Presentation Outline

1. Labor Force Participation: the House – Work tension and "Opting-Out"

2. Discrimination: New Theories and Examples

3. Sex Segregation: Neoclassical explanations, Revolving Doors, and Queues
Fact: Since the 1960s, women have increasingly entered the labor market, to previous “male-only” jobs

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ErSno36icyg

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dPkYmI5RECY&feature=player_detailpage#t=90

• Women entering a male-oriented workplace shift their way of thinking about time at home and time at work.

• We should spend more time at our jobs to earn more but we are ambivalent about spending time at home. This is the *Time bind*.

• Interviews at “Amerco”, a Fortune 500 company. She spoke to workers there and followed them around.

• Devaluation in male wages -> many women entered the work force (*really?*). But they did so in “male-terms” -> less time available to stay at home.

• This happens not only in poor families but also in upper-middle class families.
Women comprise vast relative numbers in higher education, sometimes up to 50% or more. They then get jobs at top firms. But then they stop ‘climbing’. Why?

Stats about women’s involvement in workplace in the US, number of mothers working/not working, and their trajectories.

Women *could* get to power, but they *opt out* of the labor market to raise children.

Women get children, leave their job and few ever come back to the labor market.

Women are redefining work and success. They can take time off their families to pursue success and money goals, as men did.

- Interesting: the workplace needs women because they are flexible and thus the market adapts to new flexibility models (*yeah, right...*)

“Why don’t women run the world? Maybe it’s because they don’t want to”.
To test the opting out theory


There is no evidence of new women opting out. If anything, there are higher numbers of employment rates among professional women, but there is a stabilization for younger cohorts.

Sex-type of job present differences for full-time year-round employment, for which women have higher rates in male than female occupations.
Discussion questions

1. Is opting out real? Is it new? Has it always been part of the labor market? Is it a discourse? Whose discourse? For which women?

2. If working in the labor market seems like anomie for women, where does household work or working-at-home fit? What about domestic workers?

3. Where is the agency in all this? Where is the structure?
Discrimination is the differential treatment of persons because of status characteristics that are functionally irrelevant to the outcome in question (an intended and consciously motivated act).-> explicit purposive-action framework.

However, all these ignore other source of employment discrimination: automatic, unconscious cognitive processes:
- Categorization
- Stereotyping
- Attribution error

Micro processes -> macro level consequences.

Policies/Practices:
- Decategorization
- Recategorization
- Increase the amount of unambiguous relevant information
- Curbing decision maker’s discretion
Now, discrimination is no longer intended and conscious. The mechanisms behind discrimination are hardwired by biology into our brains and are not accessible to human decision makers.

Discrimination, from animus or statistical considerations is rational in the sense that (a) it reflects preference, (b) it is intended, and (c) the employer is conscious about (a) and (b). Action is conscious and directed toward achieving goals that the agent values. Legislation has made discrimination more costly.

Experiments of implicit association to prove unconscious discrimination.
Fact: Until recently members of the orchestras in the U.S. were largely handpicked by the music director. Among the five highest-ranked orchestras in the US none contained more than 12% women until about 1980. Most major orchestras changed their audition policies in the 1970s and 1980s making them more open and routinized. Identities of the applicants were hidden, by blinding and screens.

- Looking at blind-audition records and hiring practices in 8 orchestras in the U.S.

- Findings:
  - The adoption of the screen and blind auditions served to help female musicians in their quest for orchestral positions. This was reflected in actual hiring practices observed by the authors.
Fact: Mothers in the United States suffer a 5 percent per-child wage penalty. The pay gap between mothers under age 35 is larger than the pay gap between men and women.

• Wage gaps have been explained by two arguments: difference between productivity and discrimination.
• Two experiments:
  1. Laboratory study to test the hypothesis of the "motherhood penalty": motherhood is a "status characteristic" that results in biased evaluations of commitment and competence and a stricter standard for evaluating the workplace performance of mothers.
  2. Audit study to test actual discrimination of employers

RESULTS:
• Mothers were judged significantly less competent and committed than women w/o children
• They were held to harsher performance standards, allowed less late times to work, and needed a higher score on management exams
• The motherhood penalty interaction: parental status negatively impacts ratings for female, but not male, applicants.
• Being a parent lowers the odds that a women, but not a man, will receive a callback from employers. Mothers are disadvantaged when actual employers make hiring decisions.
Most literature on LGBT wage discrimination has focused on wage inequality; however, hiring discrimination is an important inequality-generating mechanism with potentially powerful effects on a job seeker's access to a broad range of opportunities.

Audit study, responding to job postings with two resumes with a sign of sexual orientation.

RESULTS:

- Large part of the discrimination is due to stereotypes, jobs classified as responding to stereotypically male heterosexual characteristics.
- Heterosexual applicants had a 11.5 percent callback, equally qualified gay applicants had only a 7.2 percent response.
Discussion questions.

1. Interaction of sexual preference + gender. If stereotypes of feminized-men (gay) lower chances of hiring, would stereotypes of masculinized-women (lesbians) increase chances of callback/hiring?

2. If discrimination is unconscious, how guilty is someone that unconsciously discriminates someone? How can it be prohibited/controlled?

3. Nature/nurture debate around discrimination (sexual division of labor). What role do biological differences play? Should they be taken into account?
Test the validity of the Neoclassical explanation of sex segregation in the workplace

Guess what? It is not true, at least for two reasons:
  - Allocation: Women do not exert less effort to work than men
    - No limited energy sources
    - Entitlement norms make women perform better than men
    - Structural characteristics reinforce sex differences
    - “Rational” behavior does not work smoothly
  - Non-statistical bases of discrimination: There is a reproduction of “traditional” gender roles
    - Policies (who is hired)
    - Inertia
    - Cultural stereotypes (Misperceptions and expectancy confirmation sequences)
    - Interests (do men want to concede power to women?)

• Defend the revolving door theory against the cumulative disadvantage theory

• Labor market is more porous than it is believed. Women “come and go” from male-dominated jobs at different stages of their lives.

• No methodology. We have to believe him.

• There is mobility in jobs. However this does not mean equal opportunity.

• Women have 1/3 chance of going into a male-dominated job. But that means they can go to others as well.

• Segregation is maintained not only by socialization but also by social control.

- Markets behave like a queue system instead of rational neoclassical explanations.

- Case studies of several occupations that doubled women participation (bartenders, pharmacists, etc.)

- Queues have:
  - Ordering (preferences)
  - Overlap of interests
  - Shape

- Emphasis in the collective nature of sex segregation and values assigned to jobs

- Group conflicts between employers, male workers and female workers:
  - Employers (supposedly rational)
  - Male workers (short-term goals)
  - Employers+Male workers (confine women to bad jobs)
  - Employers+Female workers (organize and get in the queue)
  - Male workers resistance (against integration—they keep the best jobs).
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Discussion questions.

1. For what types of jobs is the revolving door true? Do you believe in it?

2. The queue theory seems to work for low-skilled jobs. What happens in jobs that require more credentials or experience?

3. What is more convincing, structural or agency-based explanations?