

106

THE CHANGING AMERICAN WOMAN:
HER ROLE FROM THE HOME TO THE
LABOR FORCE AND BUREAUCRATIC
SOCIAL STRUCTURE

by

DONNA LYN ALLEN

B.A., Washburn University, 1971

A MASTER'S REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Sociology

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1977

Approved by:

Cornelia Butler Flora
Major Professor

LD

2668

.R4

1977

A46

c.2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES.....	iii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION: WOMEN AND THE BUREAUCRACY.....	1
General Considerations	
Nature of the Bureaucracy	
Organizational Models	
Approach to the Problem	
II. HISTORY OF WOMEN'S ROLES: THE LABOR MARKET AND WOMEN'S MOVEMENT.....	10
During the 19th Century	
Suffrage and World War I	
World War II Era and the Depression	
The 1950's to the Present	
III. WOMEN'S ROLES IN RELATION TO THE BUREAUCRATIC SOCIAL STRUCTURE.....	27
Definitions	
Research Models: Temperamental and Role Related	
Social Structural Approach	
Social Relations - Male-Female	
Social Relations - Female-Female	
IV. SUMMARY AND FUTURE PROJECTIONS.....	41
Change and the System	
Concluding Remarks	
Appendix: Labor Force Statistics	
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	50

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Women in the Labor Force, Selected Years, 1870-1976.....	45
2	Occupational Distribution of the Labor Force: 1900-1976.....	46
3	Female Labor Force Work Rates by Age.....	47
4	Women in Federal Civil Service, Selected Years, 1939-1973.....	48
5	Number and Percent of Women on Full-Time Federal White-Collar Employment.....	49

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION: WOMEN AND THE BUREAUCRACY

General Considerations

"Getting the vote just gave us equality in voting, that's all, but not in earning a living or seeing that the laws for earning a living are equal. I also think that the laws that govern looking after a family should be equal. So I propose that the next step is complete and absolute equality for women under the law." That was the beginning as Alice Paul and the National Women's Party began pushing for the passage of the Equal Rights Amendment--which took the next 49 years to be passed by Congress (Pincus, 1977:59). We have often heard it said in reference to women, "You've come a long way to get where you are today," but just how far have women advanced in the last 100 years and since the right to vote? The women's movement is not new. In fact over 100 years ago the Seneca Falls women's movement group that gathered in New York in 1848 were crying for equal access to the labor force.

It was not until 1964 that the Civil Rights Act passed Congress, and Title VII of the Act, "Equal Employment Opportunity", prohibited discrimination because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin in hiring, upgrading, and all other conditions of employment. The Equal Rights Amendment has not yet passed. But these are but surface actions and do not tell us the story beneath. Is there equality for women in the labor force?

My own working experience in the last three years has been within a bureaucratic organization; therefore, I began to focus this study on organizations and women's roles within them. A great deal of information has been amassed about bureaucracies and their formal and informal structures, but my first-hand experience within the system has been useful to add meaning to the theoretical principals advanced. Where are women in the organization and how do they fit into the hierarchial structure?

Formal organizations have existed since ancient times. Bureaucracies in which government officials were formally organized developed in ancient Rome and Egypt. Blau goes on to point out that the "greatest accomplishments of modern society - technological progress, superior standard of living, high level of education - would not be possible without formal organizations" which are "the roots of power" (Blau, 1971b:3). The bureaucratization of the industrial sector has been paralleled in other spheres. Government at all levels has undergone similar growth. "At the federal level, there were only 49,000 employees in 1870. By the close of World War II, that number had skyrocketed to 3,569,000. In 1969, there were still over 3 million federal employees" (Ritzer, 1977:34). The question then becomes how the structure and conditions of an organization affect individual human behavior and accordingly their roles. Women accounted for one-third of the Federal Civil Service work force, but "relative to men, women are concentrated in the lower level civil service grades. In October 1973, women accounted for nearly 47 percent of all employees in grades 1 to 6, 23 percent in grades 7 to 12, and only 4-5 percent in grades 13 and above" (U.S. Dept. of Labor, 1975).

Considering the growing importance of bureaucracies and the increasing number of working women, the purpose of this inquiry is to assimilate information on women within a hierarchial structure of the formalized bureaucracy. That includes their mobility and power. Women account for a large percentage of the labor force, but only a small percentage of those in the upper strata or power structure. Observations of women workers certainly justify our stereotypes of women in clerical and service occupations, but why only a small percentage in management?

To examine this thought, we go back to our understanding that a bureaucracy has a normative structure and that it is a system of upward mobility. We must tie this to women within the system, and consider why they are not advancing in

any significant numbers. In trying to answer this question, we often turn to discrimination, the American normative structure, and stereotypical attitudes of the appropriate behavior for employment for women. Age-old attitudes may account for some of the concentration of women at the bottom of the bureaucratic hierarchy, but current research now suggests that the social structure itself is an important limiting factor. Chafe's principal assumption is that:

Sexual inequality is rooted within the social structure itself, through the allocation of different spheres of responsibility to men and women. In tradition and practice, most societies have developed an elaborate and segregated network of roles for each sex, with little interaction or exchange between the two. The division of labor, in most cases has led to a division of authority as well (Chafe, 1972:viii).

Considering the above issues and the assumption of Chafe, how has the women's role altered over time and how is it affected by the nature of bureaucratic social structure? The main hypothesis of this paper regarding women in bureaucracies is that their role has not changed significantly. There has been a dramatic shift in the women's work from the homefront to the labor market. However their increased presence in bureaucratic employment has not been accompanied by increases in decision making roles.

Nature of the Bureaucracy

A bureaucracy is a formal organization characterized by a hierarchical authority structure and explicit normative system. Max Weber established an "ideal type", listing the following characteristics for bureaucracies: 1) clearcut division of labor among the individual officials; 2) a hierarchical authority structure, with the scope of each individual's responsibility clearly defined; 3) a formal system of rules and regulations governing decisions and actions; 4) a specialized administrative staff that maintains the organization and its internal communications system; 5) an impersonal orientation by the officials toward their clients, who are treated as "cases"; 6) a promotion system based on merit or seniority (or both) so that officials typically anticipate lifelong

careers in the organization (Blau, 1971a).

Within the organization is a division of labor, with each office holding more responsibility (and power) than the one below it. Each office in the hierarchy is delegated certain functions defined by formal rules.

The combined effect of bureaucracy's characteristics is to create social conditions which constrain each member of the organization to act in ways that, whether they appear rational or otherwise from this individual standpoint, further the rational pursuit of organizational objectives. Personnel policies that cultivate organizational loyalty and help provide for promotion on the basis of merit serve this function (Blau, 1971a, 22).

