: Trends, Explanations, Remedies*. National Academy Press, Washington, D.C.
- Blau, F. & Ferber, M. (1992). *The Economics of Women, Men, and Work*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Corcoran, Mary and Greg J. Duncan. 1979. "Work History, Labor Force Attachment, and Earnings Differences Between Races and Sexes." *Journal of Human Resources*. 14: 3-20.
- Crosby, F. (1982). *Relative Deprivation and Working Women*. New York; Oxford University Press.
- D'Andrade, R. (1966). *Sex Differences and Cultural Institutions*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Darwin, C. (1859). *Origin of the Species by Means of Natural Selection*. Royal, Geological, Linnean, etc., Societies' researches during H.M.S. Beagle's voyage around the world, (6th ed). London: John Murray, Albemarte St.
- Dunn, D. (1997). *Workplace/Women's Place*. Los Angeles: Roxburuy Publishing
Gender Issue: Why There Are So Few Women CEOs. American Management Association, 8.
- Ehrensaft, D. (1990). *Parenting together*. Chicago. University of Illinois Press

- England, Christopher & Reid (1998). *The effect of the sex composition of jobs on starting wages in an organization*. NLSY
- England & Farkas. (1986). *Households, employment, and gender. A social, economic, and demographic view*. New York: Aldine Publishers
- Espenshade, T. (1979). *The economic consequences of divorce*. The Journal of Marriage and the Family. 41, 615-625. Washington D.C. The Urban Institute Press.
- Federal Glass Ceiling Commission (1995). *A solid investment: Making full use of the Nation's Human Capital*. Washington D.C.: United States Government.
- Gourgaud, G. (1817). *The Mind of Napoleon, Sainte H el ene: Journal In edit of 1815, Vol I*, Paris: Flammarion, 390:
- Gutek, B. (1993). *Changing the Status of Women in Management*. Applied Psychology, An International Review; 42, 301-311.
- Kanter, R.M. (1977). *Men and women of the corporation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Kelly, C. & Kelly, J. (1994). *Who Gets Involved in Collective Action? Social Psychological Determinants of Individual Participation in Trade Unions*. Human Relations. 47, 63-88.
- Kelly, R. (1991). *The Gendered Economy: Work, Careers, & Success*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Kramarae, C. (1980). *The voices and words of women and men*. Pergamon Press. Pfeiffer, D. (1985) & Thorne & Henley, (1975). *Affirmative action & the unemployment of disabled persons*. AHSSPE Conference 254-256.
- Machiavelli, N. (1981). *The Prince*. New York: Bantam Classic
- Major, B. (1989). *Gender Differences in Comparisons and Entitlement: Implications for Comparable Worth*. Journal of Social Issues. 45. 99-115.
- Mathis, R. & Jackson, J. (1997). *Human Resource Management*, St. Paul: West
- McDonald, L. & Korabik, IL (1991). *Sources of stress and ways of coping among male and female managers*. Journal of Social Behavior and Personality. 6, 185-198.
- McDonald, L. (1980). *Women, gender & social psychology*. New York, Aldine Publishers
- McKeen, C.A. (1991). *Women in Management: Introduction*. Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences. 8, 222-223.
- Reich, P. (1981). *Applied social psychology: Understanding & addressing social & practical*

