

**BARRIERS TO WORKPLACE ADVANCEMENT
EXPERIENCED BY WOMEN IN LOW-PAYING OCCUPATIONS**

January 1994

Sharon L. Harlan, Ph.D.

Catherine White Berheide, Ph.D.

Center for Women in Government

University at Albany

State University of New York

This report was funded under purchase order number B9434073 for the U.S. Department of Labor, Glass Ceiling Commission. Opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent the official position or policy of the U.S. Department of Labor.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The U.S. Department of Labor Glass Ceiling Commission funded this project, along with several others across the country, to help the commission formulate recommendations in its final report to the President and Congress.

We gratefully acknowledge the help of the Commission's staff, Sarah Gotbaum and Ellen Wernick, in formulating and finalizing the substance of the report. Brigid O'Farrell, Center for Women Policy Studies, was very generous with her time and expertise in offering suggestions and critical feedback on drafts of the report. We also thank Judith Saidel, executive director, and Pamela Robert, senior research associate, Center for Women in Government, for thoughtful and helpful comments. Judith's discussions with Joyce Miller, former executive director of the Glass Ceiling Commission, paved the way for support of this research.

Finally, we could not have completed this on schedule without the valuable assistance of Michele Forbes. Michele's organizational skills allowed us to navigate through vast amounts of material, and she took up the important tasks of tracking down census data and writing the annotated bibliography.

SH
CWB
Summer 1994

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

I. INTRODUCTION

The invisible barriers that limit women's progress toward employment equity extend all the way from the "glass ceiling" at the top of the nation's largest corporations to the "sticky floor" of low-paying, low-mobility jobs at the bottom of the labor market. These barriers are created by a process of exclusionary practices that successively eliminate women, people of color, and other disadvantaged groups as candidates for higher positions. Barriers exist in the structure of work organizations, in the structure of the educational and economic systems, and in the larger social order.

In this paper, we examine the workplace barriers that restrict the opportunities of the vast majority of employed women who will never advance high enough to encounter the "glass ceiling." We use the results of a wide range of empirical research to analyze how social structures create and recreate gender, race, and class inequality specifically by limiting the advancement of women and people of color who work in low-paying jobs.

II. LOW-PAYING JOBS AND THE CONCEPT OF ADVANCEMENT

A low-paying job is one in which an individual earns less than one and a half times (150 percent) the federal poverty threshold for a family of four. Using this standard, we classify as a low-paying job one that paid a full-time worker an annual income of less than \$21,515 in 1992. People in low-wage jobs earn less than \$414 a week (or less than \$10.00 an hour) on a full-time, year-round basis. A person who makes less is not earning a "living wage" in today's economy.

"Advancement" beyond low-paying jobs must be considered in a broader context than simply movement up the hierarchy of a private sector firm or public agency. In the best case, advancement means a job change that results in better pay, benefits, working conditions, or security. In other cases, it is simply a matter of perceiving that one is better off than one's reference group or one's own expectations for attainment.

Many women work in low-paying jobs in the informal and secondary sectors of the economy where opportunities are lacking. The majority of women employed in the largest and most stable U.S. companies work in clerical, blue-collar, service, and sales jobs at the lower levels of organizational hierarchies. Women in these types of jobs have few opportunities for "promotions" and they face many structural and cultural barriers that keep them from earning more money.

III. BARRIERS TO ADVANCEMENT EXTERNAL TO ORGANIZATIONS

Discrimination in educational opportunities and in economic systems that are external to work organizations present formidable barriers to women.

1. *Educational systems* that use gender, race, and class to ration access to first-rate education restrict future job opportunities for many women, minorities, new immigrants, and people from lower or working class backgrounds.
2. *Occupational segregation* results in the over-representation of women and minorities in the lowest-paying jobs. Nearly 70 percent of the full-time female labor force work in low-paying occupational categories. Women of color work in minority-female-dominated jobs in the race- and gender-specific segment of the secondary labor market.
3. *Wage differentials by gender and race* are due to channeling women and minorities into less complex jobs, as well as underpaying female-dominated and significantly minority jobs relative to their compensable characteristics.
4. *The class position* of low-paying jobs in the capitalist labor market is a structural barrier to job advancement. Class-based economic power relationships are closely associated with the sexual and racial division of labor.
5. *The growth of the contingent work force* is creating more part-time and temporary jobs in which women and African Americans are over-represented. Approximately half of employed women work in part-time or part-year jobs; most have low-paying jobs with no employee benefits or protections against earnings loss from social insurance systems.

IV. BARRIERS TO ADVANCEMENT: ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

Organizations mirror society's ideas about which groups of workers are appropriate for different kinds of jobs. Although hiring and promotion decisions in organizations are supposed to be based on rational and universalistic criteria, they often express informal and socially acceptable expectations about the gender, race, and class of the people best suited for particular positions.

1. Gender and race are often synonymous with one's place in organizational hierarchies. Those individuals who occupy the top positions have a stake in maintaining traditional rules and procedures related to hiring, promotion, seniority, and other personnel practices, that work to their advantage and exclude others.
2. Social relations at work between women and men as well as between racial minorities and whites form barriers to upward mobility. These include sexual harassment, exclusion from informal systems of support, and resistance to EEO policies.

V. BARRIERS TO ADVANCEMENT: ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

Social norms, cultural stereotypes and power and privilege in organizations provide the "invisible foundation" for organizational decisions about which jobs and how much opportunity are suitable for certain types

of workers. These decisions determine the ways that complex organizations structure work, creating barriers for women and keeping them from advancing in organizational "pipelines."

1. The low-paying jobs with the largest number of female incumbents are not connected to any "pipeline" (job ladder) in the organization.

2. Job recruitment and hiring practices used by employers often result in the initial placement of women in jobs that have short or nonexistent job ladders. This results from using inexpensive and expedient "screens" for job applicants, and from recruiting candidates through sex-segregated training and educational programs.

3. Job incumbents who work in jobs on female-typed job ladders experience significantly lower rates of promotion than those whose jobs are on male- or mixed-gender job ladders.

4. Women who might move to male or mixed-gender job ladders with higher opportunities for promotion are blocked by restrictive eligibility requirements, seniority rights, and the lack of training and career development opportunities.

5. Enforcement of rigid work schedules, requirements of excessive time commitments, and lack of family-sensitive employee benefits constrain women's promotional opportunities as they try to combine jobs with the needs of their families. Ironically, low-wage jobs are the most inflexible and least likely to have benefits.

6. Job evaluation systems that form the basis for employer compensation policy perpetuate the invisibility of the content and context of women's work. Value bias in job evaluation systems means that existing wage structures neither acknowledge nor reward the skill, effort, and responsibility in traditional women's jobs.

VI. STRATEGIES FOR INCREASING ADVANCEMENT OPPORTUNITIES

Improving the advancement opportunities of low-wage workers, especially women and minorities, will require significant changes in social structures. Affirmative action programs did not fulfill their promise for women at the bottom of organizational hierarchies. Interpreted narrowly as increasing the number of women and minorities in nontraditional jobs, affirmative action was an inadequate basis for creating social change in organizations. The elimination of sexism and racism from organizations can occur only if the rigid organizational hierarchies that institutionalize class inequality are drastically reduced through the following strategies:

1. Raise the wages of low-paying jobs through equitable compensation policies.

2. Improve advancement opportunities through changes in administrative promotion systems and redesigned job ladders.

3. Make substantial investments in the education and training of the lowest-paid employees.

4. Stop requiring excessive time commitments that force employees to "prove" that their job is more important than their family.

5. Redirect organizational "diversity" initiatives away from changing attitudes and toward reducing structural inequalities in organizations.

The women who work in this country's lowest-paying jobs do not work for large corporate employers or in the public sector. A long distance separates women in part-time, temporary, and underpaid jobs in the informal and secondary economy from those who work for large, stable employers. Reducing the amount of inequality generated by economic and educational institutions will help women on the outside of organizations.

1. Reform the legal framework for industrial relations so that it offers opportunities for representation and collective bargaining rights to the contingent work force. Increased unionization promises better wages and working conditions for women in low-wage jobs who currently lack such protections.

2. Increase poor women's access to higher education, especially four-year degree programs in colleges and universities. Although basic education, literacy programs, and skills training programs enable women to enter the labor force, these are not enough to provide women with the education needed for upward mobility. In today's labor market, only women in managerial, professional, and technical occupations have average earnings that provide a living wage.

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR POLICY AND RESEARCH

Women and minorities on the sticky floor of the economy are disadvantaged by the class inequalities and organizational hierarchies that overlap and perpetuate sex and race discrimination. Steps that the federal government could take to reduce the degree of inequality among jobs and among individuals include policies that would: 1) raise wages; 2) provide better protection for workers in low-paying jobs; 3) change the structure of external and internal labor markets; 4) provide more support for families; and 5) increase public and private investment in the education and training of low-wage workers.

To devise better strategies for eliminating the barriers to upward mobility encountered by low-wage workers, more research that includes women of all racial and ethnic backgrounds is needed on the following: 1) the contingent work force; 2) advancement in sales and service occupations; 3) measuring value bias in compensation systems; 4) effects of employers' family policies on careers; 5) employers' training investments in nonexempt jobs; and 6) independently conducted evaluations of employers' diversity initiatives.

BARRIERS TO WORKPLACE ADVANCEMENT EXPERIENCED BY WOMEN IN LOW-PAYING OCCUPATIONS

Sharon L. Harlan and Catherine White Berheide

I. INTRODUCTION

The "glass ceiling" metaphor originally referred to the invisible barriers that keep a small number of highly placed women from reaching the very top jobs in the largest corporations in the United States. Over time it has proved to be an enduring and extraordinarily powerful image, one that has focused sustained attention on the limitations of women's progress toward employment equity. Those limitations extend all the way from the glass ceiling at the top to the "sticky floor" of low-paying, low-mobility jobs at the bottom (Berheide 1992). The glass ceiling mirrors the barriers at lower levels of the labor market. It is but the last barrier in a process of exclusionary practices that successively eliminate women, people of color, and other disadvantaged groups as candidates for higher positions.

These barriers exist in the structure of work organizations, in the structure of the educational and economic systems, and in the larger social order. To achieve a more equitable distribution of opportunities, one that is not distorted by unfair treatment, we need to understand and then eliminate all the artificial barriers created by class, race, and gender, including but not limited to those that make up the glass ceiling. In this paper, we examine the workplace barriers that restrict the opportunities of the vast majority of employed women who will never advance high enough to encounter the "glass ceiling."

We use the results of a wide range of empirical research in sociology, economics, business, and organizations to analyze how social structures create and recreate gender, race, and class inequality specifically by limiting the advancement of women and people of color who work in low-paying jobs. This same research, augmented by phone interviews with consultants, companies, and trainers, provided specific examples of mobility barriers for

women in low-paying jobs and of corporate attempts to eliminate barriers in internal labor markets. In addition, we use household data from the 1992 Current Population Survey to show disparity in the proportions of and earnings of women and men employed in occupational categories. We also present 1990 census data to illustrate the overrepresentation of racial and ethnic minority women in low-paying occupations.

Section II considers the definitions of low-paying jobs and job advancement. We define low-paying jobs as those in which full-time wages are less than 150 percent of the federal poverty threshold for a family of four. Job advancement for low-wage workers means any change that results in better pay, benefits, working conditions, security, or even the perception that one is better off. Section III provides an overview of barriers that are external to work organizations, specifically within educational and economic systems. Sex stereotyping in educational and training programs, as well as structural features of the labor market, impede women's upward mobility; that is, improvement in job status or income. Once women enter the internal labor markets of organizations, they encounter another set of barriers. The mobility barriers in low-paying jobs within well-defined organizational hierarchies are clearly part of an exclusionary process that begins on the sticky floor and culminates at the glass ceiling. Sections IV and V provide a more in-depth examination of those barriers that exist within work organizations at both the cultural and structural levels. Section VI considers a variety of workplace initiatives that have had some success in improving the situation of low-waged women. We argue that uncovering structural processes is the prerequisite for successful intervention programs. Section VII sets forth recommendations for policy and future research.

The metaphor of a glass ceiling has had the important effect of drawing attention to the ways in which women are excluded from positions of power and leadership. Focusing only on the glass ceiling, however, has the potential to narrow our efforts to understand and address issues of employment equity. Many women work in low-paying jobs in the informal

and secondary sectors of the economy. The majority of women employed in the largest and most stable U.S. companies work in jobs at the lower levels of organizational hierarchies. Achieving employment equity for women in all these low-paying jobs requires opening advancement opportunities to them. The larger the gap in power, prestige, and pay awarded to people working at the top of organizations compared to those working at the bottom of or outside organizations, the higher will be the barriers to improving upward mobility for women and people of color. The power, prestige, and pay of jobs on the sticky floor need to be elevated to reduce that gap. Improving women's opportunities for advancement requires significant changes in social structures.

II. LOW-PAYING JOBS AND THE CONCEPT OF ADVANCEMENT

Definition of Low-Paying Jobs

When people say that someone works "for a living," they mean that ordinary men and women support their families with income earned from their jobs. "Living" implies a wage that can adequately support a family without subsidies from government or other sources. Although the earnings necessary to support a family vary by characteristics such as family size, age of members, and number of workers, many analysts measure adequate earnings, or a "living wage," as some proportion of the federal poverty threshold for a family of four (e.g., Spalter-Roth, Hartmann, and Andrews 1993; Pearce 1990).

We define a low-paying job as one in which a man or woman earns less than one and a half times (150 percent) the federal poverty threshold for a family of four. Using this standard, we classify as a low-paying job one that paid a full-time worker an annual income of less than \$21,515 in 1992. People in low-wage jobs earn less than \$414 a week (or less than \$10.00 an hour) on a full-time, year-round basis. A person who makes less than \$414 a week is not earning a "living" wage in today's economy.

"Advancement" in Low-Paying Jobs

Extensive research (e.g., Cockburn 1991; Segura 1989; Kanter 1977) demonstrates the lack of advancement opportunity in all types of female-dominated low-paying jobs. For mid-level and top managerial jobs in complex organizations, advancement typically means promotion to higher levels in the career ladder where the job incumbent has more autonomy, control, resources, and a higher salary. Central concerns in formal promotion systems include the selection of candidates based on merit and equal opportunity for women and people of color. In low-level jobs, however, advancement seldom means "promotion" because most of these jobs are either not in complex organizations, or if they are, they lack career ladders that link them to any of the higher level positions in organizations. Thus, the lack of opportunity that is inherent in the structure of the labor market is itself a barrier, one that becomes even more insurmountable as it intersects with the gender, race, and class of job incumbents.

"Advancement" beyond low-paying jobs must be considered in a broader context than simply movement up the hierarchy of a private sector firm or public sector agency. In the best case, advancement means a job change that results in better pay, benefits, working conditions, or security. In other cases, it is simply a matter of perceiving that one is better off. Segura's (1989, p.48) study of Chicana and immigrant Mexican women in low-wage jobs illustrates how they perceive upward mobility:

They evaluated job success according to the type of job they thought they would get as a worker in the U.S. labor market, the earnings they thought they would earn as an adult worker, and whether their current job was better than jobs held by members of their reference groups. If their current job met any one of these conditions, the respondent considered herself to be occupationally mobile--even if actual wages or working conditions had not improved from the first to the current job.

Jobs in the Informal Economy. Completely outside the realm of corporate America, the lowest of low-paying jobs are in the informal or "underground" economy. Many of these workers clean other people's homes, tend their yards, or care for their children. Street vendors (Spalter-Roth 1988) and ethnic enterprises often involve jobs in the informal economy. Since the defining characteristic of this form of work is that employers and workers do not report it, there are no official statistics on the number of such workers (Hall 1994). Recently, the cases of several designates and appointees to high-level positions in the federal government highlighted the widespread existence of these jobs, the immigrant people who often do them, and the exploitative working conditions.

The women in Segura's study felt mobile when they worked in the formal labor market because these were better jobs than those their peers had in the informal economy as baby-sitters or housecleaners. A stable job, even a low-paying one with limited advancement, may constitute upward mobility for women in the underclass. For low-wage workers employed outside complex organizations, advancement might mean:

- o Moving from the informal (underground) economy to the formal economy;
- o Moving from an employer who treats workers badly to one where the treatment is better;
- o Moving from jobs that are peripheral to an employer's work force (part-time, seasonal, or temporary) to jobs that are full-time, year-round.

Jobs in the Formal Economy. Women who work in low-paying jobs in the formal economy are located at the bottom levels of organizational hierarchies. Their perceptions and expectations about "good" jobs often define mobility for these women (Harlan 1989; Rosen 1987). However, movement between and within organizations, as well as pay increases, also constitute "advancement." Advancement might mean:

- o Moving from smaller firms that offer low-paying and unstable jobs with poor benefits (the secondary sector) to larger firms that occupy a better market position (the primary sector);
- o The possibility of promotion in graded job ladders, where such formal structures exist, or to the relatively few supervisory positions available;
- o Shifting to a higher-paying occupation, a move that requires access to training and development and usually entry into an occupation that is nontraditional for women;
- o A change in job evaluation and wage-setting policies that revalues low-wage jobs by basing pay on required skill, effort, and responsibility and not on the gender, race, or class of job incumbents.

Women in low-paying jobs in the formal economy typically work in one of the following occupational categories:

Clerical jobs. Clerical work employs the largest number of women in the United States, both absolutely (14.7 million) and proportionately (27.5 percent), in such titles as secretary, bookkeeper, typist, or receptionist. African American women, historically excluded from white-collar work, began entering some types of clerical jobs in the past 25 years. However, they are over-represented in lower-paying jobs and are less likely than white women to leave clerical work for better jobs (Power and Rosenberg 1993). Traditionally, clerical jobs had higher pay and status than factory or service jobs, but the lack of career ladders linking clerical jobs to professional and managerial positions has always "dead-ended" the upward mobility of millions of women (Glenn and Feldberg 1989; Peterson-Hardt and Perlman 1979). Changes in the way companies organize work, resulting from the availability of new information processing technology, have eroded many of the advantages of office work, making it more similar to women's blue-collar jobs in pay, skill level, job security,

automation, stress, and management control of the production process (Glenn and Feldberg 1989; Gutek 1988).