The bureaucratic social structure is the total pattern of social organization - both formal and informal. The formal obligations and rules are spelled out, but the informal norms are woven around social relationships. Haas and Drabek (1973:8) "conceptualize organizations as interaction systems rather than collections of individuals." Organizations are people, "but sociologists challenge this view by arguing that people's attitudes are shaped at least as much by the organization in which they work as by their pre-existing attitudes" (Perrow, 1970:4). Deviations from the organizational blueprint are socially organized patterns not due to personality differences; patterned expectations arise from social interaction (Blau, 1971a:53). The organizational system becomes very much internalized. As Langer points out, even the women of the telephone company accepted company policy as their own (Langer, 1970:3).

An ideal type does not mean the best social arrangement and should only be regarded as a methodological device with which to compare reality. The bureaucratic social structure represents the epitome of organizational efficiency. "Occupations both adapt to and change organizations, because most occupations cannot exist without some sort of formal organization" and can be analytically viewed by utilizing ideal type concepts (Montagna, 1977:172).

Organizational Models

Growth of large organizations has brought forth bodies of knowledge dealing

with organizational ideologies and perspectives. Stemming from these models was justification for professional management and its legitimation, as well as for the apparent sex stratification of all male management positions.

A 'masculine ethic' of rationality and reason was identified in the early image of managers...with traits assumed to belong to men with educational advantages to necessities for effective organizations: a tough minded approach to problems; analytical abilities to abstract and plan; a capacity to set aside personal, emotional considerations in the interests of task accomplishments; and a cognitive superiority in problem solving and decision-making (Kanter, 1975:43).

The early rational and classical models supported these characteristics, and women were seen as fulfilling their most efficient niche in their clerical or support positions.

The Human Relations Model of the 1930's stemmed from research in the Hawthorne studies by Elton Mayo and colleagues. Out of this grew awareness of the importance of the informal structure and human behavior from social relationships within the organization. The Hawthorne studies brought to light informal practices, including workers' sharing the norm of how much should be produced. "Rate busters" turned out too much work and "chiselers" too little. The group used a variety of sanctions from "binging" to name calling. This model stressed workers as social creatures, motivated by such factors as security and self worth. Individual workers were seen as deriving primary satisfaction from the groups in which they interact, with group norms serving as regulatory devices for behavior (Haas and Drabek, 1973:43-5).

The model was limited in stressing the informal system as an end in itself without due consideration for structural or functional aspects of the organization. These "early rational and human relations models tended to support a managerial viewpoint...seen to have latent functions as a 'masculine ethic', congruent with the nearly exclusive male occupancy...and justify the absence of women - the bearers of emotion - from power" (Kanter, 1975:48).

During the 1950's the conflict perspective was reborn in America, and was unlike the human relations model that stressed conflict avoidance. This model stressed that: 1) conflict is natural; 2) groups vary in power; 3) system change is best understood through analysis of conflict of persons to alter power distribution; and 4) conflict has a positive function from which new solutions can emerge (Haas and Drabek, 1973:55-7). This model is useful in discussing change.

"The sociological level emphasizes the impossibility of individuals attaining their goals, because they are blocked by society. Discussion usually involves how to change society to meet these goals. Theories developed are primarily conflict theories" (Montagna, 1977:231). In considering the occupational structure within the organization, it will be useful to briefly mention the conflict theory of social stratification. Rewards in a society are distributed according to power and not according to system needs resulting in social inequality and one group dominates the other (Montagna, 1977:36). This theory of social stratification as applied to the bureaucratic social structure coincides with Haller's definition of structured social inequality as an "arrangement of positions in a graded social hierarchy of socially superior and inferior ranks" on basis of power (Montagna, 1977:46). Haas and Drabek (1973:119-0) conclude that underlying the structural arrangements of organizational life is a continuing struggle. Structures co-vary with patterns of stress and strain. Blau and Crozier conclude that change cannot occur without crisis or intense stress. Change appears as an intermittent or dialectical pattern rather than a smooth continuous process (Haas and Drabek, 1973:293). Change to include women in the bureaucracy, according to this theory, requires a reorganization of the reward system and a mobilization of new power sources to assure that this occurs.

The newer, more integrated "structuralist" model as developed by sociologists such as Amato Etzioni focuses on structural issues and the resulting behavior. This type of model adapts itself to the understanding of men's and women's positions

within an organization, not only their typical occupations, but how these are related to one another and to the social structures of the organization (Kanter, 1975:49-0). From this perspective, the economists Doeringer and Piore have expanded to explain sexual discrimination in their dual market theory of stratification. Kanter's analysis of the social structure of a large organization, which she calls "Industrial Supply Corporation", stems from such a model.

During the 1960's, economists theorized dual markets or "primary" and "secondary" work forces. Later Doeringer and Piore "postulated that in addition to racial discrimination there is discrimination by sex and age". The "internal" market gives exclusive rights to jobs filled internally, and the "external" market, or all other workers, are not in direct competition (Montagna, 1977:67). The organization may open to the external market under conditions of demand or pressure from civil rights legislation, but once inside, vertical mobility is due to the internal market (Montagna, 1977:68). The internal labor market relies on the internal allocation of personal and rewards ability, rather than seniority, but "women participate in a different labor market than men, even within the same organization". Women are placed "in a class and hierarchy that itself limits mobility into positions of power". Women are rewarded for "routine service" while men are rewarded for "decision-making rationality" and "visible leadership" (Kanter, 1975:51).

Piore further develops his theory to include a primary sector of upper and lower tiers, and a secondary sector below them.

Primary Sector

upper tier - Professional and technical workers, managers
and administrators

lower tier - Sales persons
clerical workers
skilled workers

Secondary Sector

Semi-skilled
nonfarm laborers
service workers

(Montagna, 1977:69).

Contrary to human capital theorists, who believe that the problem of unemployment resides primarily in faulty individual behavior, dual labor market theorists claim that it is primarily social institutions and patterns that cause the problem. Employment in primary jobs depends to a great extent on the degree of social acceptability of work groups and occupation. This acceptability is determined by factors such as race, sex, and shared social beliefs (Montagna, 1977:71).

The social structural model advanced by Kanter is directed at the nature of organizational structures and the organization of work. "A number of structural and situational variables are more important determinants of the organizational behavior of women (and men) than sex differences or global social roles. These variables include: opportunity structures, internal labor markets, dominance structures, and sex ratios within and across hierarchical levels" (Kanter, 1976c).

The social structural approach begins to question the stereotypical attitudes of sex difference in work behavior. It no longer assumes that only women are peer group oriented, lacking in achievement motivation, and only concerned with family responsibility that it limits aspirations for upward mobility. "In other words, structural position can account for what at first glance appear to be 'sex differences' and perhaps even explain more of the variance in the behavior of women and men. People in low mobility or blocked mobility situations tend to limit their aspirations, seek satisfaction in activities outside of work, dream of escape, and create sociable peer groups in which interpersonal relationships take precedence over other aspects of work" (Kanter, 1976a). Men disadvantageously placed in the organization also demonstrate these characteristics.