- problems*. Schneider, Gruman, Coutts (Eds), 8-9.
- Reskin & Hartmann, (1986). *Women's work, men's work: Sex segregation on the job*. National Academy Press. Washington D.C.
- Reskin and Roos. (1990). *Job Queues, Gender Queues*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Rosen & Jerdee (1978). *Influence of sex-role stereotypes on personal decisions*. Journal of Applied Psychology. 837-843. Springer, Netherlands.
- Rosener, J. (1991). *The Valued Ways Men and Women Lead*. HR Magazine. 147.
- Runciman, W.G. (1966). *Relative deprivation and social justice: A study of attitudes to social inequality in Twentieth-Century England*. Berkley. University of California Press.
- Scanzoni, J. (1970). *The sexual bind: Rethinking families & close relationships*. Newbury Park. Sage.
- Scanzoni, J. (1979). *A Historical Perspective on Husband-Wife Bargaining Power and Marital Dissolution*. 10-36 in *Divorce and Separation*, edited by G. Levinger and O. Moles. New York: Basic Books.
- Schopenhauer, A. (1977). *History of Ideas on Women: A Source Book*. NY. Perigee Books 193-206.
- Schwartz, F.N. (1989, 1990). *Management Women and the New Facts of Life*. Harvard Business Review. 67, 63-76.
- Smith, A. (1910). *The Wealth of Nations*. New York: E.P. Dutton.
- Smith-Lovin, L. J. & Miller McPherson. 1993. *You Are Who You Know: A Network Approach to Gender*. 223-251 in *Theory on Gender, Feminism on Theory*, ed. by Paula England. Hawthorne, New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Solomon, King in Ecclesiastes 7:28. King James Bible: Old Testament.
- South, S.J., Bonjean, C.M., Markham, W.T., & Corder, J. (1982). *Social Structure and Intergroup Interaction: Men and Women of the Federal Bureaucracy*. American Sociological Review. 47, 587-599.
- South, S.J., Markham, W.T., Bonjean, C.M., & Corder, J. (1987). *Sex Differences in Support for Organizational Advancement*. Work and Occupations. 14, 261-285.
- Spock, B. (1974). *Raising Children in a Difficult Time*. 39, 256-257. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.

Steinberg & Acker (1989). Evans & Nelson (1989). *Doing Comparable Worth: Gender, Class & Pay Equity*. Philadelphia, Temple University Press.

Steinberg, Ronnie. 2001. *Comparable Worth in Gender Studies*. International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences, ed. Neil J. Smelser and Paul B. Baltes, 4, 2293-2397. *Comparable Worth Analyses and Evidence*. Edited by M. Anne Hill and Mark R. Killingsworth. Ithaca, NY, Cornell University, New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, 1989. 138.

Tougas, F., Beaton, A.M., & Joly, S. (1990). *L'appui des femmes a l'action positive: une question d'image on de cohere?* Science et comportement, 20, 211-222.

Tougas, F. Beaton, A.M., & Veilleux, F. (1991). *Why Women Approve of Affirmative Action: The Study of Predictive Model*. International Journal of Psychology. 26, 761-776.

Treasury Board of Canada. (1990). *Beneath the veneer. The Report of the Task Force on Barriers to Women in the Public Service* (Vol. 3). Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada.

Treiman, D. & Hartmann, H. (1981). *Women, Work and Wages: Equal pay for jobs of equal value*. National Academy Press, Washington D.C.

United States Bureau of Census. (1980). *Percentage of Women in the Labor Force*.

United States Bureau of Census. (1994). *Women in the Labor Force*.

United States Department of Labor, Women's Bureau. (1994, 1995). *Don't Work in the Dark-Know Your Rights*.

United States Department of Labor, Women's Bureau. (2008). *Women in the Labor Force, 2006*.

Waite & Berryman (1985). Barnes & Jones (1974). Haber, James, Lamas & Green (1983). Viscusi (1980). *Sex Segregation in the workplace*. Ohio State University. University of Columbus.

Walker, I., & Mann, I. (1987), *Unemployment, Relative Deprivation, and Social Protest*. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin. 13, 275-283.

West & Zimmerman. (1987). *Doing gender*. University of California; Santa Barbara.

Walker, I., & Pettigrew, T.F. (1984). *Relative Deprivation Theory: An Overview and Conceptual Critique*. British Journal of Social Psychology. 23. 301-310.

Yoder, J.D., Adams, J., Grove, S., & Priest, R.F. (1985). *To Teach is To Learn: Overcoming Tokenism with Mentors*. Psychology of Women Quarterly. 9. 119-131.