Blue-collar jobs. While industry and the construction trades have provided many high-paying, skilled, blue-collar jobs for men, the 5.3 million blue-collar women are mainly limited to operative jobs in a few industries (textile, apparel, electronics) that pay far lower wages (O'Farrell 1994). Sex-segregated career ladders and lack of access to apprenticeship and other training programs have severely limited women's upward mobility (O'Farrell and Harlan 1984). Increasingly, women in the better-paying, unionized factories have lost their jobs as plants shut down or moved to the South or out of the United States (Rosen 1987). Increasingly, new immigrant women perform women's factory work in the U.S. under conditions of stress, health and safety hazards, tightly controlled production standards, and job insecurity (O'Farrell 1994; Hossfeld 1990; Rosen 1987; Bookman 1988).

Service and sales jobs. Services employ 9.6 million women in fast-growing, female-dominated jobs, such as waitress, health aide, chambermaid, and child care providers. Women in many racial and ethnic minority groups are over-represented in service jobs (see below). Sales work employs 6.7 million women, predominately in retail positions. The distinguishing feature of these two categories of jobs is that "the objects of labor are people," not parts as in factory work nor information as in office work (Glazer 1993). Yet, service and sales jobs are also clearly subject to business strategies that seek to reduce costs by re-organizing the work process. "Most jobs in retailing and health care offer low wages, short career ladders, and high rates of job burnout. Most service jobs substitute a new form of drudgery ... in non-unionized, low-wage, and increasingly part-time jobs without benefits" (Glazer 1993, p.22).

In the next section, we document that women in clerical, blue-collar, service, and sales jobs earn, on average, less than a living wage. For women in these jobs and those in the

informal economy, upward mobility means any change that results in higher pay, not necessarily a promotion. Women in low-paying jobs face many systemic barriers that keep them from earning more money. We turn our attention to those systemic barriers below.

III. BARRIERS TO ADVANCEMENT EXTERNAL TO ORGANIZATIONS

Discrimination in educational opportunities and in economic systems that are external to work organizations present formidable barriers to women. Educational barriers hit early and hard, depriving many women of the chance to start a career on equal footing with men. Job segregation results in the over-representation of women and minorities in the lowest-paying jobs, the class structure insures that many jobs are poorly compensated, and current economic and technological trends lead to the proliferation of low-waged work.

Differential Outcomes of the Educational System

Educational systems that use gender, race, and class to ration access to first-rate education contribute to occupational segregation and confine disadvantaged groups to low-wage jobs (Wolfe 1991; Harlan and Steinberg 1989). Low levels of educational attainment, illiteracy, and language difficulties restrict opportunities for many women, minorities, new immigrants, and people from lower or working class backgrounds. The process of exclusion begins in the public schools. Sex stereotyping in curriculum, teachers' attitudes, and administrative practices deny girls the early preparation they need to enter vocational and academic programs that lead to high-paying male jobs (Sadker and Sadker 1991). Minority and working class communities have fewer resources to allocate to schools and thus cannot purchase the same quality of education as middle class communities (Gittell 1991). Secondary education has a history of tracking white working class and minority female students into vocational programs that are considered gender- and race-appropriate and that lead to low-wage jobs (Vetter 1989; Baker 1978).

Graduating from a four-year college is much more likely for students who are white and come from a middle or high socioeconomic background. Most youths in the United States,

however, do not graduate from four-year colleges. Some students who graduate from high school or drop out before graduation get job training from a range of public and private institutions, such as vocational education provided by community colleges, the military, proprietary schools, or employers. Others do not get any training. Twenty-nine percent of women high school graduates do not receive any additional job preparation (U.S. Department of Education 1987a). Most high school dropouts, half of whom are women, do not even finish a GED program within two years of graduation (Earle, Roach, and Fraser 1987).

Women who do receive job training outside four-year colleges have extremely limited choices within the post-secondary and occupational education systems. Vocational tracking in post-secondary programs, the lack of school-to-work transition programs, and very restricted opportunities in apprenticeship programs and the military reinforce occupational segregation by gender and limit women's earning capabilities. Thus, women with lower educational attainment have higher unemployment, work in lower-status occupations, earn less money, and have a higher risk of being poor than do men with the same level of education or women with more education (Harlan and Steinberg 1989). Minorities and working class women are even more likely to suffer these consequences of discrimination in educational systems (Segura 1989). Adult women who re-enter the occupational education system through welfare-related federal job training programs typically receive services that prepare them for low-wage work (Nettles 1991; Gittell and Moore 1989).

Employers contribute to the educational and skill deficiencies that prevent women without college educations from moving out of low-wage jobs (see below). Employers expect women to enter female-dominated occupations with the requisite skills, skills that they believe women have by virtue of being female or for which workers acquire training before employment. They often associate skills required in sales and service jobs, such as interpersonal and domestic skills, with femaleness (Berheide 1988). In contrast, employers

expect to train workers after hiring them in male-dominated occupations that do not require a college degree, such as the protective services and blue-collar trades. As Kemp (1994, p.248) notes, "overall, when women's jobs are more likely to require premarket training and worker funded recredentialing, the costs to employers are reduced. It is clearly cheaper for companies when work is organized in such a way that workers pay for their own training and retraining."

Regardless of the amount of education and training women receive, they do not earn as much as comparably educated men (U.S. Department of Education 1987b). Women get lower economic returns than men on their training investments, which accounts for the flatter life-time earnings profile of women (Treiman and Hartmann 1981). To explain why women receive less pay for a given level of education, we examine discrimination in economic systems.

Discrimination in Economic Systems

Occupational Segregation and Low Wages. The U.S. labor force is sex and race segregated with women dominating fewer occupations than men (Kemp 1994; Reskin and Roos 1990; Jacobs 1989). Although the proportion of women in the labor force has increased dramatically, women are still over-represented in occupations with low wages, low prestige, and high gender segregation. Among full-time wage and salary workers, women are more likely than men to have low-paying jobs. For women employed full-time, only managerial, professional, and technical occupations pay more, on average, than the low-wage standard of \$414 a week (Table 1). *Nearly 70 percent of the full-time female labor force work in the low-paying occupational categories of administrative support (clerical), blue-collar, service, sales, and farming* (Table 1). In contrast, only men in service (other than protective service or private household), laborer, and farming occupations had median earnings of less than \$414 a week (Table 1).

Women of color work in minority-female-dominated jobs in the race- and gender-specific segment of the secondary labor market. These jobs pay less, are less likely to have recognized promotion ladders, and more likely to experience seasonal layoffs and other forms of job insecurity than white-female-dominated jobs (Segura 1989; Dill, Cannon, and Vanneman 1987).

The occupational distribution of women in each racial and ethnic minority group is unique (Table 2). Differences exist for a number of reasons, including size of the group, circumstances of immigration, geographic location, and widespread prejudice about suitable occupational roles for each group. For example, women of "other" Spanish origins (from Central and South America), African Americans, Mexican Americans, and Native Americans have the highest percentages employed in service occupations. Women of "other" Spanish origins, Mexican Americans, and African Americans are over-represented as private household workers. Chinese, Korean, and Vietnamese women, as well as Hispanic women of all nationalities, are two to three times as likely as white women to work as factory operatives. High levels of educational attainment among Japanese, Chinese, and Asian Indian women result in larger percentages of those groups holding professional and managerial jobs. However, the gap between women's and men's occupational attainment within these groups is wider than it is among European whites or other minorities (Almquist 1989).

Occupational segregation by race is not as pronounced as occupational segregation by sex and has declined considerably since 1940. According to Xu and Leffler (1992, p.382), "gender outweighs race as a determinant of labor force concentration ... although clearly both gender and race affect occupational distributions." While occupational segregation by gender limits the employment options of all women, "racial and ethnic segmentation within typical women's jobs further constrains the employment options of women of color" (Segura 1989,

p.38). Black women work in the bottom strata of female-dominated jobs (Sokoloff 1987). Dill et al. (1987) report that white women are over-represented among secretaries, receptionists, waitresses, and bank tellers, while blacks and Hispanics are over-represented among sewing-machine operatives and teacher's aides. Low-wage workers are disproportionately members of minority groups, particularly minority women. They are under-represented in the occupational categories--managerial, professional, technical--that pay the highest wages (Table 2).

Part of the relationship between segregation and wage differentials by gender and race is due to channeling women and minorities into less complex jobs, which require fewer skills and demand less effort and less responsibility than white male jobs. Differential occupational allocation by gender or race may be attributable to: employer discrimination in hiring or initial assignment (Bergmann 1986; Bielby and Baron 1986; Talbert and Bose 1977); restrictive union practices in selective industries (Walby 1986; Cockburn 1985); promotion practices (Steinberg, Haignere, and Chertos 1990; DiPrete and Soule 1988); differential training opportunities (Harlan and Steinberg 1989; Corcoran and Duncan 1979); or differences in human capital more generally (Becker 1985; Polachek 1985).

The low wages that most women and minorities earn are also a consequence of underpaying female-dominated and significantly minority jobs relative to their compensable characteristics (Berheide, Chertos, Haignere, and Steinberg 1987; Steinberg 1984). Women and minorities may be segregated in lower-paying jobs even though those jobs require equivalent amounts of productivity-related skill, effort, and responsibility as white male jobs. For example, McGuire and Reskin (1993) find that black women receive substantially less than white men for equivalent levels of job authority. In addition, a number of studies (e.g., Berheide et al. 1987; Treiman and Hartmann 1981) find that earnings are greater for all incumbents in male than in female-dominated occupations after controlling for differences in human capital and job content.

In those instances in which the compensation for productivity-related job content characteristics differs by race and gender, discrimination may be embedded directly in the existing structure of remuneration. Bridges and Berk (1978, p.562) find that differences in the rates of return to job skills and personal characteristics accounted for about two-thirds of the salary disparity for male and female white-collar jobs in 20 Chicago firms. England et al.'s (1982, p.163) results are strikingly similar:

Occupational sex composition explains about four times as much of the annual sex earnings gap as either of the only two skill groups (training and social skill) which make a positive contribution to the sex earnings gap.

Taylor's (1979, p.476) study of federal government white collar employees reveals that "salary differences due to pay structures vary from 18.8 percent for minority males to 37.0 percent for minority females."

Occupational segregation in the labor market is largely responsible for the low wages that women and minorities earn. Confining these groups to a narrow range of low-paying job options makes segregation a structural barrier to job advancement. Although there has been some progress toward de-segregation, the most significant drops in the index of segregation have occurred for managers and professionals (Taeuber and Valdisera 1986). Women in low-paying, female-dominated jobs continue to face job segregation as a barrier to earning more money and upward mobility.

Class Position and Low Wages. Limited opportunity for advancement is a result of the class position that low-wage jobs, and job incumbents, occupy in the labor market. Both the individual and structural dimensions of social class contribute to inequality in wages and job status. The effects of social class are closely intertwined with those of gender and race.

The intergenerational transmission of social class functions as a barrier to advancement, especially for women and minorities. A long tradition of sociological research has shown that having lower or working class parents confers educational disadvantages upon children that inhibit intergenerational upward mobility. The inheritance of poverty is greater for large racial and ethnic minority groups (African Americans, Native Americans, Mexican Americans) "who experience greater discrimination and [possess] limited economic resources" (Almquist 1989, p.432). The inheritance effects of lower class origins are stronger for women than men because, as we described above, the educational system provides women who do not go to college with limited options for vocational preparation. Lower social class background is a powerful factor in limiting aspirations and expectations for economic attainment, as well as reproducing the traditional sexual division of labor within families (Ferree 1985). Thus, working class and professional women do not share significant areas of experiences and opportunities (Rosen 1987).

The class position of low-paying jobs in the capitalist labor market is a structural barrier to job advancement. Control of the work process (ownership, resources, and authority) belongs to groups who have the power to define certain kinds of work as unskilled, low-paying, and lacking routes of advancement. Class-based economic power relationships are closely associated with the sexual and racial divisions of labor (Andes 1992; Acker 1990). Thus, the problem of advancement for women and minorities in low-paying jobs is not only one of mobility for individual job incumbents, but even more importantly, a problem of intertwined class, gender, and race relations that shape the labor process, often to their disadvantage.

Economic and Technological Trends Leading to the Proliferation of Low-Paying Jobs. There is wide variety and constant change in low-wage employment--in the type of work, work settings, and the race and gender of typical job incumbents. Patterns of racial and ethnic segregation and re-segregation continue to evolve as ethnic European whites, African

Americans, and new waves of immigrants flow through the job market. Job segregation and re-segregation by gender are historical and on-going processes (Reskin and Roos 1990). Overlaying these features of the labor market are major structural changes that are causing an increase in the number of low-wage jobs and making low-wage workers more vulnerable.

Economists offer a variety of explanations for the labor market turbulence experienced in recent years. Harrison and Bluestone (1988) argue that employers responded to increased global competition in a variety of ways that increased wage disparity and lumped more workers in the low-wage category. Others read events differently (Bamezai 1989; Kusters 1989), claiming that the quality of jobs, on the whole, has not deteriorated. Nevertheless, the manifestations of economic restructuring that result in the loss of high-wage jobs are clearly in evidence: abandonment of core industries, offshore investment, subcontracting work, wage concessions, and the substitution of contingent labor for permanent employees (Harrison and Bluestone 1988).

O'Reilly (1992) cites Department of Labor data indicating that nearly one-third of the full-time jobs added between 1979 and 1989 paid less than \$250 a week. One of the consequences of the decline in durable goods manufacturing industries and the commensurate increase in services and retail sales is that many of these jobs are in smaller establishments and in low-wage areas of the country. Large employers' share of the labor market has declined somewhat over time (Doeringer 1991). By 1990, only 20 percent of the nonagricultural labor force worked for employers with more than 500 employees, and another 17 percent worked for federal, state, or local government (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1993; U.S. Department of Labor 1991). Doeringer says that, "on average, ... small and medium-size firms offer lower wages and fringe benefits and are economically more marginal than their larger counterparts" (p.8).

Although most low-wage jobs are still full-time year-round, employers' desire for a contingent work force that is cheaper and easier to control is creating more part-time and temporary jobs. Increasingly, employers "contract out" jobs to temporary agencies, independent contractors, and part-time workers (Levitan and Conway 1992; Callaghan and Hartmann 1991; Doeringer 1991). This trend toward replacing full-time jobs with peripheral ones is projected to continue. Using Department of Labor data, Callaghan and Hartmann report that women and African Americans are over-represented in the contingent work force.

People who work less than full-time, year-round are much more likely to hold low-paying jobs than people who work full-time. *Approximately half (52 percent) of employed women work in part-time jobs or part-year jobs or both (Pearce 1987). Most of these women have low-paying jobs.* Shorter hours mean smaller paychecks for women, many of whom cannot find full-time jobs, or have no choice but to work part-time because of family responsibilities. However, more important factors than shorter hours determine the earnings of part-time workers. First, part-time jobs are more likely to be in low-paying occupations: 78 percent of part-time jobs, but only 55 percent of full-time jobs are in sales, clerical, service, and unskilled labor occupations (Levitan and Conway 1992). Second, research has shown that controlling for differences between part-time and full-time workers, employers pay part-timers a lower hourly wage (Levitan and Conway 1992). Third, part-time workers have less protection from earnings' loss because they often do not qualify for unemployment and disability insurance or for employers' fringe benefit and pension plans (Levitan and Conway 1992; Pearce 1987). In general, other contingent workers also lack these protections (Callaghan and Hartmann 1991; Doeringer 1991).

Technological changes in the way work is performed have different consequences for women and minorities than for white men because of gender and race segregation. Technological and organizational changes frequently require the reconstruction of occupational segregation (Cockburn 1983, 1985; Hacker 1981). For example, technological

advancements in the electronics industry have reproduced the older patterns of job segregation by race and gender. Young third-world women typically perform the very precise, eye-straining, repetitive, and low-paid work in this industry (Lim 1983). Organizations repeatedly reproduce the gender identity of occupations, albeit sometimes in new forms. As technological advances turned the craft of typesetting into electronic composition, for example, printing changed from a male-dominated to a female-dominated industry. Simultaneous with the process of feminization, low-paying jobs replaced jobs that previously paid high wages (Roos 1990; Cockburn 1983). Deskilling, downsizing, and other processes involved in economic restructuring lead to large numbers of women working in low-paying jobs and make it difficult for women to find routes of advancement beyond them. The connection between gender segregation and low wages has proved extraordinarily resistant to change.

In summary, these trends in the external labor market reveal the nature of low-wage work. First, low-wage work is highly feminized. Pearce (1990) reports that between 1975 and 1984, an additional 10 percent of women became employed, and 60 percent of them entered the work force as low-wage workers. The high rate of poverty among female-headed families where the mother works results directly from low-wage employment. Second, minorities work in the least desirable of low-paying jobs. New immigrant women, especially, are concentrated in low-paying job ghettos in particular industries and regions of the country. Third, economic trends point toward the proliferation of low-paying jobs in which a single worker cannot earn enough to keep a family out of poverty. A significant segment of today's work force does not have many of the basic protections, such as collective bargaining rights and social insurance coverage, that workers have struggled for and won in the United States over the past 50 years.

IV. BARRIERS TO ADVANCEMENT: ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

Organizations mirror society's ideas about which groups of workers are appropriate for different kinds of jobs. Although hiring and promotion are supposed to be based on rational and universalistic criteria, they often express informal expectations about the gender, race, and class of the people best suited for particular positions, producing race- and gender-stratified work forces. Most jobs are sex-typed, as appropriate only for one sex or the other. Consequently, people of a particular gender and/or race become identified with certain kinds of work, such as women with clerical work and its supervision and men with administration and top management. Occupations usually labeled as 'men's jobs' (e.g., engineer and janitor) are not equally distributed across different racial groups (Xu and Leffler 1992). Further, occupations labeled as 'women's jobs' (e.g., nurse's aide and garment worker) are also identified with particular racial groups.

Organizational Ideologies

While claiming to honor achievement as the rule for hiring and upgrading, organizations reflect the privilege of the dominant group in such decisions. "Those who advocate a 'color blind' or 'sex blind' approach to hiring and promotion ignore the fact that, without intervention, the usual racial and sexual biases will probably persist" (Blumberg 1987, p.130). These informal expectations constitute one barrier women face in moving out of low-paying sex-segregated jobs in organizations.