Approach to the Problem

In this work, I will show that there has been little change in the positions that women hold in bureaucracies. Theories explaining the overt behavior are now changing, taking us from a "blaming the victim approach" to an understanding of structures. Women are gaining a new awareness that structures of organizations and society have held women constant. Women are realizing they should not be

relegated to only certain positions. Change will come more readily with the new awareness, but not without stress and conflict. As historical forces and social structures change, so will the status of women. The token role and relationships between men and women have always existed, but now this relationship is not viewed as characteristic of individuals on basis of sex, but rather due to situational structures. Granted, people will continue to behave differently, but not because of maleness or femaleness, but because of individuality.

In looking at women in a bureaucracy, it is important to examine male-female relationships, but the dimension of woman to woman needs to be considered as well. As more women enter traditional male roles, role models will be established for more to follow. As more follow, change will be easier. Through new behavior will come about new roles. One theory cannot predict or account for all behavior.

Chapter II will provide a concise history of women and their gradual move from the homefront into the labor market. Statistical information will reflect the changing composition of the labor force. This information will provide basis to show change.

Chapter III will delve deeper into the women's roles within the bureaucratic social structure. It will touch upon assumptions that try to account for sex-related characteristics, following the structural perspective. The inter-relationships of men to women and women to women will be examined.

Chapter IV will provide some future projections and concluding remarks.

CHAPTER II

HISTORY OF WOMEN'S ROLES: LABOR MARKET AND WOMEN'S MOVEMENT

During the 19th Century

Very little has been written about the work history of women. This chapter will briefly examine women's roles in history as relating to sociological, demographic, and economic factors.

The female has been relegated to lower positions than the male throughout history for most societies. After gaining the right to vote, many thought there would be new changes in the home and work situation. But to many modern feminists, it would appear that the status of women has not changed at all in the fifty years since the adoption of the Suffrage Amendment (Chafe, 1972:viii).

In predicting that women would act together to spearhead a drive for social change, the suffragists had correctly assumed that all females shared a common experience based on their sex. But they failed to realize that, unlike some other minority groups, women were distributed throughout the social structure and had little opportunity to develop a positive sense of collective self-consciousness. Discrimination against women was deeply rooted in the structure of society - in the roles women played, and in a sexual division of labor which restricted females primarily to the domestic sphere of life (Chafe, 1972:46).

The Seneca Falls Convention of 1848 is often regarded as the beginning of the women's movement. During the nineteenth century, women were not allowed to testify in court, own their own property, or establish businesses. It is to these issues that the women addressed themselves. They wanted not only to control their own property and earnings, but to increase opportunities for employment as well.

Industries were developing rapidly at the same time women were mobilizing for their political rights. Between 1840-1860 women were 24 percent of the total labor force (Flexner, 1972:78). Women provided a cheap source of labor; many were working 10 hour days, six days a week for a few dollars a week. There were many attempts at unionization by emerging women leaders, and the National Labor Union gave support to women's organizations, since the cheap labor source was

seen as a threat to men's attempts to better standards (Flexner, 1972:132). However, most men's groups were not as accepting of the necessity for fighting for women in the labor force and did not see the need for equal pay. If women were admitted to the unions, they were not permitted leadership roles. Most of these attempts at women's unionization failed due to sheer ignorance, apathy, helplessness, and habits of submission and acceptance without question (Flexner, 1972:199).

Much of the work being done in the early nineteenth century by women leaders was focused on social service and reform. Those dedicated women received little wages, and most began their crusades out of wants for themselves and needs they saw for social reform. Many lived only on small sums from lecturing, although the members of elite upper class soon took up the cause for social reform.

During the 1860's there were two camps of the women's movement. One had little interest in working women, and the other had broad interests and for a brief time was associated with Virginia Woodhull. She, in defying the double standard of the Victorian age, had endorsed free love and licensed prostitution. The cause of the movement was being hurt as early feminists "allowed themselves to be identified with proposals to liberalize sexual morality" and possibly causing the movement to be "dismissed as a radical fringe and charged with trying to destroy the moral fiber of the nation" (Chafe, 1972:11). This further removed the mainline women's movement from working women.

The suffrage leadership was becoming more professional. That these women were of substantial means created a widening gap between the suffragettes and working women.

Women of means, with contacts and influence, such as those who kept the nascent suffrage movement alive for decades, had not yet become interested in the problems of working women, or seen the relationship between their goals; they did not do so on any appreciable scale until the turn of the century (Flexner, 1972:141).

By the end of the century, most of the early feminists had died or retired, and new leaders continued the fight for the vote but within the context of

traditional women's place so as not to arouse public disapproval. "Women could preserve the home and remain good mothers only if they acquired the vote and through political involvement protect the family" and "by such reasoning the women's movement broadened its appeal and neutralized the oppositions charge that it sought to destroy the home" (Chafe, 1972:14). The labor force participation for women in 1870 (Table 1) was fifteen percent of women workers; increasing by twenty percent from 1870 to 1900. The 1900 occupational distribution shows one percent of women in the professional field, and four percent in clerical work. Nineteen percent in farm related occupations, twenty-three percent as operatives, and twenty-eight percent as household workers. It was clear that when women worked, it was in the lowest positions. Almost thirty percent of the female labor force were between 14 and 24 years of age (Table 3). That suggests that work was often a stop-gap between family and marriage.

Suffrage and World War I

World War I created new job opportunities for women. The census of 1920 revealed that over 8 million females were employed in 437 different job classifications (Chafe, 1972:49). Many historians view the 1920's as a revolution in women's work, as the female labor force grew 26 percent or 2.2 million during the decade. Chafe feels that if a revolution had taken place, it occurred with the industrial revolution during the time new industries needed a cheap labor force and the economic survival of the family meant women and children working. "The relative size of the female labor force was thus established at a stable level a full decade before either World War I or women suffrage, and grew by only five-tenths of 1 percent in the thirty years between 1910-1940 (Chafe, 1972:55). From 1900 to 1910, the proportion of all women who held jobs jumped from 20.4 percent to 25.2 percent. Thereafter it remained almost constant, falling to 23.3 percent in 1930, and peaking at 25.7 percent in 1940 (Chafe, 1972:55).

Table 1 reflects the percent of women workers in the labor force at different periods of time. The percentage of women workers, as a percent of all workers, increased from 1870 to 1940. Breaking these down by decades yields: a 13 percent increase for 1880-1890, a 6.5 percent increase for 1890-1900, a 17 percent increase for 1900-1910, a 3 percent decrease for 1910-1920, a 7.4 percent increase for 1920-1930, and a 16 percent increase for 1930-1940. The 1900-1910 increase supports Chafe's view as coinciding with the industrial revolution. The 1930-1940 increase reflects the Depression era as more women sought work out of economic need. This will be expended upon in the next section.

