

## Gender Discrimination and Pay Equity issues

### Male Work as Norm (women – supposedly - accept this voluntarily)

- Normalize male career track.
- Lower pay for women is functional
  - Not serious, ‘want’ or ‘choose’ flexibility over career progress and occupational status.
  - Split commitments.
- Women’s jobs, teaching, ‘pink collar ghettos’.
- Mommy track policies
  - Heath – these policies don’t work – Why?

### Superwoman Role

- Mass media image.
- Harmonious blend of work and family, instrumental and nurturing.
- Multi-tasking. Aided by:
  - Technology, consumer goods.
  - low-paid servants and day care,
  - Professionalization of child-rearing
- Men not affected. Reinforces gender roles.

### Pay inequity

- Problem of Gender wage gap – 68-72% of men’s wages.
- Gender segregation: cleaning, retail, clerical, non-unionized.
- In professions: librarians, teachers, nurses, family doctors
- Glass ceiling - mgmt jobs.

### First Solution:

#### Equal Pay for Equal Work

- Same job, same experience & training, same pay.
- Addresses **direct discrimination**.
- Limited effectiveness due to gender segregation – i.e., **structural discrimination**.

### Next solution: Equal Pay for Work of Comparable Value (EPWCV)

- Address gender ‘job category’ discrimination.
- Compare male and female jobs.
- Measure job characteristics: value to firm, responsibility, discretion, danger, difficulty, education required, etc.)
- Raise wages of undervalued ‘female category’ jobs.

### Ontario's law

- Most advanced in N. America. (1993)
- Allows equal or proportionate value.
- Allows exceptions: seniority, merit, etc.
- Covers public and private sector
- Results (increases as % of total payroll):
  - Public sector: 2.6%
  - Private sector (large): 0.7%
  - Private sector (small): 0.2%

### Problems with EPWCW

- Markets won't support wage equality (Tiger Woods, Annika Sorenstam)
- Firms may not discriminate, men and women choose differently.
- Supply and Demand (lots of women want teaching jobs, caring professions).
- Disincentive to hire women.
- Favors women w/o children, professional women vs. low skill women

### More problems (and explanations)

- Non-salary compensation – NSC (flexibility)
  - Part-time, summers off, maternity leave, etc.
  - With EPWCV employers will replace MSC with SC.
  - Attract even fewer women. Or women w/o kids.
- Markets: adapt to change better than EPWCV.
- Econ's say
  - markets will penalize pay inequity and discrimination.
  - .

### Problems and criticisms cont'd: Problem of Mommy-track

- Talent and Effort
  - Talent: women = men.
  - Effort: women do 'second shift'.
  - Result: Men fast-tracked, women mommy-tracked.
- Why women don't opt for mommy-track
  - Team production
  - Scaled down effort doesn't work.
- Rhoads: women do opt for jobs allowing exit or entry from labour market, work close to home, etc.

### Could pay equity increase social inequities?

- Pay equity (intra-family) could lead to class (inter-family) inequity.

- Couples grouped according to status.
- Only wealthiest couples can afford joint freedom from household responsibilities.

#### Affirmative Action Hiring Policies

- Attempt to address gender segregation at root.
- Increased diversity through hiring.
- Recruitment, preferences, targets.
- Reverse discrimination?
- Tokenism?
- Federal Employment Equity legislation.
- Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

#### Economists like AA (employment equity)

- Pay equity would reduce female employment (by raising wage above market rate).
- EE would reduce crowding in lower paid areas.
- PE only applies to
  - women underpaid by gender job category, not within job category
  - Within a given establishment (not across).
- Disincentive to education.

#### Heath's Perspective on Gender inequality

- Division of household labor is efficient.
- Traditional gender roles therefore have had staying power even after changed norms.
- Feminism's challenge: a valid response to unfairness.
- Can inequality of gender roles be challenged w/o losing functional (efficiency) advantages of div. of labour.

#### The Problem

- Even non-sexist relationships will 'tip' toward gendered div. of labour.
- Why women still prefer flexible work.
  - Husbands use this to advance career.
  - Employers use this to differentiate between serious and less serious employees.
  - Disadvantage in modern workplace
- Supermom model: not a solution

#### The Alternatives

- Men as househusbands. Women need to marry down.
- Problem: marriage is source of status.
  - Women like 'successful' men.
  - Men like 'trophy' wives.

- Cultural norms are changing, but it's still functional.
- Can women compete w/ men w/ housewives?

#### England's argument

- Job devaluation, not simply hiring discrimination (which overcrowds women-only categories).
- Social changes **require** pay equity:
  - Divorce, single mothers.
  - Will address “balance of power in marriages.”
- Norms devaluing women's work.

#### Best argument

- EPWCV will attract more men to formerly women-only jobs.
- Employers will also want to encourage integration – so EPWCV won't apply.