A related barrier women confront includes the official concepts, justifications, and ideologies which organizational cultures develop to explain why people of certain races, classes, or genders inhabit particular organizational levels. These elements of organizational culture, in turn, affect the structure of the labor market, relations in the workplace, control of the work process, and the compensation system. In short, gender is deeply embedded in organizations; indeed, according to Acker (1990), organizations are gendered.

Gender and race interact with social class as they determine women's and men's positions within organizations. Class affects the worker's hierarchical position, and gender and race

shape the segregation of occupations within the class-based hierarchy. Organizations use gender and race to decide who fills positions at various levels in their hierarchies.

"Patriarchy is not simply hierarchical organization, but hierarchy in which particular people fill particular places" (Hartmann 1979, p.13). Hierarchical differences among workers frequently coincide with racial, ethnic, or gender divisions. As a result, within the organizational culture, gender and race become synonymous with one's place in the hierarchy. Thus, another barrier women face is the identification of particular positions in organizational hierarchies with race and gender, keeping women in lower-level positions.

Resistance to Women's Advancement in Organizations

According to Goode (1982), men often resist the entry of women into male domains; the glass ceiling is but one form of that resistance. Reskin (1988, p.61) argues that:

Men will resist efforts to close the wage gap. Resistance will include opposing equalizing women's access to jobs because integration would equalize women and men on the current superficial cause of the wage gap -- occupation. Men may also try to preserve job segregation because it is a central mechanism through which they retain their dominance in other spheres, and because many people learn to prefer the company of others like them.... Men will resist efforts to replace occupation with alternative principles for assigning pay that would mitigate segregation's effect on women's wages (as pay equity purports to do).

Dominant groups have a stake in maintaining existing forms of inequality in the workplace. Their stake constitutes a formidable barrier to women's upward mobility. As Lieberman (1985, p.166) notes, "the dominant group ... uses its dominance to advance its own

position" by writing and as necessary rewriting the rules to counteract any challenge to their continued dominance. "Like other dominant groups, men make rules that preserve their privileges" (Reskin 1988, p.73).

One of the most important and least visible set of rules elite men establish is the one distributing valued resources, including the power to write the rules, as well as income and promotional opportunity. This power to rewrite the rules and procedures relating to hiring, promotion, seniority, and other personnel processes constitutes a sometimes hidden but critical barrier to women's upward mobility. Male-dominated organizations resist attempts to diversify the work force by moving women and minorities out of low-paying occupations into higher-level jobs (Cockburn 1991).

Specific Forms of Resistance

Social relations at work, shaped by class, race, and gender, affect occupational mobility. Hostile workplace climates--negative co-worker attitudes, harassment, and expectations that employees will work long hours and make their jobs a higher priority than their families--form another barrier to women's occupational attainment, one that becomes institutionalized within the organizational structure (Section V).

Sexual harassment is one particularly pernicious tactic some men use to keep women in their place. Carothers and Crull (1984, p.224) argue that sexual harassment of women in traditionally female jobs, including secretaries, waitresses, and lower-level managers, "appears to be exploitation of role and power differences, whereas in the nontraditional setting the motive seems to be a defense against what male workers take to be an implicit challenge to their gender power and work roles." According to Kemp (1994, p.312), "sexual harassment serves the functions of (1) discouraging women from participating in traditionally male jobs; (2) limiting them to low-wage, dead-end, female-dominated jobs; and (3) most of all, keeping the pressure on so that job turnover, absenteeism, and other responses to harassment contribute to the stereotype of women as uncommitted, unreliable workers."

Loy and Stewart (1984) report that half of all women workers experienced at least one form of sexual harassment. Of the women who were harassed, 51 percent of the experiences involved verbal commentary, 10 percent sexual negotiation, 36 percent physical manhandling, and 3 percent physical assault. Schneider (1982) indicates that men in positions of authority were responsible for more of the workplace assaults than the sexual propositions, pinches or grabs, or comments about women's bodies. Similarly, Loy and Stewart show that superordinates were most likely to commit manhandling, negotiation, and assault but co-workers were more likely to make verbal comments.

Gruber and Bjorn (1982) indicate that being sexually harassed had a negative effect on women's perceptions of how fairly promotions were handled. Loy and Stewart (1984, p.42) report that some women "received lowered work evaluations or were denied promotions." Schneider (1991, p.545) finds that "20 percent of the total sample believed they lost some career opportunity; 9 percent felt they lost an expected pay increase, and 10 percent believed they were not promoted when they thought they should have been."

"Harassment is considerably more subtle and less physical in managerial and technical positions than in sales and clerical positions" (Benokraitis and Feagin 1986, p.77). Carothers and Crull (1984, p.224) find that women in traditionally female jobs were more likely to experience "hints and requests for dates which, when rejected, are followed by workplace retaliation." Women in non-traditional jobs were more likely to face "a sexually demeaning work environment" (p.222). Gruber and Bjorn (1982) report that 36 percent of the women working in an automobile plant had experienced sexual harassment with sexual propositioning (28 percent) and abusive language (24 percent) the two most frequent types. The sexual harassment of women in male-dominated blue-collar jobs "is typically more overtly hostile," ranging from threatening sexual remarks to actual physical attacks (Carothers and Crull 1984, p.224).

Women in blue-collar jobs, especially black women, experience more sexual harassment than women in clerical and professional jobs. Gruber and Bjorn (1982) find that the most likely targets of frequent harassment within an automobile plant were black, unmarried women under 25 in low status jobs. Black women not only experienced more harassment than whites, they were harassed more severely. Black women are twice as likely as white women to encounter sexual harassment on the job (Sims 1982), including those employed as private household workers (Rollins 1985).

Important but subtle barriers to occupational mobility are rooted in class, ethnic, and gender dynamics within the organization. Workers struggle to meet the expectation that women, and especially men, must not take time off work to attend to children if they wish their employers to consider them "serious" aspirants to occupational success. Coltrane (1989) reports that whereas supervisors and co-workers expect women to take primary responsibility for children, men find that supervisors and co-workers often perceive their involvement with children as a sign that they are not "serious" about their work. Fathers receive indirect messages that providing for their families is primary and being with their families is secondary. This feature of organizational culture continues to limit the occupational mobility of women as well as men's involvement with their families.

Men often leave women out of informal networks of communication and mentorship that support workers in their current positions and in their pursuit of upward mobility. For example, men in skilled trade jobs and in police work often refuse to provide women with important work-related information and training (Martin 1980; Riemer 1979). A tremendous amount of informal knowledge is necessary to move up the job ladder. Men may not tell women about particular positions in the organization that are dead ends. White women may do the same thing to women of color. Segura (1989) finds that the greatest barrier to upward occupational mobility for women of color was the lack of supervisory support needed to adjust to the social and work requirements of their jobs and the white middle-class

organizational culture. "Two-thirds of the occupationally mobile women became more successful in their second or third jobs by obtaining supervisory support for the training necessary for promotions" (Segura 1989, p.47).

Affirmative action mandates grew out of the government's attempts to counter both the formal and informal practices that lead to the exclusion of women and people of color. As women have made gains in the workplace, men have responded by attacking the programs women have used to advance, such as Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) programs, by claiming that sex and race inequality have been eliminated and that men are now the victims of "*reverse discrimination*." Though qualified according to universalistic standards, women and people of color continue to meet resistance to their entrance into higher-paying positions, including race and gender biased assumptions about their presumed qualifications (or lack thereof). For example, Swerdlow reports that men adjusted to women's entrance into the jobs of subway conductors and train operators by accepting almost universally the "preference" myth. They rationalized that, "women workers received favored treatment over men, and even the job itself had been made easier so that women could do it" (Swerdlow 1989, p.383).

Segura finds that Chicana and Mexican immigrant women clerical workers faced a high level of antagonism and lengthy periods of social ostracism from their coworkers and supervisors because of their racial or class background and because they had entered their jobs through affirmative action.

In response to such cross pressures, organizations differ in their commitment to EEO, affirmative action, and diversity. EEO laws constrain organizations, but they can be and are circumvented. Resistance can take the form of marginalizing these programs as not central to the company's interests, of failing to hold line managers accountable for developing and promoting women and minorities, and of limiting implementation of EEO, affirmative action, and diversity programs only to highly visible, and perhaps less central, positions.

V. BARRIERS TO ADVANCEMENT: ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

Social norms, cultural stereotypes, and power and privilege in organizations provide the "invisible foundation" for organizational decisions about which jobs and how much opportunity are suitable for certain types of workers (Tomaskovik-Devey 1993; Acker 1990; Roos and Reskin 1984). These decisions determine the ways that complex organizations structure work, creating barriers for women. Employers use administrative rules and procedures to regulate hiring, promotion, and wage systems in the "internal labor market" (ILM) of organizations (Osterman 1984; Doeringer and Piore 1971). The ILM theory is useful in analyzing more formally and precisely the notion of the "pipeline" for career advancement. Ideally, a job ladder that links steps in a logical progression of skill, knowledge, and experience acquired on the job characterizes an ILM. Formal rules govern who is eligible to move up the ladder and how promotion decisions are made. Hiring practices in entry level jobs determine access to ladders.

Complex organizations contain many subsystems of job ladders (pipelines) to which different rules and procedures apply (Osterman 1984). Promotion rates and access to the means of acquiring new skills systematically differ according to where one is located in the organization. Certain career lines are blocked while others afford ample upward movement. The barriers that prevent women and minorities from moving off the "sticky floor" often arise because the jobs in which these groups are concentrated either lead nowhere or have very short lines of progression. Discrimination against women, minorities, and working class people becomes institutional and systemic in large bureaucratic organizations, as opposed to intentional and personal, by organizing labor along job ladders in ways that segregate them according to the gender, race, and class of incumbents (Fisher 1991; Hartmann 1987; Bielby and Baron 1986; Kanter 1977; Stevenson 1977).

The "Pipeline" and Traditional Women's Jobs

Pipelines, or more formally job ladders, are central to the process of advancement in organizations. Whether a particular job is located on a ladder as well as the characteristics of the job ladder itself define the built-in limitations on when, how high, and how quickly incumbents can advance. Thus, the extraordinarily high degree of sex segregation at the individual job title level within firms has critical ramifications for differences in the career advancement opportunities of women and men (Baron and Bielby 1985). The adverse effects of sex segregation multiply during the course of women's work lives as they find their mobility chances constrained by gendered job ladders or the gendered absence of job ladders.

The single most important structural barrier that keeps women from advancing in organizations is the lack of connection of low-paying jobs with the largest number of female incumbents to any job ladder in the organization. Osterman (1984) developed the notion of the "secondary subsystem" to apply to jobs within firms that do not fit the ideal ILM model. The secondary subsystem, which includes large numbers of clerical jobs, offers poor pay and a lack of career prospects in low-skilled jobs, much like the secondary sector of the economy. Because workers can gain access to clerical jobs from many points inside or outside the firm (Osterman 1984), upward mobility is rare, and job ladders are short or nonexistent.

Fisher's (1991) analysis of New York State civil service system, one of the few attempts to measure the promotion characteristics of job ladders, finds that jobs employing the largest absolute number of women are much less likely to be located on job ladders. These female-dominated jobs, in office work and direct patient care, are the largest titles in the agencies he studied. Cockburn (1991) observes the same pattern in a British Civil Service Agency. She argues that organizations seem to be "comprised of a populous base that is not really part of the hierarchy and is the place where women are found.... The hierarchy within organizations should realistically be seen as beginning at a point above this base" (p.56).

Kanter (1977) describes stark differences in the job mobility possibilities of managers and secretaries in a major corporation. She finds that people with high mobility prospects behave quite differently from those with low prospects within the organization. Mobility is the most important motivating force for managers. Managers define their success as movement upward, a change in title, a better salary, and more authority. In contrast, Kanter indicates that secretaries have little hope of entering more prestigious, remunerative, or responsible positions except by accompanying a boss who is moving up. Similarly, Segura (1989) reports that Chicana and Mexican immigrant women experienced blocked opportunity structures in organizations. "Slightly over three-fourths of the 26 occupationally stable women worked in minority-female-dominated service jobs, such as teacher's aides in bilingual programs, child-care workers, waitresses in small Mexican restaurants, domestic workers, and production workers in private industry. The other 6 occupationally stable women worked in white-female-dominated clerical occupations." Segura (1989, p.47) finds that "promotions and pay increases in minority-female-dominated jobs hinged on a combination of factors, which included individual productivity, seniority, and a supervisory job opening -- a rare occurrence." Only one woman, who went from hotel maid to assistant housekeeper manager, advanced occupationally in a minority-female-dominated job. She concludes that labor market structure is more powerful than individual characteristics, including education and fluency in English, in explaining why some women were upwardly mobile and others were not.

Male-dominated industrial craft jobs served as the model for developing the ILM theory of job ladders. However, the factory operative jobs in which women predominate are dead-end jobs (Hossfeld 1990; Rosen 1987; O'Farrell 1982). Baron and Bielby's (1985) example of female "Assemblers" and male "Production Workers" demonstrates the lack of job ladders in women's factory work. These two entry level jobs carried the same duties (except that men occasionally lifted more than 25 pounds). Men, however, had a much greater chance of being

promoted to Leadman than women had of being promoting to Leadlady because proportionately many more slots were available in the former category. There were two more steps in the job ladder up to the Supervisor level, which had 14 men and no women incumbents. These examples are typical of other research that demonstrates how the arbitrary segregation of women's work cuts women off from routes of advancement in organizations.

Organizational Hiring Practices at the Bottom

Entry-level jobs are critical in establishing career trajectories in organizations because promotional ladders, where they exist, are connected to specific points of entry into the organization (Stevenson 1977). Job recruitment and hiring practices used by employers often result in women being placed in jobs that have short or nonexistent job ladders. This is an important barrier limiting women's advancement beyond low-paying jobs. Such practices, in conjunction with the difficulty of changing career paths once employed in an organization, perpetuate the existence of female job ghettos that are low-paying and cut off from mobility channels (O'Farrell and Harlan 1984; Roos and Reskin 1984).

Stevenson (1977) theorizes that employers use recruitment and hiring methods that have worked well in the past because they help to avoid costly hires of unsatisfactory workers. Statistical discrimination, as this is formally called, is based on stereotypes about appropriate work roles for women and men, which the public, employers, and most women readily accept. It results from the use of inexpensive and expedient "screens," in place of more detailed information about individuals, to make recruitment and hiring decisions, and it is likely to reproduce the characteristics of the current work force in a given job (Stevenson 1977).

Hiring screens, such as age, height, weight, and physical strength, prevent women from gaining access to traditionally male jobs in industrial plants and protective services.

Although the Supreme Court ruled in Griggs v. Duke Power Company (1971) that entry

requirements must be job-related if they disproportionately exclude protected groups, many employers continue to argue in court over the definition of "job-related." For example, Chertos and Phillips (1989) describe the lengthy litigation (1979-87) over the physical examination for New York City firefighters. Although the Fire Department revised its test more than once in response to lower court rulings, the courts eventually allowed it to keep a test that few women could pass. The number of women applying to the Fire Department is lower than any other municipal department, and as of 1987, only one or two women could qualify, even though many women had passed the written examination.

Employers use gender itself as a screen in white-collar work that can mean the difference between placement in a clerical job or in a management pipeline. Caplette's research on the publishing industry (1981, reported in Roos and Reskin 1984) finds that background and credentials could not explain why two-thirds of the men, but only 9 percent of the women, hired in publishing during a given year entered as sales representatives. While sales is the recognized route to upward mobility in the company, women traditionally enter the industry through secretarial jobs. Caplette says that, "Women were automatically excluded from [college traveler sales jobs] on the assumption that the extensive traveling would conflict with their present or future domestic responsibilities."

Employers typically recruit applicants for a specific job within a company. Just as in hiring decisions, recruitment strategies for entry-level nonmanagement and nonprofessional jobs rely on traditional sources that yield a homogeneous set of applicants. The military services, trade schools, and high school shop classes provide a steady supply of young men for skilled and semi-skilled blue-collar trades, but very few women (O'Farrell and Harlan 1984). Similarly, vocational education programs and business colleges supply women to meet employers' demand for clerical workers (Giese 1989; Vetter 1989). Personal networks of friends and relatives are another common way that people find out about entry-level jobs

(Granovetter 1974). Women, minorities, and people of working class background, networking with people like themselves, hear about the least desirable entry-level jobs.

A common argument, posed as a counter explanation to institutional practices that channel women and minorities into dead-end jobs, is that they "choose" to work with people like themselves. In 1986, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission lost a major discrimination case against Sears, Roebuck and Company because the defense successfully argued that women chose low-paying clerk positions rather than higher-paying commission sales jobs held by men (Cooper 1986). This narrow definition of choice as individual preference, however, ignores the powerful historical forces and occupational socialization that influence women's job aspirations (Kessler-Harris 1986). Women (or minorities or any other group) seek jobs that they perceive they have a chance of getting (Palmer and Spalter-Roth 1991; Harlan 1989; Kessler-Harris 1986; Kanter 1977). Because individuals make choices in the context of what they perceive as available opportunities, employers' administrative procedures for recruitment, hiring, and job assignment that support gender, racial, and class stereotypes about appropriate work roles contribute to job segregation in entry-level jobs. Thus, "choice" is not the barrier to greater opportunity; instead, employers' acceptance, and indeed their exploitation, of uninformed choices is the barrier to future upward mobility.

Barriers to Promotion

Women experience barriers to advancement that are related to differential rates of promotion on gender-typed job ladders, as well as difficulties in "crossing over" to male-dominated ladders, or pipelines, that provide more promotion opportunities. Empirical analyses of private companies and government agencies have revealed a number of important characteristics of job ladders (e.g., Fisher 1991; DiPrete and Soule 1988; Bielby and Baron 1986; Harlan and O'Farrell 1982; Peterson-Hardt and Perlman 1979). First, most job ladders

are comprised of a series of sex-segregated jobs, and most ladders are male-dominated, rather than female-dominated or mixed gender. Second, female-typed ladders begin and end at lower grades in the organizational hierarchy. Third, female-typed ladders have a poorer ratio of entry-level to higher-level positions. All of this means that even women who are on job ladders are in positions at the bottom of organizations, and they are less likely to be promoted to mid- or higher-level jobs.