In 1900, there were 1,800,000 women in service industries; 700,000 doing farm labor; 325,000 employed as teachers; 217,000 as sales clerks; and 100,000 in clerical and related occupations (Flexner, 1972:230). Table 2 breaks down the percentage distribution. The number of women employed in agriculture and manual occupations have been declining since 1900. Service, sales, and clerical occupations have increased since 1900. We find that women are moving out of manual and agriculture fields into industries and white collar clerical because they are more easily mechanized. As industry work became piecemeal and with the invention of the typewriter, women were in demand. Changes in the nature of the job through technological innovation changed the sex labeling of the white collar clerical field (Oppenheimer, 1970:116).

Most women held the lower status positions; 28 percent were service workers in private households, and 23 percent were operatives (Table 2). In higher status positions, there were only 1.4 percent of women serving as managers and 1.4 percent as craftsmen. The 1,800,000 women in service industries supplied the cheap labor force needed by the industrial revolution. At this point, the women's movement was concerned with suffrage and had not rallied to help the position of the working woman.

Table 3 gives work rates by age over time. In 1900, workers tended to be

very young. The age of workers increased dramatically during the first half of the 20th century. In 1900, 29 percent of the female labor force were between 14-24 years old. Many middle and upper class viewed employment outside the home with much disfavor. They claimed it led to demoralization and destroyed femininity (Oppenheimer, 1970:40). Most women retired from work once they did marry reflecting a fairly negative attitude toward employment of married women, at least among the middle and upper classes (Oppenheimer, 1970:42). "The very poor could probably not afford the luxury of negative attitudes toward married women working" (Oppenheimer, 1970:42).

In 1908 to 1911 investigations by women leaders through the National Consumer League led to protective legislation and governmental responsibility for working conditions (Flexner, 1972:207:14). Also during this time was the growth of unions composed largely of women. The Women's Trade Union League (WTUL) enlisted the aid of influential women and suffragists during the 1909-10 shirtwaist strike (Flexner, 1972:240). It is interesting to note that a working woman did not serve as president of this league until 1921. "Although many of its members were involved with middle-class reform groups,....the WTUL consciously sought to follow the lead of working women themselves (Chafe, 1972:70).

Most women in industry were clustered in low-paying unskilled jobs in candy factories, textile mills, apparel centers, and commercial laundries. The seasonal nature of their occupations caused them to change jobs repeatedly preventing the development of a stable, cohesive work force which a union activist could organize effectively. In addition, the labor movement had historically concentrated its efforts among skilled workers. The majority of its members came from the mining, construction, and transportation industries--areas with few female employees. Since women workers were grouped in occupations which fell outside the mainstream of organized labor's concern, they were largely ignored. Overall the labor movement had reached 1 of every 9 male workers, but only 1 of every 34 females (Chafe, 1972:68).

The 1910's to the 1930's brought a change in attitudes. The carefree flapper symbolized the new era with looser morals. Many felt that the increased economic opportunities also brought forth a revolution in morals. "Although observers

differed on the overall significance of the 1920's, almost all agreed that the age was one of unprecedented personal liberation" (Chafe, 1972:49). "Perhaps most important, the increase in sexual freedom did not necessarily alter the basic distribution of roles between men and women...shifts in manners and morals did not interfere with the perpetuation of a special division of labor where women assumed responsibility for the home and men went out into the world to earn a livelihood" (Chafe, 1972:96). It was assumed that women were solely responsible for the home and family, and most women accepted roles and were unwilling to change. The decline of domestic employment in the 1900-1910 period hurt middle class women, but probably meant more opportunity for working class women (Table 2).

"Seventy-five percent of the women who earned Ph. D.'s between 1877 and 1924 remained spinsters", showing that many did not want dual responsibility, or that it was impossible to have it. Such women were restricted in the marriage market for two reasons: 1) most men their age were married and 2) the pool of eligibles was further restricted if she did not want to marry beneath her educational status. In any case, "the changes threatened traditional definitions of women's place and required a social revolution, which most Americans were unwilling to accept" (Chafe, 1972:97). In 1935 Margaret Mead commented that a woman had two choices: either "a woman, and therefore, less an achieving individual, or an achieving individual and, therefore, less a woman" (Chafe, 1972:100). "Indeed woman's place in the home seemed to have been strengthened rather than weakened in the years after 1920", and over 75 percent of the female respondents in George Gallup's poll of 1936 disapproved of married women working (Chafe, 1972:111). This was at a time when attitudes were against married women replacing the breadwinner, because of a shrinking job market. Nevertheless, more women were forced to seek employment because of economic need. The 1920-1940 period was one of little progress toward economic equality and career women were still limited to positions traditionally set aside for females.

The type of work performed, however, did undergo substantial restructuring in the years after 1910. At the turn of the century, almost all gainfully employed females worked as domestics, farm laborers, unskilled factory operatives, and teachers. By 1940, white-collar work, and especially clerical jobs, had emerged as an important category of employment (Chafe, 1972:55).

During the 1920's, the women's movement among the young appeared lost even though they enjoyed the benefits the feminists had won. "Most veteran's of the women's rights struggles strongly disapproved of the new morality and condemned what appeared to them as an orgy of sexual indulgency" (Chafe, 1972:95). Chafe (1972:96) adds that the "new woman" focused on the right of women to control their own bodies and the feminists stressed the need for achieving social and economic equality. Shifts in morals did not interfere with women assuming responsibility for home, but having a career challenged the family as a unit. The increasing number of women in the labor force was due to 1) the growing number of single middle class women in white-collar clerical; 2) the single career women; and 3) a growing working class. "A married woman of the lower class might work for reasons of economic necessity, but employment was fundamentally inconsistent with the status of a middle-class wife (Chafe, 1972:101).

After 1920, there were again opposing women's camps divided over the issue of the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) which had been proposed by the National Women's Party headed by Alice Paul. The other group, or League of Women Voters, attempted to serve a broader constituency "although it, too, was composed primarily of middle and upper class women" aimed at social welfare reform (Chafe, 1972:115).

In the 1930's the movement was deep in antagonism over the ERA. "The reformers denounced the Women's Party as a small but militant group of leisure class women" and feminists responded saying the reformers' "hearts bled for the 'poor' working girl but who would oppose for themselves the restriction as to pay and hours imposed on the same working girls" (Chafe, 1972:130).

World War II Era and the Depression

The Depression brought another barrier to the advancement of the women's economic role.

The greatest jump in employment among wives after 1910 occurred during the Depression, a time when half the nation's families earned less than \$1,200 annually. Married women worked, not because they sought liberation from the burdens of domesticity or enjoyed a new equality with men in the job market, but so that their families could survive economically (Chafe, 1972:56:7).

Many individuals felt that working women were taking jobs away from men, even though women were concentrated in occupations where few men were employed. Table 2 shows most of the increase between 1900 and 1940 was in the clerical fields. Many women had been satisfied after winning the right to vote, but a few militant leaders desired more far-reaching change. During this time much legislation that appeared limited female labor force participation.

With World War II, the economic situation for women changed radically, and the female labor force increased by 50 percent. The federal government encouraged employment for women and hired one million women workers for a 260.5 percent increase from 1941 to 1943 alone (Chafe, 1972:141). Table 4 shows the wartime peak. With the nation at war, the male civilian labor force was rapidly dwindling. Most jobs lost their sex labels, as public attitudes again changed. Stella the Steamfitter and Rosie the Riveter stepped in and proved they could do a man's job. But even during war, women were excluded from management positions. The Army refused to commission women doctors until 1943, and the government that encouraged women to work denied them top administrative positions. The Depression and World War II changed the definition of the women's sphere being in the home, but mainly for the blue-collar and lower middle class women.

During the War, women were 36 percent (Table 1) of the labor force, a figure that was not reached again until the late 60's.

Before World War II most women in the labor force were single and

middle class, white collar workers who held their jobs until they married, or they were poor, and either single or married women working in factories or in domestic service. After the war, the labor force entrants were increasingly married, middle class women (U.S. Dept. of Labor, 1976:10).

Table 3 shows the 25 to 34 year old women as the highest percentage in the labor force in 1940, but a substantial rise for all 25 to 54 year old women as compared to 1910. "Most important, the war enabled women's work to become an increasingly accepted part of middle class life" by helping "legitimize work for women of all classes by defining employment as a patriotic necessity," and prompting "a boom in white-collar occupations which were respectable for women of middle-class status to hold" (Chafe, 1972:183).

After the war, it was not long before the age-old attitude that "a woman's place is in the home" began to creep back into the country's thinking. Women who did work, and they were gradually becoming a substantial part of the labor force, were mainly relegated to jobs at the bottom rung of the ladder, as they had been previously. A Women's Bureau Survey showed that three out of four women who had taken jobs during the war wanted to continue working and Frida Miller, Chief of the Bureau, observed that the majority of public opinion had shifted from "excessive admiration for women's capacity to do anything, over to the idea...that women ought to be delighted to give up any job and return to their proper sphere - the kitchen" (Chafe, 1972:178). Women were a reserve labor force to be kept marginal to keep the economy going. Women were suddenly felt to have abandoned the home. For example, a reported increase in juvenile delinquency during the war-time period was attributed to the women's absence from the home.

The Selective Service Act gave veterans priority over wartime workers for their old jobs. Women comprised 60 percent of all workers released after the war. They were forced to leave their jobs at a rate 75 percent higher than men (Chafe, 1972:180).

Table 4 shows the change for Federal Civil Service; from 37 to 24 percent of

the total employed. The war had been a turning point for those women who had taken jobs out of patriotic duty, for now most wanted to keep them. However only the war had legitimized their working positions. The wartime experience presented a strange paradox as significant numbers of women were in the labor force, but traditional attitudes of women as homemakers largely remained unchanged. Chafe (1972:189) explains that most Americans accepted the wartime shift as long as it was viewed as temporary, but objected when the issue became one of preserving the economic change. Women did not seem to regard working as a conflict to traditional roles if they were working out of economic need to help the family. Even if little progress was made toward equality in pay and types of positions available, the women's economic role had been permanently altered as her role shifted more out of the home and into the work force.

The 1950's to the Present

Betty Friedan began working on The Feminine Mystique in 1957; she had begun questioning and expressing sentiments of earlier feminists. For her, housework had become a dirty word, because of its connotation of expected duty. By the 1960's the women's movement reached a point that had been unmatched since the suffragists. The revival of the movement carried sentiments of the 1910-1930 period. According to Chafe, (1972:227), it appeared again at the right time, as three necessary preconditions were met: 1) a point to organize on; 2) a positive response from a group; and 3) the social atmosphere conducive to reform. The discontented housewife could identify with Friedan, as cultural conditioning had hindered women from achieving their own personal identity outside the roles of housewife and mother.

Historically, women's rights advocates had succeeded in focusing attention on their grievances only at a time of generalized social reform. The feminist movement began when abolitionism provided female activists with an opportunity to organize and exposed them directly to the physical and psychological reality of discrimination based on sex. For nearly forty years after the Civil War, the

movement was stagnant and isolated. The civil rights movement did not cause the revival of feminism, but it did help to create a set of favorable circumstances (Chafe, 1972:233).

The "feminists analysis betrayed the same middle class bias which had characterized the women's rights movement from its inception", as few housewives had the training to follow a career, nor could millions of lower-class women, who "lacked both the sophistication and experience to envision the possibility of an alternative life style" (Chafe, 1972:231). Efforts had always been concentrated on the college graduates or suburban middle class housewives who could foresee a different way of life.

Today, as 50 years ago, women still hold the lower jobs and earn lower wages, so equality has not been reached in the labor market. Occupations predominantly female in 1900 are still so in 1950. But the movement has a very positive side in that many underlying attitudes on traditional roles have been shaken, and the movement has spread more widely throughout social structure. "In 1950, however, unlike 1940 or 1900, the advent of marriage and a family did not lead to continuous decline in female labor force participation. Rather, married women in their late thirties--women usually with school age children only--started to return to the labor force or perhaps even entered it for the first time" (Oppenheimer, 1970: 15).

Over 40 percent of all women held jobs by the end of the 1960's and approximately 50 percent of all women workers were mothers with children six to eighteen. Now half the girls in this country are growing up with working role models in their own homes (Chafe, 1972:234). Chafe adds that on tests administered to female students, "daughters of working mothers scored lower on scales of traditional femininity, viewed the female role as less restricted to the home, and believed that men and women participated in and enjoyed a variety of work, household, and recreational experiences" (Chafe, 1972:235:6). Eighty years ago, a woman needed consent for marriage; fifty years ago, a girl could become a

secretary allowing her more freedom in not accepting the first man who asked her hand in marriage; and today, marriage just isn't enough. "The women's movement is a response to fundamental social and economic changes, changes that are long term, continuing, and which affect women's lives both inside and outside the home (Janeway, 1973:101). The movement has brought a new awareness and consciousness to many women that theirs is not an isolated case.

There has been a shift from the 1800's to the present from full-time housekeepers to paid workers, much of which can be attributed to smaller families and mechanized housekeeping allowing more free time (Flexner, 1972:ix). Oppenheimer (1970:160) feels that labor saving devices have facilitated the entry of women into the labor market but that the overall increase in participation has been due to the demand for female workers. The white-collar field has increased, especially clerical, calling forth the separate female force. A series of technological changes has attributed to this increase but:

Perhaps even more significant was the dramatic change in the child-related aspects. For example, in 1910 married women in the age group of 45 to 59 years had borne an average of five children; by 1950 the number of children borne had declined to about half that figure (U.S. Dept. of Labor, 1976:10).

Since 1940 there has been an important change in the work behavior of married women in their thirties and older. Instead of remaining in the house, they have increasingly entered the labor market after their children have reached school age (Oppenheimer, 1970:18).

The increasing life span in addition to completion of child rearing has increased the availability of older workers. By 1960 the rate for women 45 to 54 years (Table 3) had risen to a proportion higher than the 14 to 24 year old.