A barrier to women's advancement beyond low-paying jobs in organizations is their location on female-typed job ladders. Using a survival analysis technique to measure actual promotion opportunity in New York State government agencies, Fisher (1991) finds that, after controlling for salary grade level, the cumulative proportion of incumbents experiencing a promotion on female job ladders is significantly less than on male or mixed-gender ladders. Moreover, men are more likely to acquire the smaller number of promotions that are available at mid- and higher levels in the agencies. Other studies, which report that women equal or surpass men in promotion rates, have examined only exempt jobs (Gerhardt and Milkovich 1989), or have not controlled for grade level or location on job ladders (Hartmann 1987; Markham et al. 1985). Thus, they do not speak to the particular issues of women in traditionally female, low-level jobs. In contrast, Fisher includes job ladders and promotion rates throughout the entire organization and controls for grade level in his analysis.

Given the promotional disadvantage of being a female worker on a female-dominated job ladder, it would seem advantageous to move to a male-dominated ladder that would offer better opportunity. Unfortunately, women who try to move internally through transfer or promotion to nontraditional jobs face a number of significant structural barriers. We give examples of three barriers involving restrictive *eligibility requirements*, *seniority rights*, and *the lack of training and career development opportunities* for women in traditional jobs.

Eligibility requirements for jobs at higher levels of organizational hierarchies systematically exclude from promotion consideration lower-level jobs in which women and

minorities are concentrated. This barrier is of a different magnitude than bias in decisions about which individuals will be promoted because gender, race, and class become structural parameters of the promotion process, excluding whole categories of individuals. For example, the first step in the promotion system in New York State civil service is the establishment of eligibility criteria, which consist of a list of job titles whose incumbents are eligible to take promotion exams for a particular higher-level position. Steinberg, Haignere, and Chertos (1990) find that women and minorities are far short of being proportionately represented in the "feeder grades" for managerial jobs. The definition of eligible job titles--and not the examinations, the interests of candidates, or the rule of choosing from among top scorers--proved to be most important in excluding these groups from promotion into management. A follow-up project to this study helped three state agencies expand their lists of eligible job titles for entry-level management positions (Hawkins and Chertos 1985).

Seniority systems, designed decades ago, often protect high-paying, nonmanagement jobs for white male incumbents (Kelley 1982). Companies that define seniority-unit classifications narrowly (perhaps by department or by job ladder), rather than on a company-wide basis, drastically reduce the potential for women and minorities to move onto job ladders traditionally occupied by working-class white males. Workers in other parts of the company cannot move to another seniority unit without being penalized by losing their seniority rights for promotions, layoffs, "bumping," and transfers (Kelley 1982). Another disincentive to mobility is loss of wages because of a requirement that workers transfer into a new unit at a lower grade level. In Teamsters v. U.S. (1977) and subsequent decisions, the Supreme Court has upheld existing "rational" seniority systems, even when they have a disparate impact on promotion opportunities for women and minorities.

The absence of a job posting system is also a barrier that keeps people from hearing about the availability of jobs outside their immediate work group (O'Farrell 1982). Foulkes (1980)

finds that the implementation of affirmative action programs pushed companies toward formalizing job posting and bidding procedures, in an effort to broaden opportunities for women and minorities. In doing so, however, managers reported that they increasingly relied on seniority to make promotion decisions. Once the promotion process became more open, managers needed to have "objective" criteria with which to justify their decisions. The seniority-unit classification determines whether the use of job posting and bidding systems helps women's chances for promotion.

Corporations short-change workers in lower-level jobs on opportunities for *training and job development*. A Conference Board study in 1975 finds that 8 percent of all U.S. firms accounted for 75 percent of corporate education and training opportunities (Lusterman 1977). The firms most likely to invest were the largest ones, particularly financial and insurance companies, whereas manufacturing industries were least likely to invest. Furthermore, the company employees most likely to participate in training were in management, professions, and sales. Only 19 percent of nonexempt salary and 11 percent of nonexempt hourly (far less than any other category) participated. In a follow-up study ten years later, supervisors and mid-level managers made the greatest gains in training participation, as companies tried to tie training programs more closely to strategic goals (Lusterman 1985). Secretarial/clerical and operative/craftworkers were least likely to have increased in participation, and when they did so, it was to learn new technology associated with computers.

More recently, a report on employer-provided training among young adults shows that, on the whole, employers make greater training investments in better educated, white, and male workers (U.S. Department of Labor 1993b). During 1986-1990, about one-fifth of the young adult population received company training. College graduates were almost twice as likely as high school graduates to benefit from employer-sponsored training, and their training lasted 25 percent longer. Whites (21.4 percent) were more likely than blacks (17.4 percent) or

Hispanics (15.4 percent) to receive training. The report attributes the difference between the percentages of men and women who were trained (men received more training) to the weaker labor force attachment of women. As we discussed above, however, employers in general provide less training to women, particularly women in low-wage, part-time, or seasonal jobs in the informal and secondary economy.

Goldstein's (1989) study of multinational high tech firms illustrates how management's training decisions "lavished upgrading opportunities on [male] engineers and technicians," while offering female production workers training only for their assigned task in the factory. Even though companies experienced shortages in technicians, they went outside their firms to hire men rather than re-train women they already employed. Both gender and class played a role in these decisions. Women were not hired because managers wanted "the right people" to fit into "techie culture," the male partnership surrounding technical work. Women production workers were specifically not offered opportunities because scheduling on-the-job training might cause a disruption in production. In addition, "workers taking night classes and aspiring to better things might not be the careful, conscientious workers management wanted" (p.498).

Work and Family Policies

Structural barriers that make it difficult to combine work and family also constrain women's promotional opportunities. Coser (1974) describes the family and the workplace as greedy institutions because of the commitment of time and energy that each demands during the peak years of family formation and job mobility. Women with children experience the most constraints because they continue to shoulder the primary responsibility for child rearing and homemaking even when employed full time (Hochschild 1989; Berheide 1984). The increasing numbers of single mothers working in low-wage jobs bear the greatest double burden.

The *rigidity of short-term and long-term timetables in the work world* poses barriers for women seeking to move into higher-paying positions. Women face time constraints involving total hours worked, the scheduling of work (e.g., shiftwork, overtime, compatibility with public school schedules, etc.), commuting time between home and work, job-related travel, the years spent working in one's job, and the timing of major work history events. As noted above, the expectation that "serious" aspirants to occupational success will not take time out of the labor market to rear children constitutes a significant barrier for women. Women's attempt to combine family and work often results in a less uniform work history than men have. The amount of traveling or transferring jobs require also presents a barrier to women's upward mobility. Their job or job opportunities are less likely to determine where the family lives (Bielby and Bielby 1992).

The assumption that *work should have top priority at all times* is a barrier limiting upward mobility for women. Organizations measure employees' commitment levels by the amount of time they are willing to give to their jobs and by the priority of work in their lives. In this case, time involves the sheer number of hours employees work daily, monthly, and yearly. Many companies gauge high performance by a commitment to work that employees demonstrate by working long hours. The willingness to shift one's personal schedule whenever the organization demands, even when those demands are capricious or excessive, provides proof of the required attitude for upward mobility. Most managers resist alternatives, such as reducing hours or shifting the location of work between office and home, that fly in the face of entrenched personnel procedures that evolved when the work force consisted primarily of men who had full-time support at home and, therefore, could make their jobs top priority.

Whereas professionals have careers that often demand that they bring work home after regular work hours, blue-collar, sales, and service workers need to deal with mandatory overtime and shiftwork. If women can choose hours that are compatible with their family

situation, then night shift jobs, for example, can be a solution to women's child care problems when another family member is available at home at night (Presser 1988). If not, then non-standard hours and shifts can be an insurmountable barrier because of the lack of child care.

Jobs that *lack family-sensitive employee benefits*, such as paid pregnancy leave, paid parental leave, paid days off for caring for infants and sick children, and provision of on-site or other child care, constitute another barrier to women's upward mobility. In one company where clerical workers earned less than sweepers in the factory, women usually did not seek training and transfers for skilled production jobs because clerical workers (traditionally a woman's job) were entitled to 20 days sick or personal leave whereas skilled production workers (traditionally a man's job) were entitled to only two such days (O'Farrell 1982).

Many employers believe that mothers must limit their occupational choices to those jobs that accommodate family responsibilities, that is that mothers self-select into low-paying female-dominated jobs because they ease the strain of combining employment and parenthood. Employers assume that women will trade off earnings, chances for advancement, or interesting work for flexible work schedules, shorter hours, or the absence of travel to help them meet the often conflicting demands of a family and a job (particularly as Desai and Waite 1991 suggest women with lower commitment to work). However, the data do not support employers' beliefs. *Ironically, Glass and Camarigg (1992) find that those most likely to hold jobs with both schedule flexibility and ease of performance, such as lack of travel, are males without dependent children. Mothers employed over 30 hours a week are not more likely to be in jobs with those characteristics, nor are predominantly female jobs in general likely to possess them.*

Job Evaluation and Wage Setting

Another barrier that keeps women from escaping low-paying jobs is the artificially low wages assigned to female-dominated occupations. Employers systematically undervalue job

characteristics differentially associated with work historically performed by women and minorities (Berheide et al. 1987; Steinberg and Haignere 1984). Remick (1984), for example, notes that jobs historically performed by women involve greater responsibility for human life, while jobs historically performed by men involve greater responsibility for fiscal decision-making. Yet, she indicates that standard compensation systems value only fiscal responsibility. Similarly, she suggests both female- and male-dominated jobs involve exposure to dirt, yet standard wage systems compensate for the dirt associated with men's blue-collar work, but not for exposure to human fluids and waste associated with health and social service work.

In general, job evaluation systems that form the basis for employer compensation policy perpetuate the invisibility of the content and context of work differentially performed by women at the same time that work associated with men is, in fact, compensated for skills, responsibilities, and undesirable work context (Steinberg and Haignere 1987). Indeed, job evaluation systems serve to legitimate and objectify value biases, often reverting to seemingly neutral broad arguments about what constitutes a productive contribution to a firm (Jacobs and Steinberg 1990).

It is possible that the process of describing and evaluating jobs reflects the pervasive cultural stereotypes regarding the relative worth of work done traditionally by men and work done traditionally by women (Treiman and Hartmann 1981, p.81).

To the extent that employers fail to value skills differentially found in female or minority jobs, these jobs come to be treated *as if* they are less complex. However, they are not necessarily less complex, rather they are complex in different ways.

Research on skill variation and remuneration has confirmed the observations of comparable worth proponents. Both England (1982) and Lucas (1974) have shown that the content of female jobs differs somewhat from the content of male jobs. Organizing DOT

data into five general categories, England finds male and female jobs require equal levels of education and cognitive skills, on average, and similar levels of visual perception (although different types). Men's jobs require more of some manual skills, while women's jobs require more social skills. Despite these observed similarities in the levels of skill demands, the data show that as the percentage female in the occupation rises, earnings fall.

Historical studies of the labor process reveal that employers neither defined nor compensated the work that women do as skilled. Looking at the carton and the textile industries, Phillips and Taylor (1980, p.79) suggest that:

The classification of women's jobs as unskilled and men's jobs as skilled or semi-skilled frequently bears little relation to the actual amount of training or ability required for them. Skill definitions are saturated with sexual bias.

Coyle (1982) and Cockburn (1983) reached similar conclusions about the textile industry and about typesetters, respectively.

Rubery (1980) analyzes the struggle over the meaning of skill that occurred with the introduction of technological change in the textile industry. Employees successfully resisted employers' attempts to deskill, and thus devalue, male-dominated occupations through the introduction of new technology. Employees were able to maintain control of the definition of their work. Therefore, despite the observed decrease in job complexity that resulted from technological change, formal skill and wage levels remained intact. In contrast, employers may not recognize as skill those characteristics they associate with femaleness (Berheide 1988). Creighton (1982) has argued that employers take advantage of the social and domestic skills women acquire as a result of gender role socialization when hiring women for nurturing, cleaning, waitressing, and public relations types of service work. Hochschild

(1983, p.234-235) agrees, noting that women are over-represented in "jobs calling for emotional labor," such as nurse, receptionist, and flight attendant.

More recently, Acker (1989) reports that the management consulting firm hired by the Oregon State Pay Equity Task Force undercut a Task Force directive to compensate technical and human relations skills differentially found in clerical and human services work. In addition, male employees serving on job evaluation committees, a major union representing incumbents of male-dominated jobs, and a Personnel Department intent on wresting control over compensation from the Legislature successfully resisted attempts to compensate skills involved in women's work.

Thus, value bias in job evaluation systems means that existing wage structures neither acknowledge nor reward the skill, effort, and responsibility in positions held by women and male minorities. Such job content may exist in white male-dominated jobs as well, but not to the extent that it exists in female or male minority jobs. Eliminating value bias would allow women to earn a living wage without having to move into traditionally male occupations.

VI. STRATEGIES FOR INCREASING ADVANCEMENT OPPORTUNITIES

Our account of attempts to break down barriers to advancement out of low-paying jobs has two parts. To deal with the barriers we have identified in large, bureaucratic organizations, this discussion draws on the experiences of those types of employers. Since we have shown that many people who work in low-wage jobs are not permanent, full-time workers queued up for promotions in organizational pipelines, we next consider unionization and higher education as two strategies to improve wages in the external labor market. Improving the career development opportunities of low-wage workers, especially women and minorities, is a significant challenge that will involve reforming wage-setting practices, restructuring internal and external labor markets, and improving educational opportunities.

Policies and Programs in Organizations

The Limits of EEO. Strategies for increasing the opportunities of women in low-paying jobs within organizations have had only limited success. To be sure, through the affirmative action programs of many employers, some women gained access to higher-paying jobs that they would not otherwise have had. As a result of comparable worth initiatives, employers have upgraded some jobs, and some women take home bigger paychecks than they did in the past. Despite these improvements however, Leonard (1989) finds that the affirmative action programs required of federal contractors had only a minor impact on increasing white women's share of employment among contractors, although black females have benefited more. Our review of the research on affirmative action programs that emerged from Title VII litigation suggests that these settlements left firmly entrenched in organizations the institutional and cultural barriers that we identified in the sections above.

Our intention here is to point to problems with previous attempts at implementing equal employment policies that are specific to jobs at the bottom of organizations, and then to suggest some examples of how such efforts could be more effective. We also examine whether corporate initiatives to achieve greater diversity in upper management jobs are taking into account the career development of people in low-paying jobs.

In the 1970s and early 1980s, discrimination complaints filed with the EEOC resulted in consent decrees affecting major employers in several industries, such as communications, steel, construction, and electrical products. The mandated affirmative action programs implemented as a result of these settlements were aimed at moving women into higher-paying, traditionally male production and craft jobs. Subsequent research, however, has revealed some of the difficulties with achieving the goal of increased opportunity for women in these industries. First as noted above, seniority rules posed a major stumbling block for women already employed in the plants that prevented them from taking advantage of new

opportunities in nontraditional jobs (Rosen and Strauss 1990; Kelley 1982). By moving outside their own seniority unit, which in many cases could be as narrow as a couple of job titles, women would lose the job security and benefits that seniority entails. Even when broader seniority rights were in place, or were changed as part of the consent decree, clerical jobs and women's production jobs in separate plants were not included (Hams 1984; O'Farrell and Harlan 1984).

Second, to the extent that these settlements included training programs, they reflected the particular limitations of a sex-segregated and class-based work hierarchy (Rosen and Strauss 1990; Hams 1984). Rosen and Strauss argue that if the settlements had dealt more effectively with the need for internal recruitment and training, women would have been more likely to take the necessary steps to gain the seniority for promotions. As Strauss (1993, p.163) writes about the affirmative action program at General Electric Company, "most recruits were enrolled in short-term, one-type, formal training for work in particular jobs." This training prepared women only for jobs at the lowest skilled rates and limited their mobility opportunities. In contrast, very few women from the plants ever entered or completed the three-year apprenticeship program, designed for highly skilled workers, at least some of whom would move to management. The long, intensive, and expensive (in lost wages) training made it impractical for most women (Rosen and Strauss 1990).

Not surprisingly, the imperfect and incomplete solutions devised in these agreements contributed to the continuation of sex-segregated jobs and to a process of job re-segregation, in which jobs at the lower end of male-dominated job ladders rapidly became female-dominated (see references above and Reskin and Roos 1990 on re-segregation). In the steel mills studied by Deaux and Ullman (1983), for example, half of the women in "nontraditional" jobs were hired as janitors and laborers. Harlan and O'Farrell (1982) observed two lower skilled male job ladders in one company become disproportionately

female over a short period of time. Of course, these settlements did not affect most women in these industries--women working in white-collar clerical and administrative support jobs.

The unforeseen difficulties with these agreements stemmed in large measure from the fact that the goal was *to place newly hired women in entry-level jobs* on skilled, male, blue-collar job ladders. In these industries, most of the women who benefited from newly desegregated jobs were hired "off the street." This view of affirmative action did not even consider the implications of the agreements for women in these industries *who were already working in low-paying traditionally female jobs* in factories and offices. In one important exception, a union local continued the court action even after the national agreement was signed, and it won back pay, job upgrades, training opportunities, and job bidding rights for women in traditional factory work (Hans 1984).

Although the chance to work for a primary sector employer represented advancement for the newly hired women, the subsequent deterioration of the manufacturing economy meant that a disproportionate number of the women newly hired in skilled job ladders lost their jobs in the major layoffs that followed. Economic downturns and technological change have limited women's advancement (Strauss 1993; Rosen and Strauss 1990; Deaux and Ullman 1983; Hacker 1979). Rosen and Strauss correctly point out that if women from the plants had been given opportunities for these jobs, many would have had the seniority to hold on to them, even in the face of economic decline.

What we have learned from these EEO programs is that they have not addressed the underlying sources of inequality in organizational hierarchies for women, racial minorities, or the working class. They have created opportunities for some individuals by fitting them into existing structures, but they have not changed systemic inequalities that devalue and subordinate the work traditionally done by these groups. One result is that most people at the bottom of organizations remain cut off from routes of advancement. Another result is that

white men perceive programs to hire and promote women and minorities as preferential treatment for those groups. In an effort to protect their slim advantage and avoid having their own work degraded, men in production and craft jobs have heightened their resistance to women and minorities who try to enter their turf.