"The year 1956 marked the switch over from a predominantly blue-collar to a white-collar economy in which women had greater opportunities" (U.S. Dept. of Labor, 1976:10). The growth in government and industry brought a rising demand for clerical workers to handle the paperwork. Women made up 34 percent (Table 4) of all Federal white-collar workers but relative to men were concentrated in the

lower civil service grades (Table 5). The increase in white-collar work has made it possible for female managers to emerge. Women are not only in separate labor markets from men based on occupation, but are also in a separate market from other women based upon class. Generally lower class women do not qualify for white-collar jobs, and middle class women find manual jobs distasteful (Oppenheimer, 1970:139).

In considering labor force participation and working women, statistics are useful describing where we are today. Women now represent 51.3 percent of the population. "Between 1950 and 1974, the number of women workers nearly doubled (also shown on Table 1), while the number of men in the labor force increased by only about one-fourth. Accordingly, the ratio of women per 100 men in the labor force has risen from 41 in 1950 to 63 in 1974" (U.S. Dept. of Commerce, 1976:26). In 1974 about 35 percent of all employed women were in clerical jobs, 21 percent were service workers, 15 percent were professional and technical jobs, 13 percent operatives, and about 5 percent were working as managers and administrators (U.S. Dept. of Labor, 1975:4).

The occupational percentage distribution has changed somewhat from 1960 to 1976 (Table 2). There has been a twenty percent increase in professional workers, but a breakdown of this group yields: .37 percent as engineers, 1.3 percent as physicians and dentists, 39 percent as teachers, and 59 percent as other professionals (U.S. Dept. of Commerce, 1977:35). The clerical field has increased by 17 percent and managers and administrators by 38 percent. The latter figure is somewhat misleading as most women would be found in middle management positions of limited power. In a study by Lyle and Ross in 1973 it was found that 76 percent of the firms surveyed had no women in top management, only 3 percent of the firms had more than 10 percent female top level managers, and most were found in lower-level positions.

Women may now see it appropriate for work outside the home, but now must come

the drive for equality within that work force to gain positions of power and authority. We cannot settle just for the opportunity to work, but for equal positions. Two-thirds of all secondary vocational-technical students are girls "being prepared more for cinderellahood than for jobs...as 49.2 percent are in home economics and only 2.4 percent of all home economics enrollees are in training for gainful employment", and another "29 percent are in female-intensive clerical fields that seldom offer high pay or promising career ladders" (Verheyden and Hilliard, 1975:34:7). Time must be taken now to provide vocational training to young girls on current labor market information and income differentials for positions. Suter and Miller concluded from their study that even among continuously employed women, earnings were generally lower than those of men workers of comparable age, occupation, education, and experience; a significant proportion of the gap was due to discrimination (Suter and Miller, 1973:125). "According to U.S. Department of Labor statistics, the median wage for women as compared with that for men has been declining in recent years. It was 63.9 percent of the men's average in 1955 and 60.8 percent in 1969" (Etzioni, 1973:231).

Despite all the legislation aimed at integration, the work force is still very much sex-segregated. Sexism is reflected in the work world by sex segregation of occupations (Ritzer, 1977:329). This sex-typing occurs when one sex dominates an occupation. "From a 1960 list of 500 specific occupations, 36 occupations accounted for almost two-thirds of all employed women. In 31 of the 36 occupations, women were in the majority" (Montagna, 1977:126:7). Women are in a separate labor market from men; being concentrated in different occupations from men which are relatively noncompetitive of each other (Oppenheimer, 1970:65). A trend analysis by Gross on sexual division of labor from 1900 to 1960, shows that two of every three women workers would have to change occupations for equality to occur. This index is still current, "despite major social changes such as war and depression" (Montagna, 1977:136). Those occupations that have been sex-

typed include: clerical; service workers; and the semi-professions of nursing, education, social work, and librarians.

John Parrish (1975:49) reports that women's professional training enrollment has changed dramatically from 1960 to 1974:

<u>Profession</u>	<u>1960</u>	<u>1974</u>
architecture	5%	10%
dentistry	1%	11%
engineering	1%	3%
law	4%	19%
medicine	6%	19%
optometry	1%	13%
pharmacy	12%	32%
veterinary medicine	4%	21%

These statistics are very encouraging; hopefully we will move away from sex-typing in occupations.

The 1960's brought renewed interests not only to women, but to legislators as Congress passed Title VII of the Civil Rights Act. Meeting new legislation and affirmative action programs, many employers resorted to "tokenism" or hiring a woman or minority just to fill quotas even though they may not have been qualified. In fact, hiring the unqualified served a more useful purpose to many employers by "proving" that women or minorities could not handle the work.

Finally, after 47 years, the Equal Rights Amendment was brought before the House of Representatives. Hopefully, the new awareness and consciousness from the women's movement will push the final passage for the Equal Rights Amendment, which is "by far more fundamental because by undermining the present allocation of social and sexual roles, it would begin to eliminate the discrepancies between male and female work patterns (e.g. number of hours worked per week, number of years at same job) which now contribute substantially to the lower incomes and generally inferior economic positions of women" (Langer, 1977:102). Langer's research has uncovered that "in 1970 if women who worked had earned the same amount per hour as men who worked, it would have cost employers an additional \$96 billion

in payroll alone", and if "women had earned the same as men and worked the same number of hours, the addition to the payroll would have been \$303 billion" (Langer, 1977:102). The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission made A T & T pay \$100 million and Sears \$75 million, which is small compared to the cost for equality.

Since the 1800's, there has been a dramatic shift in the women's role from the homefront to the labor market, but the role in the market has not changed significantly. The vote may have been won, but economic and position equality has not been achieved. Women are still in the lower positions. The women's movement that once rallied support to gain the right to vote may again in its revival gain support to pass the ERA legislation.

The underlying ideology surrounding such participation has correspondingly changed and become more widespread throughout the social structure. Labor force participation outside the home was once considered inappropriate for the upper and middle class women's role, but now is quite common and may add to the woman's status, as well as financial status to her family. The women's movement has revived the strive for economic equality.

A blue-collar trend does exist and may be different than the white-collar trend. The wife that once worked out of necessity may not be working now, and instead is following middle class norms of 1900-1940. The women's place is considered in this group to be in the home, and the husband is not considered a good provider if he cannot support his family. Unions have provided some affluence to the blue-collar worker.

The women's movement has changed and created an awareness of working women that has spread throughout the social structure.

The leaders of the movement began with social reform needs and barely supported themselves from lecturing. The cause was later picked up by more affluent and upper class women. The movement did not align itself with the plight of the

working-class woman until early in the 20th century during factory strikes, and conditions were changed through legislation. The focus of the movement has always been and still is aimed at the educated and upper and middle class woman. The leaders of the movement hope to achieve higher status positions of power and responsibility; positions the working class woman does not hope to gain. Married middle-class women of all ages and with families have now come out of the home and entered the labor market. Will they be content to let men do the administration for them?