Given what we have learned from past attempts at reforming organizations, we should carry two ideas into the future. First, the lessons from earlier mandated affirmative action programs, even those that did not fulfill their promise, are an important starting point for developing better strategies for the future. The federal EEO laws have been critically important in ending blatantly discriminatory practices, and we have learned much about the resilience of more subtle barriers. Second, we know that affirmative action, interpreted narrowly as increasing the numbers of women and minorities in nontraditional jobs, is an inadequate basis for creating social change in organizations. More fundamentally, strategies are needed that transform organizations so that gender, race, and class are no longer institutional sources of inequality (Cockburn 1991; Burton 1991).

Toward A Better Understanding of Reforms. Moving beyond the limitations of the past will require more sweeping organizational reforms. It is important to eliminate sexism and racism from the culture of organizations. Our analysis of barriers suggests that real improvements in these areas can occur only if the rigid organizational hierarchies that institutionalize class inequality are drastically reduced. This means making changes in organizations that diminish the distance between the "glass ceiling" and the "sticky floor" in terms of wages, organizational pipelines, and educational opportunities. Four strategies are needed to increase advancement opportunities out of low-paying jobs in large organizations.

First, raise the wages of low-paying jobs by establishing equitable compensation policies. Following the National Research Council recommendations, rates of return for education, experience, supervision, and other productivity-related job characteristics should be the same (Steinberg 1984). Furthermore, to close that portion of the wage gap due to this

source requires that pay structures positively compensate the content of female and minority jobs, thereby removing from these structures the negative value bias associated with female or minority-dominated jobs.

Wages are set in internal labor markets and, therefore, changes to existing wage structures are within the power of large employers to make. As wages for jobs at the bottom rise relative to those at the top, organizations will value the work and the people who do it more highly. There will be less economic advantage to sex and race segregation, and in the longer run, they will diminish. Explicit recognition of the "invisible" skills and tasks involved in women's occupations would make more apparent how these jobs fit into pipelines for advancement. Achieving a more heterogeneous work force at an elevated floor, as well as at the top, will improve the workplace environment.

Second, employers should examine their "pipelines" and administrative promotion systems for low-paying jobs to determine where opportunities for advancement can be improved. Although the existence of pathways from middle to top management is taken for granted, there are few, if any, pathways that link women in clerical, production, or direct service jobs to anything beyond a few supervisory positions. Thus, another important way to reduce the gap between the top and bottom in organizational hierarchies is to create job ladders out of sex-segregated jobs. Companies must make a strong commitment to promote people from within the ranks of these jobs to technical, craft, and managerial jobs. It is not enough, however, to promote different people in the same pipelines; companies should evaluate the ways in which different jobs relate to one another and make appropriate changes in promotion pathways.

Public sector employers and unions have experimented with several methods of career development for nonmanagement employees, according to Figart (1989). For example, "cross-over" jobs allow employees to move to an entry level job on a different job ladder with

better opportunities, also affording them the necessary training. "Bridge" jobs are new permanent positions created between existing jobs to help employees make a move from less skilled to more skilled jobs.

Figart (1989) uses the example of the New York State Clerical and Secretarial Advancement Program (CSEAP) to illustrate how structural reforms, negotiated and financially supported by unions and management, have helped women in secretarial and paraprofessional occupations move up. CSEAP created bridge positions of program aides and administrative aides that took some responsibilities and duties from professional positions in a program area and allowed paraprofessionals to perform them. People in lower grade clerical titles could compete for these jobs. Linking the paraprofessionals to the professions, they established the Public Administration Traineeship Transition, in which clerical and paraprofessional employees can move up to be specialists in personnel, budgeting, purchasing, or human resources. Educational assistance--in the form of courses, on-the-job training, release time, and tuition reimbursement--is essential to enhancing women's qualifications for upward mobility within this program.

Third, employers should make substantial investments in the education of their lowest paid employees. The lack of education is a barrier for many people in production, service, and clerical occupations in qualifying for higher positions because employers require credentials and job skills for higher-level positions, some of which can be learned on the job and some of which are learned in college. Although many large employers are willing to invest in the further education of women and minorities with college degrees who enter the company as professionals with the potential to become managers, they try as much as possible to pass on to individuals and government the costs of educating everyone else. Short-term training for a narrowly defined task, which is typically all that is available to female nonmanagerial employees, does not result in upward mobility.

A good example of substantial educational investment is the Off-Campus College Program developed by Cornell University New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations Extension Division's New York City Office. The program began in 1978 as a pilot project at Technicon Instruments Corporation with funding from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Since 1980, Cornell has conducted the program at Chase Manhattan Bank in New York City and over 800 Chase employees have participated. Subsequently, Cornell has developed learning partnerships with a dozen major employers around the state. This two-year program, designed for secretaries and other support staff without a college background, provides six three-credit college courses in subjects such as written and oral communication, management and supervisory skills, and business finance. Cornell provides instructors, support services, counseling, and help in transferring the credits to other colleges where participants can work toward a college degree. Employers pay tuition (currently \$525 a course), provide space for classes, and sometimes release time for part of the class meeting. Participants and managers regard the program highly. According to Cornell Extension, the company has promoted many participants after they complete the program.

Company-sponsored apprenticeship programs are an alternative educational investment that employers can make, but in order for these opportunities to benefit women, employers must design the programs to accommodate women. Apprenticeship programs offer classroom and on-the-job training for jobs requiring a progression of skills. However, rules that restrict women's entry (Glover 1989) and the limitation of this form of training to blue-collar work curtail women's opportunities. Women were only 7.1 percent of registered apprentices in 1990, and 63 percent of those women were in the trades with the lowest earnings (Coalition on Women and Job Training 1992).

An apprenticeship program at Consolidated Edison Company, a New York utility company, has greatly expanded its recruitment of women as general utility workers, a

physically demanding, unionized craft job. As a result of an OFCCP compliance review, the company voluntarily designed a program to increase its recruitment of women in this nontraditional job, in which beginning apprentices progress to journeyman positions paying approximately \$20 an hour. The company entered a partnership with NEW (Nontraditional Employment for Women), a training organization which they pay to provide women with pre-employment training, including physical fitness, academic studies, and other subjects relevant to utility work. Assigned mentors and support groups are important to women once they are on the job. Con Edison believes that their recruitment efforts will lead to an increased number of women who are eligible for promotions to supervisory positions because 75 percent of first-line supervisors come from the ranks of these blue-collar jobs (personal communication and unpublished company material).

This program recruits new workers to the company rather than creating new opportunities for current female employees, but it is noteworthy because the company has learned from its own and others' past difficulties in retaining women in jobs that require physical labor. Con Edison has also committed its own resources to providing in-depth training for women. The apprenticeship model is one that should be used in expanding career ladders in a broader range of occupations.

Fourth, employers need to stop asking employees to "prove" their commitment to their jobs by making work the top priority when a family need arises. Bailyn (1993) suggests that organizations should respond more flexibly to their employees' needs. Experimentation with a shorter work week and institutionalization of flextime in both private and public sectors are changing the rigidity of the work day and week to make it more adaptable to women's needs. Workers have asked that the particular hours they work, the number of hours per week, and the years devoted to upward mobility be made more flexible. These reforms provide employees with greater flexibility in the timing of work and allow women and men to schedule job hours flexibly so that they can meet family obligations.

Employers are experimenting with part-time and job-sharing positions. Traditionally, part-time work has been confined to jobs at lower skill levels or female-dominated professions, such as teaching, social work, and nursing. Some employers offer as an option permanent part-time work with prorated salary and benefits, upward mobility opportunity, and a stable position in the work organization (Barrett 1979). The federal government took an early step in passing and implementing the Federal Employees Part-Time Career Employment Act of 1978 which mandates expansion of part-time employment opportunities at the federal level. Similar efforts are underway in a number of states and local jurisdictions and in private industry (Ferber and O'Farrell 1991; Long and Post 1980; Claman 1979).

Another type of alteration in the organization of work is flextime. Flextime and part-time hours can be advantageous for workers but they are also problematic if the employer controls the flexibility or if reduced hours mean wages and benefits are not sufficient to support the worker and her family. To benefit employees, sufficient wages and benefits need to accompany flextime and part-time work and reduced hours need to be voluntary (Negrey 1990).

Organizational Diversity: For Whom? Historically, employers have devoted greater effort and more resources to creating affirmative action programs that would increase the representation of women and minorities in managerial positions rather than in nontraditional lower-level jobs (Tomaskovic-Devey 1993; O'Farrell and Harlan 1984; Kanter 1977). Employers emphasize management jobs because they have greater public visibility, and managers perceive the barriers to job integration at the higher levels as being easier to overcome.

Currently, business leaders and organizational consultants are portraying "diversity management" as the successor to corporate affirmative action programs (Thomas 1990). Corporate initiatives in managing diversity theoretically afford the company a "strategic

advantage by helping members of diverse groups perform to their potential" (Winterle 1993, p.11). We wanted to know whether employers' diversity initiatives would also, like affirmative action, put more resources, energy, and commitment into management and professional positions, or whether workers in low-paying jobs in production, clerical, and direct services could expect to benefit from these programs. We reviewed some, though by no means all, of the literature on diversity, interviewed several consultants, and obtained lists of award-winning companies. Our focal point was what companies say they are doing specifically with respect to nonmanagerial jobs.

¹ We find that data about diversity programs is based on anecdotal evidence and what companies choose to put in the public domain rather than on independent evaluations.

¹ We reviewed two major reports on corporate responses to work force diversity (Winterle 1993; Towers Perrin and the Hudson Institute 1990). We talked with colleagues as well as several business consultants suggested by staff at the Glass Ceiling Commission about what practices they had observed in corporations. We conducted phone interviews with and requested written material from a few companies the consultants suggested as having progressive outlooks. We also obtained lists of the companies that received the 1993 Catalyst Awards and the 1992 and 1993 Exemplary Voluntary Efforts (EVE) Awards from the OFCCP. Two of the examples we used above (the Cornell Extension Division program and Consolidated Edison apprenticeship) came to our attention through these efforts. However, the Cornell program originated as a women's educational program in the late 1970s and Con Edison's program was motivated by an OFCCP compliance review. Finally, we conducted computerized literature searches under ABI/INFORM.

This limited review suggests that employers *do not* relate current efforts at valuing diversity to re-ordering organizational hierarchies or reducing sex, race, or class-based inequalities within organizations. The initiatives might be creating some opportunities for women and minorities to gain access to professional and managerial pipelines. The Conference Board study of "leading edge" companies, however, suggests that when companies address diversity initiatives to people below the management level, they most often take the form of training "to change employees' attitudes and behavior toward people who are different" (Winterle 1993, p.21).

In short, most descriptions of corporate initiatives are focused on creating opportunities for women and minorities in managerial jobs. Companies seem to be investing more than they used to in education, though for whom and for what remains elusive based on the public accounts. Programs to enable all levels of employees to balance work and family demands seem to have support. We find no evidence that addressing compensation policies or restructuring low-wage jobs are part of diversity initiatives.

Strategies for the Outside

The women who work in this country's lowest-paying jobs do not work for large corporate employers or in the public sector. In one sense, the barriers they confront in moving out of those jobs stem from the same sexist and racist structures that create the glass ceiling at the center of corporate and government power. Yet as we have stressed, a long distance separates women in part-time, temporary, and underpaid jobs in the informal and secondary economy from full-time, permanent, but still underpaid jobs in the primary sector. Expanding the concept of the glass ceiling to connect the needs of ordinary employed women with those of elite women means reducing the amount of inequality generated by economic and educational institutions as well as by organizational hierarchies. As a society, we have not moved very far down the road of re-ordering national priorities on industrial policy and

access to educational opportunities. Thus, there are not many examples of successful experiences. However, unionization and higher education are two strategies that have worked in raising wages, and the evidence suggests they would also increase advancement opportunities beyond low-wage jobs if applied to a larger group of women in the informal and secondary economy.

Expanding Union Coverage. In industries and occupations where labor unions exist, wages are higher in unionized than in non-unionized jobs. In separate analyses of the wage effects of unions, Freeman and Leonard (1987) and Spalter-Roth and Hartmann (1993) find that unions raise women's wages more than men's, thus helping to close the wage gap. The biggest advantage to women is in areas where women are a larger percentage of the work force, that is the public sector and private sector white-collar jobs (Freeman and Leonard 1987).¹ Union wage premiums are higher for workers with a high school diploma or less than for workers with more education, and the premiums are also higher for blacks and Hispanics than for whites (Spalter-Roth and Hartmann 1993). Unionized jobs are more likely to have pensions, health insurance, and formal procedures for hiring and promotions (O'Farrell 1994).

In addition to bargaining for higher wages, unions have been an important force in pushing for structural reforms in wage determination through pay equity (National Committee on Pay Equity 1990; Freeman and Leonard 1987; Hams 1984). Pay equity has emerged as an area of common interest to unions and women. Unions won the early cases on

¹ Although unions increase men's wages in blue-collar jobs more than women's (Freeman and Leonard 1987), Rosen (1987) finds that blue-collar unions made these jobs preferable to women over the alternatives of clerical and service jobs.

wage discrimination in court (IUE v. Westinghouse, AFSCME v. State of Washington), and since then, several unions have turned to collective bargaining strategies to win better compensation for low-paid female members (National Committee on Pay Equity 1990). Unions have helped to win \$150 million in wage adjustments for women from pay equity settlements with state and local governments (Barko 1993). Some unions have also bargained for affirmative action programs that increase women's access to nontraditional blue-collar jobs in industry (O'Farrell 1993).

Although unions have obvious benefits for women, only 10.4 percent of women (12 percent of all workers) in the private sector belong to unions. Women are currently more than one-third of union members, but the large increase in women's membership has been only a public sector phenomenon, and some of it has been due to organization among professional women, such as nurses and teachers (O'Farrell 1994; Spalter-Roth and Hartmann 1993; Freeman and Leonard 1987). For example, in service industries, which employ a high proportion of women, only 5.8 percent of workers are union members. In retail trade, 6.5 percent are organized (U.S. Department of Labor 1993a).

There are some reasons for optimism in hoping that women's union representation will increase as economic issues catalyze grassroots activism among women and as organizers learn more about the importance of race and ethnicity in targeting organizing drives (Glenn and Feldberg 1989; Bookman 1988). Public opinion data show that many unorganized workers would be willing to join a union and that women's and men's preferences for unions are very similar (Freeman and Leonard 1987). However, the political and economic environment for unions has been oppressive. In recent years, employers have used increasingly aggressive anti-union tactics and highly unionized manufacturing industries have suffered dramatic job losses (O'Farrell 1994). The benefits of unions for workers in general, and for women in particular, can be expanded by providing greater government protection for

workers' right to organize and extending bargaining rights to the populations that make up the contingent low-wage work force.

Cobble (1993) has argued that the New Deal industrial relations framework in which existing labor law developed is not suitable for an economy that is increasingly made up of "many highly mobile, part-time, temporary, leased, on-call and subcontracted workers." Many of these workers are women in service and clerical occupations. She calculates that 39 percent of employed women are in jobs that do not meet the criteria to be eligible for union representation. Therefore, she proposes that the legal framework for establishing representation and collective bargaining rights must be reformed to encompass their work situations.

Increasing Access to Higher Education. An important strategy for improving women's opportunities for advancement beyond low-paying jobs is increasing their access to higher education. As the earnings data in Table 1 show, only women in managerial, professional, and technical occupations have average earnings that provide a living wage. Most of these occupations require a college degree. Women college graduates earn an average of \$22,000 a year (Tucker 1993) and 75 percent of college educated women are in professional, managerial, and technical jobs (Harlan and Steinberg 1989). Although basic education, literacy programs, and narrow skills training programs enable women to enter the labor force, these are not enough to provide women with the education needed for upward mobility. As we pointed out above, publicly supported training programs, such as vocational education, JTPA, JOBS, and even the military, limit women's options to training for low-wage, traditionally female jobs. These programs help to meet employers' demand for low-wage female labor, but they do not meet women's needs to be self-sufficient.

Two studies in Massachusetts and in New York of women who had received AFDC prior to graduating from college have demonstrated the occupational and income benefits of a college education for this economically disadvantaged population (Kates 1991; Gittell,

Schehl, and Fareri 1990). Previous research has shown that only about 20 percent of women on AFDC are able to "work their way" off welfare through increases in their own earnings (Ellwood 1988). In Kates' study, however, 79 percent of the college graduates were earning over \$20,000 a year in middle level professional jobs, while the others were in graduate school. Gittell's study showed similar results. Despite the success of these women, both studies document extensive barriers in the regulations of public assistance and educational assistance programs that prevent many other women from following this path.

Nationally, between one-half and two-thirds of AFDC recipients have not completed high school (Tucker 1993). Among those who have, some are not ready for college. As Gittell argues, many women require basic education, literacy, ESL programs, and vocational programs that are important steps on the way to self-sufficiency, but these steps should not be routinely viewed as the end of educational opportunities for them. Neither should policies that encourage women's access to higher education be used as a substitute for structural reforms in low-wage labor markets.

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR POLICY AND RESEARCH

The glass ceiling is one manifestation of cultural and institutional barriers that restrict opportunities for women and minorities in the labor market. Class inequalities and organizational hierarchies that overlap and perpetuate sex and race discrimination also disadvantage women and minorities on the sticky floor of the economy. These barriers are deeply ingrained in the overall structure and the daily practices of work organizations that we take for granted. The way to overcome these barriers, or to lessen their effects, is to increase the cost of maintaining them by putting "political pressure on employers, the regulatory agencies that monitor them, and branches of government that establish and fund such agencies" (Reskin 1988, p.74-75).

Recommendations for Increasing Advancement Opportunities Beyond Low-Paying Jobs

Our policy recommendations focus on steps that the federal government could take to reduce the degree of inequality among jobs and among individuals. These are policies that would raise wages, provide better protection for workers in low-paying jobs, change the structure of external and internal labor markets, support families, and increase public and private investment in the education and training of low-paid workers. Other groups and individuals have set forth many of these recommendations, but the chances of enacting them would be enhanced if the Glass Ceiling Commission would adopt them as part of its agenda for increasing economic opportunity.

Wage Policy

- o **Raise the minimum wage** to a level where any full-time, year-round job pays enough to support a family of four above the poverty line, as President Clinton called for in his campaign.
- o **Expand the Equal Pay Act to prohibit employers from practicing wage discrimination on the basis of race, sex, or national origin by paying employees less for work of comparable value than they pay employees of another race, sex, or national origin** (National Committee on Pay Equity).
- o **The OFCCP should immediately require federal contractors to implement pay equity in their work forces** (National Committee on Pay Equity).

Worker Protection Policy

- o **Guarantee basic employment protection to all workers**, including health, disability, and unemployment insurance. Benefits should be portable, and extended to workers in the informal and service sectors of the economy. Part-time workers should qualify for benefits on a pro-rated basis (Carre 1993; Cobble 1993; Ferber and O'Farrell 1991).
- o **Broaden the coverage of labor laws** to include small firms, and part-time and contingent workers. Part-time, temporary, and short-term workers should be eligible for

representation by collective bargaining units based on the jobs they are doing rather than employment class (Cobble 1993; Needleman 1993).

- o **Strengthen the Civil Rights Act of 1991 to protect all employed women against sexual harassment.** Amend the law to include coverage of women who work for employers with fewer than 15 employees, remove the caps on money damages that can be awarded to women, and protect victims and witnesses (National Council for Research on Women 1992).

Labor Market Policy

- o **Increase the resources devoted to the EEOC's and OFCCP's monitoring and enforcement** of corporate EEO policies. Broaden the scope of investigations to assess whether newly created jobs are being structured as part of career ladders, and whether efforts are underway to create advancement opportunities for women and minorities in segregated low-paying jobs.
- o **The EEOC and OFCCP should require employers to form partnerships with women- and minority-focused training organizations** to design programs that recruit those groups in nontraditional jobs and provide the education necessary for upward mobility.
- o **Labor unions should participate along with the government and employers in EEO negotiations that affect collective bargaining agreements.**
- o **Adopt national industry-based skill and certification standards** to provide a common understanding of the qualifications workers need to be upwardly mobile in the labor market (U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration 1993). Advocates of pay equity should participate with educators, employers, and unions in the development of these standards to ensure that they are free of gender, racial, and class bias.

Family Support Policy

- o **Provide leave with pay for employees with family needs** so that low-wage workers are able to take advantage of the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1992. A government insurance program or an amendment to the current law requiring employers to pay could be used to finance paid leaves. Extend coverage of the act to employers with fewer than 15 employees.
- o **Expand Head Start into a full-day, full-year program**, so that it meets the child care needs of low-income women.
- o **Oppose arbitrary limits on the length of time that women may remain on public assistance.** The proposed two-year limit will force more women into low-wage work and poverty without addressing the basic problem of discrimination in educational systems and labor markets.

Education and Training Policy

- o **Develop a national policy that makes the school-to-work transition a more rational and orderly process** by strengthening public institutions, such as community colleges, that provide post-secondary education.
- o **Allocate more resources to the Bureau of Apprenticeship Training** to increase women's participation in apprenticeship programs and to expand the apprenticeship model to traditionally female occupations in health, environment, and computers (Coalition on Women and Job Training 1992).
- o **Increase federal investment in a job training system for economically disadvantaged and displaced workers** that provides the full continuum of pre-employment training (GED, ESL, counseling), academic and skill training for high-wage jobs, and assistance in job placement. Use the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act Amendments of 1990 as a model for

setting priorities in other training programs (Coalition on Women and Job Training 1992).

- o **Mandate employer contributions to a training trust fund** that would increase the money available for the education and training of unskilled and low-wage workers. The federal government should monitor expenditures to ensure gender and racial equity in training services (Coalition on Women and Job Training 1992).
- o **Enforce the provisions of the Higher Education Assistance Act of 1992** which prohibits the reduction of public assistance benefits based on receipt of college financial aid. Revise the federal regulations for the JOBS program to encourage AFDC recipients to enroll in four-year colleges, and prevent states from using time limits for college completion and the "20-hour rule" as barriers for college attendance (Tucker 1993).

Recommendations for Further Research

To devise better strategies for eliminating the barriers to upward mobility encountered by low-wage workers, government and foundation funders should support research that includes women of all races and ethnic backgrounds in the following areas:

- o **The contingent work force and mobility in low-wage jobs.** "Contracting out" by employers in the private and public sectors is having a major effect on the organization of the U.S. economy. Past research has documented and partially described the contingent work force of temporary, part-time, and short-term employees, while offering macro-level hypotheses about its emergence. Many questions remain, however, about its causal relationship to low-wage work in organizations. We need studies that compare the contingent and permanent work forces of employers to address questions about both segments of the

labor market and the degree of mobility between them. Is there mobility from the contingent into the permanent work force and where does it occur? Does an employer's use of contingent workers affect the wages and advancement chances of permanent employees? Is working in the contingent work force of short-term, temporary, seasonal, or part-time jobs a way that women cope with family responsibilities, or do these jobs actually make it more difficult for women to care for their families?

- o **Advancement in sales and service occupations.** There is very little research on women and minorities in these occupations, much less than has been done on clerical and blue-collar jobs. We need studies on whether there are job ladders ("pipelines") and promotion opportunities for entry-level workers in these industries, and how they are structured. Much of our knowledge about mobility channels is based on large establishments with thousands of employees in a single location. How does mobility work, and what are the barriers to mobility, in retailing industries, hotel and restaurant chains, or health services?
- o **How to measure value bias in the compensation of traditionally female jobs.** We know how to assess whether female-dominated jobs are paid less than male-dominated jobs for skills and tasks that are common to both, such as years of education, number of people supervised, and hazardous working conditions. We have qualitative research showing that female-dominated jobs often involve tasks and skills not necessarily found in male-dominated ones but which nonetheless produce value for the employer. We need quantitative research documenting the incidence of these "invisible" and unrewarded skills and tasks, such as responsibility for people, interpersonal interaction, and

emotional labor (e.g., handling difficult or upset people), which can be used to develop job evaluation systems for measuring and compensating them.

- o **The effects of employers' family-related policies on careers.** There is very little research studying women's career histories in low-waged work and still less that examines the effects of employers' family-related human resource policies on women's upward mobility in them. We need to document whether taking advantage of the flexible options afforded to employees (e.g., parental leave, flextime, job-sharing, reduced hours) hinders women's advancement by shunting them off onto the "mommy track," enabling women to move up in organizational hierarchies, or has no effect.
- o **Employers' training investments in nonexempt jobs.** The available research shows that, overall, employers allocate fewer resources to training and educating non-management employees, especially those in female-dominated jobs. However, we need studies on: 1) the kinds of training employers invest in those workers compared to training for management and professionals; and 2) the characteristics of employers (other than size) that are more or less likely to invest in training. A central question that these studies should address is to what degree training for women and minorities in non-management jobs is directed toward and effectively linked to upward mobility.
- o **The success of "diversity" initiatives.** The new initiatives that employers are implementing under the rubric of organizational diversity have not been subject to the same degree of outside scrutiny as EEO and affirmative action programs. In many cases, it is not clear whether employers associate diversity programs with increased opportunity for non-management workers. Independently conducted research is needed on the results of reforms and

innovations that employers say they have undertaken to determine whether employees in low-wage jobs benefit from these programs.

REFERENCES

- Acker, Joan. 1989. *Doing Comparable Worth: Gender, Class, and Pay Equity*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- . 1990. "Hierarchies, Jobs, Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organizations." *Gender & Society* 4:139-158.
- Almquist, Elizabeth M. 1989. "The Experiences of Minority Women in the United States: Intersections of Race, Gender, and Class." Pp. 414-445 in *Women: A Feminist Perspective*, 4th ed., edited by Jo Freeman. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing.
- Andes, Nancy. 1992. "Social Class and Gender: An Empirical Evaluation of Occupational Stratification." *Gender & Society* 6:231-25.
- Backhouse, Constance and Leah Cohen. 1981. *Sexual Harassment on the Job*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bailyn, Lotte. 1993. "Patterned Chaos in Human Resource Management." *Sloan Management Review* Winter: 77-83.
- Baker, Sally Hillsman. 1978. "Women in Blue-Collar and Service Occupations." Pp. 339-376 in *Women Working: Theories and Facts in Perspective*, edited by Ann H. Stromberg and Shirley Harkess. Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield Publishing.
- Bamezai, Anil. 1989. *Rising Earnings Disparity and Technological Change*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.
- Barko, Naomi. 1993. "Equal Pay In Your Pocketbook." *Working Mother* (November) pp. 42-48.
- Baron, James N., and William T. Bielby. 1985. "Organizational Barriers to Gender Equality: Sex Segregation of Jobs and Opportunities." Pp. 233-251 in *Gender and The Life Course*, edited by Alice S. Rossi. New York: Aldine.
- Barrett, N. S. 1979. "Women in the Job Market." Pp.63-98 in *The Subtle Revolution* edited by R. E. Smith. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- Becker, Gary. 1985. "Human Capital, Effort, and the Sexual Division of Labor." *Journal of Economic Literature* 3:33-58 (Suppl.).
- Benokraitis, Nijole V. and Joe R. Feagin. 1986. *Modern Sexism*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bergmann, Barbara R. 1986. *The Economic Emergence of Women*. New York: Basic Books.
- Berheide, Catherine White. 1984. "Women's Work in the Home: Seems Like Old Times." *Marriage and Family Review* 12:267-283.
- . 1988. "Women in Sales and Service Occupations." Pp. 241-257 in *Women Working: Theories and Facts in Perspective*, 2nd ed., edited by Ann H. Stromberg and Shirley Harkess. Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield Publishing.
- . 1992. "Women Still 'Stuck' in Low-Level Jobs." *Women in Public Service: A Bulletin of the Center for Women in Government* 3 (Fall).
- Berheide, Catherine White, Cynthia Chertos, Lois Haignere, and Ronnie Steinberg. 1987. "A Pay Equity Analysis of Female-dominated and Disproportionately Minority New York State Job Titles." *Humanity and Society* 11:465-485.
- Bielby, William T. and James N. Baron. 1986. "Men and Women at Work: Sex Segregation and Statistical Discrimination." *American Journal of Sociology* 91:759-799.
- Bielby, William T. and Denise D. Bielby. 1992. "I Will Follow Him: Family Ties, Gender-Role Beliefs, and Reluctance to Relocate for a Better Job." *American Journal of Sociology* 97:1241-67.
- Blumberg, Rhoda. 1987. *Organizations in Contemporary Society*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bookman, Ann. 1988. "Unionization in an Electronics Factory: The Interplay of Gender, Ethnicity, and Class." Pp. 159-179 in *Women and the Politics of Empowerment*, edited by Ann Bookman and Sandra Morgen. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

- Bridges, William and Richard Berk. 1978. "Sex, Earnings, and the Nature of Work." *Social Science Quarterly* 58:553-565.
- Burton, Clare. 1991. *The Promise and the Price: The Struggle for Equal Opportunity in Women's Employment*. North Sydney, Australia: Allen & Unwin.
- Callaghan, Polly and Heidi Hartmann. 1991. *Contingent Work: A Chart Book on Part-Time and Temporary Employment*. Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute.
- Caplette, Michele K. 1981. *Women in Book Publishing: A Study of Careers and Organizations*. Ph.D. dissertation, State University of New York, Stony Brook.
- Carothers, Suzanne C. and Peggy Crull. 1984. "Contrasting Sexual Harassment in Female- and Male-dominated Occupations." Pp. 219-228 in *My Troubles Are Going to Have Trouble with Me: Everyday Trials and Triumphs of Women Workers*, edited by Karen Brodtkin Sacks and Dorothy Remy. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Carre, Francoise J. 1993. "Women Workers in Temporary and Contingent Employment: Problems, Policies and Possible Models for Representation." Paper presented at the conference on Labor Law Reform: Viewpoints from Working Women. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau.
- Chertos, Cynthia H. and Sarah C. Phillips. 1989. "Physical Training as a Strategy for Integrating Municipal Uniformed Services." Pp. 290-315 in *Job Training for Women: The Promise and Limits of Public Policies*, edited by Sharon L. Harlan and Ronnie J. Steinberg. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Claman, P. 1979. "It Works: Part-time Employment in State Agencies." Report of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Executive Office for Administration and Finance, Division of Personnel Administration, December 28.
- Coalition on Women and Job Training. 1992. *Women's Job Training Agenda*. Washington, DC: National Displaced Homemakers Network.
- Cobble, Dorothy Sue. 1993. "Making Post-Industrial Unionism Possible." Paper presented at the conference on Labor Law Reform: Viewpoints from Working Women. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau.
- Cockburn, Cynthia. 1983. *Brothers: Male Dominance and Technological Change*. London: Pluto.
- . 1985. *Machinery of Dominance*. London: Pluto.
- . 1991. *In the Way of Women: Men's Resistance to Sex Equality in Organizations*. Ithaca, NY: ILR Press.
- Coltrane, Scott. 1989. "Household Labor and the Routine Production of Gender." *Social Problems* 36:473-490.
- Cooper, Sandi E. 1986. "Introduction to the Documents (Women's History Goes to Trial: *EEOC v. Sears, Roebuck and Company*)." *Signs* 11:753-756.
- Corcoran, Mary and Greg Duncan. 1979. "Work History, Labor Force Attachment, and Earnings Differences between Races and Sexes." *Journal of Human Resources* 14:1-20.
- Coser, Lewis A. 1974. *Greedy Institutions*. New York: Free Press.
- Coyle, Angela. 1982. "Sex and Skill in the Organization of the Clothing Industry." Pp. 10-26 in *Work, Women and the Labour Market*, edited by Jackie West. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Creighton, Hannah. 1982. "Tied by Double Apron Strings: Female Work Culture and Organization in a Restaurant." *Insurgent Sociologist* 11:59-64.
- Deaux, Kay and Joseph C. Ullman. 1983. *Women of Steel: Female Blue-Collar Workers in the Basic Steel Industry*. New York: Praeger.
- Desai, Sonalde and Linda J. Waite. 1991. "Women's Employment during Pregnancy and After the First Birth: Occupational Characteristics and Work Commitment." *American Sociological Review* 56:551-566
- Dill, B. Thorton, L. W. Cannon, and R. Vanneman. 1987. "Race and Gender in Occupational Segregation." Pp. 11-70 in *Pay Equity: An Issue of Race, Ethnicity, and Sex*. Washington, DC: National Commission on Pay Equity.
- DiPrete, Thomas A. and Whitman T. Soule. 1988. "Gender and Promotion in Segmented Job Ladder Systems." *American Sociological Review* 53:26-40.

- Doeringer, Peter B. 1991. *Turbulence in the American Workplace*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Doeringer, Peter B. and Michael J. Piore. 1971. *Internal Labor Markets and Manpower Analysis*. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.
- Earle, Janice and Virginia Roach with Katherine Fraser. 1987. *Female Dropouts: A New Perspective*. Washington, DC: National Association of State Boards of Education.
- England, Paula. 1982. "Do Men's Jobs Require More Skill Than Women's?" *Industrial and Labor Relations Report*. Spring.
- England, Paula, Marilyn Chassie, and Linda McCormack. 1982. "Skill Demands and Earnings in Female and Male Occupations." *Sociology and Social Research* 66:147-168.
- Ellwood, David T. 1988. *Poor Support: Poverty in the American Family*. New York: Basic Books.
- Ferber, Marianne and Brigid O'Farrell, eds. 1991. *Work and Family: Policies for a Changing Workforce*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Ferree, Myra Marx. 1985. "Between Two Worlds: German Feminist Approaches to Working-class Women and Work." *Signs* 10:517-536.
- Figart, Deborah M. 1989. "Collective Bargaining and Career Development for Women in the Public Sector." *Journal of Collective Negotiations* 18:301-313.
- Fisher, Brian D. 1991. *Theory of Embedded Resources in Internal Labor Markets*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Albany: State University of New York.
- Foulkes, Fred K. 1980. *Personnel Policies in Large Nonunion Companies*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Freeman, Richard B. and Jonathan S. Leonard. 1987. "Union Maids: Unions and the Female Work Force." Pp. 189-216 in *Gender in the Workplace*, edited by Clair Brown and Joseph A. Pechman. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- Gerhardt, Barry A. and George T. Milkovich. 1989. "Salaries, Salary Growth, and Promotions of Men and Women in a Large, Private Firm." Pp. 23-43 in *Pay Equity: Empirical Inquiries*, edited by Robert T. Michael, Heidi I. Hartmann, and Brigid O'Farrell. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Giese, Elizabeth H. 1989. "Expanding Occupational Choices in Michigan's Secondary Vocational Education." Pp. 316-332 in *Job Training for Women: The Promise and Limits of Public Policies*, edited by Sharon L. Harlan and Ronnie J. Steinberg. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Gittell, Marilyn. 1991. "Women on Welfare: Education and Work." Pp. 168-180 in *Women, Work, and School: Occupational Segregation and the Role of Education*, edited by Leslie R. Wolfe. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Gittell, Marilyn and Janice Moore. 1989. "Denying Independence: Barriers to the Education of Women on AFDC." Pp. 445-479 in *Job Training for Women: The Promise and Limits of Public Policies*, edited by Sharon L. Harlan and Ronnie J. Steinberg. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Gittell, Marilyn, Margaret Schehl, and Camille Fareri. 1990. *From Welfare to Independence: The College Option*. New York: The Howard Samuels State Management and Policy Center.
- Glass, Jennifer and Valerie Camarigg. 1992. "Gender, Parenthood, and Job-Family Compatibility." *American Journal of Sociology* 98:131-151.
- Glazer, Nona Y. 1993. *Women's Paid and Unpaid Labor: The Work Transfer in Health Care and Retailing*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Glenn, Evelyn Nakano and Roslyn L. Feldberg. 1989. "Clerical Work: The Female Occupation." Pp. 287-311 in *Women: A Feminist Perspective*, 4th ed., edited by Jo Freeman. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing.
- Glover, Robert W. 1989. "Apprenticeship: A Route to the High-Paying Skilled Trades for Women?" Pp. 269-289 in *Job Training for Women: The Promise and Limits of Public Policies*, edited by Sharon L. Harlan and Ronnie J. Steinberg. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Goldstein, Nance. 1989. "Management Training Strategies in High Tech Electronics." Pp. 485-509 in *Job Training for Women: The Promise and Limits of Public Policies*, edited by Sharon L. Harlan and Ronnie J. Steinberg. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