CHAPTER III

WOMEN'S ROLES IN RELATION TO THE BUREAUCRATIC SOCIAL STRUCTURE

Definitions

This chapter will delve into the roles women play with the bureaucratic social structure. Here the use of "role" will refer to those behaviors typically performed by an individual in a particular situation. Individuals are constantly in the process of revising their behavior as they interact with others. Individuals adjust their behavior according to how they perceive others interpreting it. Role conflict develops when behavior and expectations are not compatible.

A study by Gross, Mason, and McEachern has provided much insight to role analysis and will be useful for the purpose of providing definitions (Ritzer, 1977: 202). A position is defined as the actor in a system of social relationships. A role is a set of expectations applied to a particular position, and role behavior is the actual performance of the individual. The positions within the bureaucratic organization will be many; but whether they refer to manager or secretary, the individual in the position will be expected to fulfill many roles. The manager may be decision maker, leader, or human relations counselor; but no matter what the role, there will be certain expectations for each held by other individuals. A position-set is a series of positions and position relationships as a result of occupying a position; and role-set the behaviors as related to the series of role performers.

Haas and Drabek provide a useful set of definitions that can be applied to the organization (Haas and Drabek, 1973:110-1). The normative structure consists of social norms that constitute the rules of organizational life and how persons ought to behave. Compliance with norms results in positive sanctions, and negative sanctions are forthcoming for rule violation. A rule is a cluster of norms that refer to units of social interaction. The norms that specify the relationship

between manager and secretary constitute a role relationship and is reciprocal in nature. The norms within an organization would be mainly of three types: written, official; unwritten, official; and unwritten, unofficial. The latter applies to the important rules that arise from the informal structure.

Haas and Drabek (1973:114) go beyond the normative structure and feel that the interpersonal structure is an explanatory structure of organizational life. This structure consists of the stable person to person understandings regardless of the positions they hold. This structure certainly should be considered in examining why individuals may or may not get along, despite their roles. Individuals confront these structures simultaneously and if there is a high normative consensus, there is a much greater likelihood there will be a positive interpersonal relationship.

Role conflict occurs when behavior and expectations are not compatible either to the role or between roles that a person has. Role strain may refer to these inconsistencies, and stress refers to demands and the capacity to deal with such demands. Role overload refers to the number of roles and their expectations when there is difficulty in satisfying all of them. Conflicts lead to actions to reduce the problem. Coping behavior will result in each individual defining his situation and acting accordingly to handle the conflict. Through internalization the women in Langer's study were able to cope with their work situation as they had come to accept the company's policy as their own. Ritzer suggests that in many cases role conflict will be resolved by one individual conforming to the expectations of the individual with more power (if two individuals are involved) (Ritzer, 1977:218). Many a secretary may be trapped into following the expectations of the boss.

Haas and Drabek (1973:135) explain a "carry in" phenomenon, where norms are brought into the "group as generalized role conceptions that members had learned before participation in that group". Most of us do have pre-conceptions of what

is appropriate behavior, and these will vary according to the interaction within the organization. Once inside we learn the policy and begin to internalize the norms. A secretary coming into an organization will have certain expectations about what will be appropriate for her. Many of these conceptions and attitudes are developed through our socialization process. She will have some understanding of her behavior, whether on the level of secretary-boss or male-female. If her behavior is in line with the expectations of others, she will be rewarded. If not, she will meet some type of negative sanction. If the woman comes in with the intention of being extremely efficient and advancing to "head secretary", then she may be extremely rewarded. But suppose she comes in with the intentions of rising to manager, and this company does not see this as appropriate behavior. The woman may cope with the conflict by laying aside her rising expectations, challenging the company (possibly through a discrimination suit), or leaving entirely.

Today women who are attempting new roles still find it a daunting challenge to value themselves and their experience and ambitions as seriously as they do those of men. Doubting themselves, they can make unnerving mistakes, fall into negation and the mere reversal of old attitudes instead of working out creative new approaches to the demands of changed reality, and sometimes they despair (Janeway, 1973:96).

Our society views women in traditional roles of nurturing, socializing, and helping, but it is cultural and not inherently female, as other societies may attribute different roles.

Epstein (1971:670) points up another problem of traditional sex structure in the case of women lawyers. "Other lawyers did not judge women lawyers' conformity to professional norms without at the same time evaluating their fulfillment of female-associated roles." This is not uncommon for women that move out of the traditional realm. Our normative structure is part of the problem as we grow up learning what is appropriate behavior for men and women. "Because of role typing, even when occupational sex typing is overcome by a woman, she is governed

by a much more rigid set of rules and obligations (Montagna, 1977:131).

Research Models: Temperamental and Role Related

The traditional absence of women from positions of responsibility have been justified by myths and generalizations about women as a class: women's place is in the home, and no one likes to work for women bosses. The necessities of household production plus the availability of male workers has led to many myths and generalizations. Many may ignore the capability of the individual woman and continue to see her only in terms of the sex to which she belongs. Research has recently turned on women to understand why they are not in responsible positions. Debates on sex differences in sex role research are between: biological and sociocultural explanations, and between various socialization theories (Hochschild, 1973:1015). Is it in the nature of being female, or are there other reasons?

Kanter identifies three major research styles from her inquiries on women and intervention. "The three models may be called 'temperamental', 'role related', and 'social structural'. They correspond, roughly, to concern with the individual, role, and organizational levels as determinants of social life (Kanter, 1976c: 283). To Kanter the temperamental model studies how women differ from men in their character, temperament, gestures, and interpersonal orientations, whether by nature, early socialization, or accumulated learning as a result of coping with an inferior position. The role related model "focuses on the division of labor between men and women, beginning with the family, as to the key to women's position and the foundation of occupational segregation (Kanter, 1976c:285). The male-female roles derived from the family are extended to the world of work and reinforced by family patterns. Research centers on role dichotomies and dilemmas.

Studies from the temperamental and role models assumptions tell us how women act, but not why. At points these models may somewhat interwind on dealing with roles and socialization. These studies on sex differences will represent a

point of departure from which the structural model may be compared. These studies can be viewed as showing the effect of a differentiated sex structure in individuals that then in turn reinforce occupational segregation.

Maccoby and Jacklin (1974:109:12) discuss beliefs and myths about sex differences. They determined the following myths about girls: 1) they are more sociable; 2) they are more suggestible; 3) they have lower self esteem; 4) they lack motivation to achieve; 5) they are better at role learning; 6) they are less analytical; 7) they are more affected by heredity; and 8) they are more auditory. There are some sex differences they feel are fairly well-established, although the sources of these differences may well be social rather than biological: 1) Males are more aggressive than females - the difference manifests itself at two years, (but other studies have reported that children are handled differently from birth); 2) Girls have greater verbal ability - age 11 through high school; 3) Boys excel in visual-spatial ability; 4) Boys excel in mathematical ability. Even these systematic findings can be related to socialization. However, even though systematically found, they do not describe all individuals. Furthermore, the females greater verbal ability should make them better managers than men.