- Goode, William C. 1982. "Why Men Resist." Pp. 121-150 in *Rethinking the Family*, edited by Barrie Thorne with Marilyn Yalom. New York: Longman.
- Granovetter, Mark S. 1974. *Getting a Job: A Study of Contacts and Careers*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gruber, James E., and Lars Bjorn. 1982. "Blue-Collar Blues: The Sexual Harassment of Women Autoworkers." *Work and Occupations* 9:271-298.
- Gutek, Barbara A. 1988. "Women in Clerical Work." Pp. 225-240 in *Women Working: Theories and Facts in Perspective*, edited by Ann H. Stromberg and Shirley Harkess. Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield Publishing.
- Hacker, Sally. 1979. "Sex Stratification, Technology and Organizational Change: A Longitudinal Case Study of AT&T." *Social Problems* 26:539-557.
- . 1981. "The Culture of Engineering Women: Women, Workplace and Machine." *Women's Studies International Quarterly* 4:341-354.
- Hall, Richard H. 1994. *Sociology of Work*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Hams, Marcia. 1984. "Women Taking Leadership In Male-Dominated Locals." *Women's Rights Law Reporter* 8:71-82.
- Harlan, Sharon L. 1989. "Opportunity and Attitudes Toward Job Advancement in a Manufacturing Firm." *Social Forces* 67: 766-789.
- Harlan, Sharon L. and Brigid O'Farrell. 1982. "After the Pioneers: Prospects for Women in Nontraditional Blue-Collar Jobs." *Work and Occupations* 9:363-386.
- Harlan, Sharon L. and Ronnie J. Steinberg, eds. 1989. *Job Training for Women: The Promise and Limits of Public Policies*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Harrison, Bennett and Barry Bluestone. 1988. *The Great U-Turn: Corporate Restructuring and the Polarizing of America*. New York: Basic Books.
- Hartmann, Heidi I. 1987. "Internal Labor Markets and Gender: A Case Study of Promotion." Pp. 59-105 in *Gender in the Workplace*, edited by Clair Brown and Joseph A. Pechman. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- Hartmann, Heidi. 1979. "The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism: Towards a More Progressive Union." *Capital and Class* 8:1-33.
- Hawkins, Jacquelyn J. and Cynthia H. Chertos. 1985. *Managerial Access Project: Final Report*. Albany: Center for Women in Government, State University of New York, Albany.
- Hochschild, Arlie. 1983. *The Managed Heart: The Commercialization of Human Feeling*. Berkeley, CA: University of California.
- . 1989. *The Second Shift*. New York: Viking Penguin.
- Hossfeld, Karen J. 1990. "'Their Logic Against Them': Contradictions in Sex, Race, and Class in Silicon Valley." Pp. 149-178 in *Women Workers and Global Restructuring*, edited by Kathryn Ward. Ithaca: ILR Press.
- Jacobs, Jerry A. 1989. *Revolving Doors: Sex Segregation and Women's Careers*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Jacobs, Jerry and Ronnie Steinberg. 1990. "Compensating Differentials and the Male-Female Wage Gap." *Social Forces* 69:439-68.
- Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. 1977. *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Kates, Erika. 1991. *More Than Survival: Access to Higher Education for Low Income Women*. Washington, DC: Center for Women Policy Studies.
- Kelley, Maryellen R. 1982. "Discrimination in Seniority Systems: A Case Study." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 36:40-55.
- Kemp, Alice Abel. 1994. *Women's Work*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Kessler-Harris, Alice. 1986. "Written Testimony of Alice Kessler-Harris (Women's History Goes to Trial: *EEOC v. Sears, Roebuck and Company*)." *Signs* 11:767-779.
- Kosters, Marvin. 1989. "The Changing Quality of American Jobs?" *Journal of Labor Research* 10:23-31.
- Leonard, Jonathan S. 1989. "Women and Affirmative Action." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 3:61-75.

- Levitan, Sar A. and Elizabeth A. Conway 1992. "Part-Timers: Living on Half Rations." Pp. 45-60 in *Working Part-Time: Risks and Opportunities*, edited by Barbara D. Warme, Katherine L.P. Lundy, and Larry A. Lundy. New York: Praeger.
- Liebertson, Stanley. 1985. *Making It Count*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Lim, Linda Y. C. 1983. "Capitalism, Imperialism, Patriarchy: The Dilemma of Third-World Women Workers in Multinational Factories." Pp. 70-91 in *Women, Men and the International Division of Labor*, edited by June Nash and Maria Patricia Fernandez-Kelly. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Long, M. and S. Post. 1980. "Alternative Work Schedules: The State and Local Experience." In Notes Book Reprint. U.S. Office of Personnel Management, Office of Intergovernmental Personnel Programs, April.
- Loy, Pamela Hewitt and Lea P. Stewart. 1984. "The Extent and Effects of Sexual Harassment on Working Women." *Sociological Focus* 17:31-43.
- Lucas, Robert E. 1974. "The Distribution of Job Characteristics." *Review of Economics and Statistics* 56:530-540.
- Lusterman, Seymour. 1977. *Education in Industry*. Report no. 719. New York: The Conference Board.
- . 1985. *Trends in Corporate Education and Training*. Report no. 870. New York: The Conference Board.
- Markham, W.T., S.J. South, C.M. Bonjean, and J. Corder. 1985. "Gender and Opportunity in the Federal Bureaucracy." *American Journal of Sociology* 91:129-150.
- Martin, Susan E. 1980. *Breaking and Entering: Policewomen on Patrol*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- McGuire, Gail and Barbara Reskin. 1993. "Authority Hierarchies at Work." *Gender & Society* 7:487-506.
- National Committee on Pay Equity. 1990. *Bargaining for Pay Equity: A Strategy Manual*. Washington, D.C.
- National Council for Research on Women. 1992. *Sexual Harassment: Research & Resources*, 2nd ed. New York.
- Needleman, Ruth. 1993. "Raising Visibility, Reducing Marginality: A Labor Law Reform Agenda for Working Women of Color." Paper presented at the conference on Labor Law Reform: Viewpoints from Working Women. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau.
- Negrey, Cynthia. 1990. *Gender, Time, and Reduced Work*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Nettles, Sandra Murray. 1991. "Higher Education as the Route to Self-Sufficiency for Low-Income Women and Women on Welfare." Pp. 155-167 in *Women, Work, and School: Occupational Segregation and the Role of Education*, edited by Leslie R. Wolfe. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- O'Farrell, Brigid. 1982. "Women and Nontraditional Blue Collar Jobs in the 1980's: An Overview." In *Women in the Workplace*, edited by Phyllis Wallace. Boston: Auburn House.
- . 1993. "Unions, Hard Hats, and Women Workers." In *Women and Unions: Forging a Partnership*, edited by Dorothy Sue Cobble. Ithaca, NY: ILR Press.
- . 1994. "Women in Blue-Collar Occupations: Traditional and Nontraditional." in *Women: A Feminist Perspective*, 5th ed., edited by Jo Freeman. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing Company.
- O'Farrell, Brigid and Sharon L. Harlan. 1984. "Job Integration Strategies: Today's Programs and Tomorrow's Needs." Pp. 267-291 in *Sex Segregation in the Workplace: Trends, Explanations, Remedies*, edited by Barbara F. Reskin. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- O'Reilly, Brian. 1992. "The Job Drought." *Fortune* 126 (24 August): 62-74.
- Osterman, Paul. 1984. "White-Collar Internal Labor Markets." Pp. 163-189 in *Internal Labor Markets*, edited by Paul Osterman. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Palmer, Phyllis and Roberta Spalter-Roth. 1991. "Gender Practices and Employment: The Sears Case and the Issue of Choice." Pp. 36-54 in *Women, Work, and School: Occupational Segregation and the Role of Education*, edited by Leslie R. Wolfe. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

- Pearce, Diana M. 1987. "On The Edge: Marginal Women Workers and Employment Policy." Pp. 197-210 in *Ingredients for Women's Employment Policy*, edited by Christine Bose and Glenna Spitze. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- . 1990. "Women's Poverty: Moving to the Workplace." Pp. 11-22 in *Risks and Challenges: Women, Work and the Future*, edited by Wider Opportunities for Women. Washington, DC: Caslon Press.
- Peterson-Hardt, Sandra and Nancy D. Perlman. 1979. "Sex-Segregated Career Ladders in New York State Government: A Structural Analysis of Inequality in Employment." Working Paper no. 1, Albany: Center for Women in Government, State University of New York, Albany.
- Phillips, Anne and Barbara Taylor. 1980. "Sex and Skill." *Feminist Review* 6:79-88
- Polachek, Solomon. 1979. "Occupational Segregation: A Defense of Human Capital Predictions." *Journal of Human Resources* 20:437-40.
- Power, Marilyn and Sam Rosenberg. 1993. "Black Female Clerical Workers: Movement Toward Equality with White Women?" *Industrial Relations* 32:223-237.
- Presser, Harriet B. 1988. "Shift Work and Child Care among Young Dual-Earner American Parents." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 50:133-148.
- Remick, Helen. 1984. "Dilemmas of Implementation: The Case of Nursing." Pp. 90-98 in *Comparable Worth and Wage Discrimination: Technical Possibilities and Political Realities*, edited by Helen Remick. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Reskin, Barbara F. 1988. "Bringing the Men Back In: Sex Differentiation and the Devaluation of Women's Work." *Gender & Society* 2:58-81.
- Reskin, Barbara F. and Patricia A. Roos. 1990. *Job Queues, Gender Queues: Explaining Women's Inroads into Male Occupations*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Riemer, Jeffrey. 1979. *Hard Hats*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Rollins, Judith. 1985. *Between Women: Domestic Workers and Their Employers*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Roos, Patricia A. 1990. "Hot Metal to Electronic Composition: Gender, Technology, and Social Change." Pp. 275-298 in *Job Queues, Gender Queues: Explaining Women's Inroads into Male Occupations*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Roos, Patricia A. and Barbara F. Reskin. 1984. "Institutional Factors Contributing to Sex Segregation in the Workplace." Pp. 235-260 in *Sex Segregation in the Workplace: Trends, Explanations, Remedies*, edited by Barbara F. Reskin. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Rosen, Ellen I. and Susan R. Strauss. 1990. "Affirmative Action in a Mass Production Context." Paper presented at the Second Annual Women's Policy Research Conference, June 1990.
- Rosen, Ellen Israel. 1987. *Bitter Choices: Blue-Collar Women In and Out of Work*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Rubery, Jill, 1980. "Structured Labour Markets, Worker Organization and Low Pay." In *The Economics of Women and Work*, edited by Alice Amsden. New York: St. Martin's.
- Sadker, David and Myra Sadker. 1991. "Sexism in American Education: The Hidden Curriculum." Pp. 57-76 in *Women, Work, and School: Occupational Segregation and the Role of Education*, edited by Leslie R. Wolfe. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Schneider, Beth. 1982. "Consciousness about Sexual Harassment among Heterosexual and Lesbian Women Workers." *Journal of Social Issues* 38:75-97.
1991. "Put Up and Shut Up: Workplace Sexual Assaults." *Gender & Society* 5:533-548.
- Segura, Denise A. 1989. "Chicana and Mexican Immigrant Women at Work: The Impact of Class, Race, and Gender on Occupational Mobility." *Gender & Society* 3: 37-52.
- Sims, Naomi. 1982. *All about Success for the Black Woman*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Sokoloff, N. 1987. "What's Happening to Women's Employment." In *Hidden Aspects of Women's Work*, edited by C. Bose, R. Feldberg, and N. Sokoloff with the Women and Work Research Group. New York: Praeger.
- Spalter-Roth, Roberta M. 1988. "Vending on the Streets: City Policy, Gentrification, and Public Patriarchy." Pp. 272-294 in *Women and the Politics of Empowerment*, edited by Ann Bookman and Sandra Morgen. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

- Spalter-Roth, Roberta M. and Heidi I. Hartmann. 1993. "What Do Unions Do For Women?" Paper presented at the conference on Labor Law Reform: Viewpoints from Working Women. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau.
- Spalter-Roth, Roberta M., Heidi I. Hartmann, and Linda M. Andrews. 1993. "Mothers, Children, and Low-Wage Work: The Ability to Earn a Family Wage." Pp. 316-338 in *Sociology and The Public Agenda*, edited by William Julius Wilson. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Steinberg, Ronnie. 1984. "A Want of Harmony: Perspectives on Wage Discrimination and Comparable Worth." Pp. 3-27 in *Comparable Worth and Wage Discrimination: Technical Possibilities and Political Realities*, edited by Helen Remick. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Steinberg, Ronnie, and Lois Haignere. 1984. "Separate but Equivalent: Equal Pay for Work of Comparable Worth." In *Gender at Work: Perspectives on Occupational Segregation and Comparable Worth*. Washington, D.C.: Women's Research and Education Institute.
- . 1987. "Equitable Compensation: Methodological Criteria for Comparable Worth." Pp. 157-182 in *Ingredients for Women's Employment Policy*, edited by Christine Bose and Glenna Spitze. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Steinberg, Ronnie J., Lois Haignere, and Cynthia H. Chertos. 1990. "Managerial Promotions in the Public Sector - The Impact of Eligibility Requirements on Women and Minorities." *Work and Occupations* 17: 284-301.
- Stevenson, Mary H. 1977. "Internal Labor Markets and the Employment of Women in Complex Organizations." Working Paper for Center for Research on Women, Wellesley College.
- Strauss, Susan R. 1993. "Strategy for Failure: Affirmative Action in a Mass Production Context." Pp. 151-170 in *Union Voices: Labor's Responses to Crisis*, edited by Glenn Adler and Doris Suarez. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Swerdlow, Marian. 1989. "Men's Accommodations to Women Entering a Nontraditional Occupation: A Case of Rapid Transit Operatives." *Gender & Society* 3:373-387.
- Taeuber, Cynthia and Victor Valdisera. 1986. Women in the American Economy. Current Population Reports, Special Studies Series P-23, no. 146. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.
- Talbert, Joan and Christine Bose. 1977. "Wage-Attainment Processes: The Retail Clerk Case." *American Journal of Sociology* 83:403-424.
- Taylor, Patricia. 1979. "Income Inequality in the Federal Civilian Government." *American Sociological Review* 44:468-479.
- Thomas, Jr., R. Roosevelt. 1990. "From Affirmative Action to Affirming Diversity." *Harvard Business Review* 68:107-119.
- Tomaskovic-Devey, Donald. 1993. *Gender & Racial Inequality at Work: The Sources & Consequences of Job Segregation*. Ithaca: ILR Press.
- Towers Perrin and the Hudson Institute. 1990. *Workforce 2000: Competing in a Seller's Market: Is Corporate America Prepared?* New York and Indianapolis: Towers Perrin and the Hudson Institute.
- Treiman, Donald J. and Heidi I. Hartmann, eds. 1981. *Women, Work, and Wages: Equal Pay for Jobs of Equal Value*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Tucker, Jennifer. 1993. Low Income Women and Higher Education. *Testimony* at the Public Forum of the Working Group on Welfare Reform, Family Support and Independence. Washington, DC: Center for Women Policy Studies.
- US Bureau of the Census. 1983. *Characteristics of the Population, 1980*. Chapter C. General Social and Economic Characteristics, U.S. Summary. PC80-1-C1.
- . 1990. *County Business Patterns*.
- US Department of Education. Office of Educational Research and Improvement. Center for Statistics. 1987a. *The Condition of Education 1987 Edition*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- . Office of Educational Research and Improvement. Center for Statistics. 1987b. *Digest of Education Statistics 1987*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

- US Department of Labor. Bureau of Labor Statistics. 1991. *Employment and Earnings*. Vol. 38, No. 2 (January).
- . Bureau of Labor Statistics. 1993a. *Employment and Earnings*. Vol. 40, No. 2 (January).
 - . Bureau of Labor Statistics. 1993b. *Work and Family: Employer-Provided Training Among Young Adults*. Report no. 838. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
 - . Employment and Training Administration. 1993. *Industry-Based Skill Standards: Analysis of Public Hearings*. Washington, DC.
- Vetter, Louise 1989. "The Vocational Education Option for Women." Pp. 91-113 in *Job Training for Women: The Promise and Limits of Public Policies*, edited by Sharon L. Harlan and Ronnie J. Steinberg. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Walby, Sylvia. 1986. *Patriarchy at Work*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Winterle, Mary J. 1993. *Work Force Diversity: Corporate Challenges, Corporate Responses*. Report no. 1013. New York: The Conference Board.
- Wolfe, Leslie R., ed. 1991. *Women, Work, and School: Occupational Segregation and the Role of Education*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Xu, Wu, and Ann Leffler. 1992. "Gender and Race Effects on Occupational Prestige, Segregation, and Earnings." *Gender & Society* 6:376-392.

Table 1
Occupational Distribution and Median Weekly Earnings
of Full-Time Wage and Salary Workers by Sex, 1992

Occupational Categories	W o m e n		M e n		Median weekly earnings of		
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Both sexes	full-time wage and salary workers Women	Men
	(000s)		(000s)				
Managerial and professional specialty	14,736	27.4	16,416	25.7	\$655	\$562	\$777
Executive, administrative, and managerial	6,126	11.4	8,641	13.5	650	519	784
Professional specialty	8,611	16.0	7,775	12.2	659	587	770
Technical, sales, and administrative support	23,539	43.8	13,269	20.8	407	365	519
Technicians and related support	2,084	3.9	2,169	3.4	508	436	591
Sales occupations	6,667	12.4	7,252	11.4	432	313	523
Administrative support, including clerical	14,788	27.5	3,848	6.0	381	364	482
Service	9,602	17.8	6,494	10.2	283	248	330
Private household	840	1.6	37	0.1	179	177	(1)
Protective service	351	0.7	1,745	2.7	486	399	501
Other service	8,411	15.6	4,712	7.4	263	248	283
Precision production, craft, and repair	1,128	2.1	12,000	18.8	491	336	503
Operators, fabricators, and laborers	4,237	7.9	12,720	19.9	357	279	393
Machine operators, assemblers, and inspectors	2,989	5.6	4,535	7.1	343	275	406
Transportation and material moving	427	0.8	4,451	7.0	427	329	436
Handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, and laborers	821	1.5	3,734	5.9	308	279	314
Farming, forestry, and fishing	551	1.0	2,905	4.6	263	223	269
Total, 16 years and over	53,793	100.0	63,805	100.0	445	381	505

1 Data not shown where base is less than 50,000.

Note: Numbers highlighted are less than 150% of the 1992 federal poverty threshold for a nonfarm family of 4 persons.

Calculated by $\$14,343 \times 1.50 = \$21,515/52 = \$414$.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics 1993. Employment and Earnings. Vol. 40 No. 2 (January).

Table 2
Occupational Distribution of Women by Race and Ethnicity, 1990

Occupational Categories	All Women	White	Black	Native American	HISPANIC ORIGIN			
					Mexican	Puerto Rican	Cuban	Other Spanish
Managerial and professional specialty	27.8%	29.8%	21.4%	22.1%	15.2%	21.1%	24.1%	17.4%
Executive, administrative, and managerial	11.3	12.1	8.1	9.5	6.9	8.9	11.2	7.7
Professional specialty	16.5	17.6	13.3	12.6	8.3	12.2	12.9	9.7
Technical, sales, and administrative support	43.6	44.9	38.8	39.4	38.7	44.9	45.5	36.0
Technicians and related support	3.7	3.7	3.8	3.4	2.5	3.2	3.1	2.7
Sales occupations	12.4	13.0	9.2	11.2	11.5	10.8	11.7	11.2
Administrative support, including clerical	27.5	28.2	25.9	24.8	24.7	31.0	30.7	22.1
Service	16.9	15.1	25.0	23.3	23.6	17.6	13.7	28.1
Private household	0.9	0.6	2.2	0.9	2.6	0.7	0.8	5.8
Protective service	0.6	0.5	1.2	0.8	0.5	1.0	0.5	0.5
Other service	15.3	14.0	21.7	21.6	20.6	15.8	12.3	21.8
Precision production, craft, and repair	2.3	2.1	2.4	3.1	3.7	3.0	3.6	3.3
Operators, fabricators, and laborers	8.5	7.3	12.1	11.0	16.2	13.1	12.8	14.6
Machine operators, assemblers, and inspectors	5.9	4.8	8.8	7.2	12.1	9.9	10.5	11.4
Transportation and material moving	0.9	0.9	1.2	1.6	0.8	0.7	0.6	0.7
Handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, and laborers	1.7	1.6	2.1	2.2	3.4	2.5	1.7	2.5
Farming, forestry, and fishing	0.8	0.9	0.3	1.1	2.5	0.4	0.3	0.6
Total, 16 years and over: percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(number)	52,976,623	41,499,763	5,912,329	317,921	2,046,146	409,485	232,782	980,773

Source: United States Bureau of the Census. 1993 Pre-publication Data. *1990 Census of Population (1990 CP)*.
 Social and Economic Characteristics, U.S. Summary, 1990 CP-2.

Table 2-Continued
Occupational Distribution of Women by Race and Ethnicity, 1990

Occupational Categories	ASIAN							Pacific Islanders
	Japanese	Chinese	Filipino	Korean	Asian Indian	Vietnamese	Other Asian	
Managerial and professional specialty	33.3%	31.9%	29.7%	20.6%	35.0%	15.9%	19.4%	20.1%
Executive, administrative, and managerial	14.0	14.9	9.9	9.4	10.4	7.2	7.4	10.4
Professional specialty	19.3	17.0	19.8	11.1	24.6	8.7	12.0	9.7
Technical, sales, and administrative support	43.7	38.1	41.5	39.4	42.0	34.9	32.0	47.6
Technicians and related support	4.2	6.4	6.0	2.5	7.4	5.9	3.2	2.8
Sales occupations	11.4	11.1	10.1	22.5	12.6	11.1	11.4	13.8
Administrative support, including clerical	28.0	20.7	25.3	14.5	22.0	17.9	17.3	31.0
Service	13.8	13.6	17.4	20.4	11.5	19.0	20.5	21.2
Private household	0.6	0.6	1.2	0.5	0.7	0.5	1.0	1.0
Protective service	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.2	1.0
Other service	12.9	12.8	15.9	19.8	10.5	18.4	19.3	19.1
Precision production, craft, and repair	3.1	3.2	3.2	5.5	2.6	10.2	7.6	2.4
Operators, fabricators, and laborers	5.3	12.9	7.5	13.6	8.7	19.6	19.8	7.9
Machine operators, assemblers, and inspectors	3.8	11.6	6.0	11.5	6.9	17.1	16.3	4.5
Transportation and material moving	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.3	1.4
Handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, and laborers	1.2	1.2	1.3	1.9	1.7	2.3	3.2	2.0
Farming, forestry, and fishing	0.8	0.2	0.7	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.7	0.8
Total, 16 years and over: percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(number)	215,319	373,165	411,393	173,422	141,028	101,304	107,137	68,129

**STUDIES OF WOMEN IN LOW-WAGE JOBS
A SELECTED ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY**

BY MICHELE A. FORBES

Baker, Sally Hillsman. 1978. "Women in Blue-Collar and Service Occupations." Pp. 339-376 in *Women Working: Theories and Facts in Perspective*, edited by Ann H. Stromberg and Shirley Harkess. Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield Publishing.

Explores the experience of women in blue-collar industrial and service occupations and examines the impact of vocational socialization, training and initial experiences on entering the labor market. Recommends specific actions that would create greater economic opportunity for women in blue-collar and service jobs.

Berheide, Catherine White. 1988. "Women in Sales and Service Occupations." Pp. 241-257 in *Women Working: Theories and Facts in Perspective*, edited by Ann H. Stromberg and Shirley Harkess. Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield Publishing.

Examines women's experiences in sales and the service occupations and finds that these occupations are highly sex segregated and demanding in the "emotional labor" that they require. Suggests measures that must be taken if women's status in these growth occupations is to change.

Bookman, Ann and Sandra Morgen (eds.). 1988. *Women and the Politics of Empowerment*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

An edited book of twelve case studies that focus on the strategies for grassroots political activism used by working class women at work and in the community. An introduction by the editors challenges the standard definition of politics as elective office. Explores a variety of contexts in which race, class, and gender combine to shape resistance to oppression and advocacy for reform.

Burton, Clare. 1991. *The Promise and the Price: The Struggle for Equal Opportunity in Women's Employment*. North Sydney, Australia: Allen & Unwin.

Discusses equal employment opportunity programs for women in Australia and identifies elements that limit their effectiveness in yielding equitable employment practices and outcomes. Attributes the underlying source of inequality in the labor market to a spillover from society where women are not accorded the same value as men. The author contends that the structural subordination of women will not be dealt with through programs that merely purport to broaden women's employment opportunities and that a more egalitarian social order requires more in terms of a restructuring of perceptions and practices.

Cobble, Dorothy Sue (ed.). 1993. *Women and Unions: Forging a Partnership*. Ithaca, NY: ILR Press.

An examination of the current work force issues that are affecting working women and the role of unions in responding to the problems of low pay, job segregation, the "second shift" at home, and contingent or part-time work. The authors discuss new directions in organizing female and minority workers in traditional and nontraditional workplaces.

Cockburn, Cynthia. 1991. *In the Way of Women: Men's Resistance to Sex Equality in Organizations*. Ithaca, NY: ILR Press.

The author uses case studies of four organizations in Great Britain and draws on feminist analysis and theory to assess attempts to equalize the position of women with that of men inside organizations. Concludes that men actively resist the effort for sex equality in organizations and that men's resistance to the liberation of women is systemic and adaptive.

Puts forth a strategy to carry equal opportunity beyond the short agenda characterized by cosmetic treatment to a long agenda where action is taken to achieve the goal of parity and transformative change in organizations.

Creighton, Hannah. 1982. "Tied by Double Apron Strings: Female Work Culture and Organization in a Restaurant." *Insurgent Sociologist* 11:59-64.

Argues that modern capitalism profits from the skills women gain through female socialization by employing women in female-dominated service work.

Analyzes the work culture among female employees at a restaurant. Examines the effects of female work culture on a union organizing drive at the restaurant.

Glazer, Nona Y. 1993. *Women's Paid and Unpaid Labor: The Work Transfer in Health Care and Retailing*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

An overview of women's experiences in the service occupations, specifically in retailing and health, to assess the gender, race, and class impacts of the transformation of work from paid to unpaid. Discusses the implications of the reorganization of work on the experiences of women at home and at work.

Glenn, Evelyn Nakano and Roslyn L. Feldberg. 1989. "Clerical Work: The Female Occupation." Pp. 287-311 in *Women: A Feminist Perspective*, edited by Jo Freeman. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing Company.

Discusses the feminization and racial stratification of clerical work. Assesses the impact of changes in the way companies are organizing work has altered the role of clerical work in the organizations and the impact it has had on the experiences of women clerical workers. Finds that the reorganization of clerical work has eroded the advantages that have traditionally distinguished it from blue-collar jobs. Considers the meaning of organizing or unionization for clerical workers.

Gruber, James E., and Lars Bjorn. 1982. "Blue-Collar Blues: The Sexual Harassment of Women Autoworkers." *Work and Occupations* 9:271-298.

Reports the results of research on the sexual harassment of women who work in unskilled jobs in the auto industry. The authors studied the social and work-related determinants of which women were more likely to be harassed as well as the consequences of sexual harassment. Harassed women had negative attitudes toward their co-workers and reported lower self-esteem, although their overall job satisfaction and mobility aspirations were not affected by harassment.

- Gutek, Barbara A. 1988. "Women in Clerical Work." Pp. 225-240 in *Women Working: Theories and Facts in Perspective*, edited by Ann H. Stromberg and Shirley Harkess. Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield Publishing. Addresses workers experiences and occupational trends of women in clerical work. Discusses what the proletarianization and computerization of clerical work, sex role spillover, sexual harassment and efforts at unionization mean for the individual workers and the future of clerical occupations. Reviews concepts that clarify the experience of clerical workers and the issues confronting clerical work and considers what they mean for efforts to change and improve clerical work.
- Hams, Marcia A. 1984. "Women Taking Leadership In Male-Dominated Locals." *Women's Rights Law Reporter* 8:71-82. An account of the efforts of women in two predominantly female plants and a local union representing General Electric (GE) employees to address issues of sex and race discrimination in GE plants. Demonstrates the important role of unions in pushing for, shaping, and implementing workplace reforms around issues of comparable worth and pay equity.
- Harlan, Sharon L. and Brigid O'Farrell. 1982. "After the Pioneers: Prospects for Women in Nontraditional Blue-Collar Jobs." *Work and Occupations* 9:363-386. A case study of one large industrial firm, carried out in the late 1970s and early 1980s, illustrates the effects of organizational change on job segregation by sex after the implementation of a consent decree. The affirmative action agreement did not address many of the barriers at the plant level that impede women's access to and advancement in traditionally male jobs.
- Harlan, Sharon L. and Ronnie J. Steinberg, (eds.). 1989. *Job Training for Women: The Promise and Limits of Public Policies*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press. A comprehensive review of publicly-supported education and training for women in clerical, service, and blue-collar occupations in the United States. Provides an assessment of various training, vocational, and apprenticeship programs and evaluates their impact on women who are located primarily in these low-status and low-paying jobs.
- Hawkins, Jacquelyn J. and Cynthia H. Chertos. 1985. *Managerial Access Project: Final Report*. Albany: Center for Women in Government, State University of New York, Albany. A follow-up project to the study which found the major barrier to women and minorities being promoted into managerial positions to be the definition of eligible job titles. Describes a pilot project in three state agencies which identified and reformed eligibility criteria in which large numbers of women and minority men were excluded from feeder titles. Demonstrates that the change required to increase the access of women and minority men to competitive managerial examinations can be achieved without compromising the quality of the process and that the size and function of the agency is not a barrier. Provides policy recommendations to diversify the managerial work force of New York State government.

Hossfeld, Karen J. 1990. "'Their Logic Against Them': Contradictions in Sex, Race, and Class in Silicon Valley." Pp. 149-178 in *Women Workers and Global Restructuring*, edited by Kathryn Ward. Ithaca, NY: ILR Press.

Reports the results of a study of the relationship between immigrant women production workers and their predominantly white managers in Silicon Valley, California. Notes that labor control and labor resistance strategies take gender- and race-specific forms. The author finds that workers' tactics result in short-term workplace improvements and suggests that the key to long-term equality in the workplace lies in collective organizing.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. 1977. *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York: Basic Books.

An account of life within a large hierarchical organization. Shows that women are not different but that both men and women are the products of their circumstances and that consciousness and behavior are formed by positions in organizations. Concludes that the key to solving human problems in organizations lies in modifying work systems. Suggests a framework for structural change which includes strategies to enhance opportunity, empower, and balance the number of people in organizations.

Lim, Linda Y. C. 1983. "Capitalism, Imperialism, Patriarchy: The Dilemma of Third-World Women Workers in Multinational Factories." Pp. 70-91 in *Women, Men, and the International Division of Labor*, edited by June Nash and Maria Patricia Fernandez-Kelly. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Reviews female employment in multinational export factories and suggests that the interaction between the capitalist, imperialist, and patriarchal relations of productions limits the extent to which workplace reforms can succeed. Concludes that the key to eliminating the exploitation of women in the labor force lies in an approach which combines strategies against capitalist, imperialist, and patriarchal exploitation which would then change the existing structure of the economy and society.

Peterson-Hardt, Sandra and Nancy D. Perlman. 1979. "Sex-Segregated Career Ladders in New York State Government: A Structural Analysis of Inequality in Employment." Working Paper No. 1, Albany: Center for Women in Government, State University of New York, Albany.

Study of four major New York State government agencies which analyzes career ladders and the opportunities for advancement of women in entry-level jobs. Finds that career ladders in New York State government are sex-segregated and the majority are male-dominated. Reveals that female-dominated ladders begin at lower salary grades and offer less opportunity for advancement than male-dominated ladders.

Rollins, Judith. 1985. *Between Women: Domesticity and Their Employers*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

A study of the effects of class and race on the relationship between female domestics and their female employers. Contends that the relationship between domestics and their employers is one of exploitation marked by rituals of deference and maternalism which provides the ideological

justification for and perpetuates a social system of class, racial, and gender stratification thus institutionalizing inequality.

Rosen, Ellen Israel. 1987. *Bitter Choices: Blue-Collar Women In and Out of Work*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Reports the results of interviews with 233 married blue-collar women workers in the New England area. Illustrates how new trends in the global economy are transforming the nature of work and are threatening to undermine the gains that have been achieved by generations of women factory workers. Suggests the need for a new framework to understand the impact of the newly restructured system on blue-collar women workers and suggests possible remedies to address their special needs and concerns.

Sacks, Karen Brodtkin and Dorothy Remy (eds.). 1984. *My Troubles Are Going to Have Trouble with Me: Everyday Trials and Triumphs of Women Workers*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

A collection of articles devoted to examining the underpaid and low-level jobs that women do in offices, services, sales, and factories. Emphasizes the relationship between family and work as well as the introduction of new technology as forces that affect the kinds of jobs and working conditions women face. Essays highlight the resistance strategies that women use on a daily basis to counteract employers control of the work process.

Segura, Denise A. 1989. "Chicana and Mexican Immigrant Women at Work: The Impact of Class, Race, and Gender on Occupational Mobility." *Gender & Society* 3: 37-52.

A study of semiskilled clerical, service, and operative jobs. Examines the effects of class, race, and gender on the occupational mobility, defined as improvement in job status and income, of women of Mexican descent by comparing those employed in jobs with an overrepresentation of white women with those employed in jobs with an overrepresentation of minority-group women. Found that even among women's jobs race and ethnicity had a stratifying effect as promotional opportunities were greater in white-female-dominated jobs than in minority-female-dominated jobs, which tended to be lower paid and of lower prestige.

Spalter-Roth, Roberta, Heidi I. Hartmann, and Linda M. Andrews. 1993. "Mothers, Children, and Low-Wage Work: The Ability to Earn a Family Wage." Pp. 316-338 in *Sociology and The Public Agenda*, edited by William Julius Wilson. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Examines the ability of women to earn a family wage using data from the 1984 Survey of Income and Program Participation. Includes estimates of women's earnings predicted by race and ethnicity, family responsibilities, occupation, industry, and work characteristics, among other variables. About half of all women who worked a significant amount during a year could not earn enough to support a family of four at 100% to 200% of the poverty level. Policy recommendations focus on income-support and earnings policies.

Steinberg, Ronnie J., Lois Haignere, and Cynthia H. Chertos. 1990. "Managerial Promotions in the Public Sector - The Impact of Eligibility Requirements on Women and Minorities." *Work and Occupations* 17: 284-301.

Study of the promotional process in the New York State employment system which examines why women and minorities are disproportionately under-represented in managerial positions. The researchers find that the primary institutional barrier to the promotion of women and minorities into managerial jobs is not the Rule of Three but eligibility requirements. Women and minorities constitute a small part of the pool eligible to compete to take the promotional examinations that would lead to high-level managerial positions.

Swerdlow, Marian. 1989. "Men's Accommodations to Women Entering a Nontraditional Occupation: A Case of Rapid Transit Operatives." *Gender & Society* 3:373-387.

A case study of a major rapid transit system which examines what happens when women enter nontraditional blue-collar occupations. Finds that women's entry into male-dominated situations causes both women and men to adopt new modes of behavior that allows the acceptance of women but still maintains the idea of male superiority. This allows men to be comfortable with women and enables them to later accept women as coequals.

Wolfe, Leslie R., ed. 1991. *Women, Work, and School: Occupational Segregation and the Role of Education*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press. Assesses the impact of sex and race stereotyping in education and its linkage to occupational segregation. Discuss the role of higher education for low-income women and women of color. Provides a repertoire of recommendations for policy change.