Hoffman (1975:129) tries to explain underachieving women with differences that can be seen in the female child. From her analysis of several studies, she concludes that the female child is given inadequate parental encouragement in early independence strivings.

Matina Horner (1971:252:3) argues that this difference between societal expectations and achievement motivated women can be great and produce higher test-anxiety scores. She defines it as "the fear that success in competitive achievement situations will lead to negative consequences, such as unpopularity and loss of femininity...and acquired early in life along with sex-role standards." At some point in time, women may experience this double bind situation and draw back to a safer level.

Young girls even today feel some anxieties of being trapped between what is expected and their own achievement. Amy Dickinson, who made it into the Little League, is now afraid she may not be good enough to compete next year "but also worried that if she is too good of a ball player, those same boys won't think of her as a girl" and she felt badly if she did do better than they (Leavy, 1977: 12).

Philip Goldberg points out that women consider their own sex inferior and view their differences from men as deficiencies. The problem is that women are judged on the basis of men instead of in their own right. Goldberg's (1971:167: 71) study shows that "even when the work is identical, women value the professional work of men more highly than that of women.

Hennig and Jardim (1977:34:5) feel that a woman is more reactive instead of taking the initiative. They feel women blame themselves and internalize it. To overcome this conflict, they suggested bringing these feelings into the open and analyzing them.

Boslooper feels that life is a game and the best way to learn to win is through competitive sports. The socialization process being different for girls and boys, has kept women from learning how to win against men. "Like Cinderella's sisters, they struggle to fit oversized feet into tiny glass shoes. Usually they manage to squeeze them in and totter through a lifetime of discomfort, blaming themselves for the bad fit, instead of a capricious cobbler who had a passion for glass and triple A size fours." He goes on to add that a competitive girl may respond by becoming aggressive and masculine. "Resenting her restrictive role, but lacking the self-confidence and initiative to create something else, she becomes a hostile mimic of the only success models around: men" (Boslooper, 1973: 39).

The above studies reflect the temperamental and role related research on women. These personality studies show that women have been socialized to assume traditional roles in society.

The behavior patterns learned from childhood would make it more difficult for women to assume leadership positions. However, this type of research can be interpreted as assuming that women should be excluded from the top levels of bureaucracy. Only when sex differences are related to structural differences can causality be implied and possibilities for change examined.

Social Structural Approach

Kanter (1976a:415), in using the "structuralist" model, argues the "absence of differences in work behavior, arguing instead that work behavior and work attitudes are a function of location in organizational structures...I suggest... that a number of structural and situational variables are more important determinants of the organizational behavior of women (and men) than sex differences or global social roles. These variables include: opportunity structures, internal labor markets, dominance structures, and sex ratios within and across hierarchial levels" (Kanter, 1976c:287).

If women sometimes have lower aspirations, lesser involvement with work, and greater concern with peer group relations - so do men in positions of limited or blocked mobility. If women are sometimes less preferred as leaders, generate lower morale among subordinates, and use directive-interfering leadership styles - so are men with relatively little organizational or system-wide power. If women in managerial or professional positions are sometimes isolated, stereotyped, overly visible, and cope by trying to limit their visibility - so are men who are 'tokens' and, therefore, rare among a majority of another social type (Kanter, 1976a:415:6).

Women have been considered to have lower aspirations than men, but Kanter attributes this to the structural situation. "People in low mobility or blocked mobility situations tend to limit their aspirations, seek satisfaction in activities outside of work, dream of escape, and create sociable peer groups in which interpersonal relationships take precedence over aspects of work." Men disadvantageously placed in the organization also demonstrate these characteristics. Their behavior is explained by the opportunity structure individuals are in. The women in Langer's study turned to "consumerism", and their peer group became

important. The Hawthorne studies reflected the interpersonal relationships affecting organizational productivity.

We find closed circles at both extremes of the hierarchy. Workers peer groups at the bottom are under pressure not to leave the group - it is seen as disloyalty or "leaving her friends". There is also a "closed inner circle" at the management end. Managers that are selected or enter must have similar characteristics and social backgrounds.

Kanter concluded that there is little evidence on sex difference and leadership, but there is a general cultural attitude that men make better leaders. "A Harris poll showed that women prefer a male boss to a female boss by a ratio of 8 to 1" (Ritzer, 1977:346). The 1965 Howard Business Review Survey of 1000 male and 900 female executives found that two-thirds of the males and one-fifth of the females would not feel comfortable working for a woman (Ritzer, 1977:423). Power contributes to leadership effectiveness, and organizational power comes from "close contact and good relations with other power-holders in the system, and advantageous location in the opportunity structure" (Ritzer, 1977:424). Women tend to be disadvantaged on both of these, and more likely found in "middle management" with less advancement potential and less power. People who are relatively powerless may "take it out" on the subordinates.

Secretaries are a good example of a sex segregated job but should lead to higher managerial positions. Why do many stay in their positions? Wendy Schuman reports "government figures show that most secretaries remain secretaries. From 1965 to 1970, 56 percent were still in their jobs and only 13 percent had changed occupations" (Schuman, 1977:25). Secretaries are individuals who are assumed to display characteristics of women, but actually "display the orientations of people whose strategies for achieving recognition and control are constrained by the social organization of their job" (Kanter, 1977c:5). Kanter found four basic work attitudes of secretary: parochialism, timidity and self-effacement, praise

addiction, and emotionality. Many times there is little incentive to look beyond their positions. Older women (longer service) have been rewarded for non-assertive and timid behavior to the organization. Many managers keep secretaries through the personalistic nature of rewards. Some secretaries become addicted to praise. When they leave the position, they lose this. Some secretaries play the game to get what they want by emotional manipulation (crying) and helplessness. Kanter points out an interesting paradox. In order for secretaries to keep their job, they do it better. Doing their job better means getting less able to hold management jobs and becoming more indispensable to the organization. Management must deal with uncertainties (not routine handling); take risks (not over-timidity); make unpleasant decisions and wait long terms consequences (not praise addiction); and demonstrate rationality (not emotional vulnerability). Younger secretaries do not show the secretarial characteristics as much as do those with longer service. (The secretarial hierarchy itself is a very short one depending on the unit size of the bureaucracy.)

Social Relations: Male-Female

What is the male-female relationship within the bureaucracy? If it is the typical male-boss, female-secretary, there is no problem. If a woman steps into a typical male position as a token, then numbers become important. Kanter (1977b: 971) discussed the interaction dynamics between tokens and dominants. Again, the same characteristics are attributable to males in the same situation. Kanter identifies three perceptual phenomena: visibility (individual captures a larger awareness), polarization (tendency to exaggerate differences), and assimilation (token characteristics distorted to fit stereotype).

Visibility puts pressure on the individual to perform, as if the woman is to represent "all women", and her performance will affect whether other women will be allowed to follow in her footsteps. Again, in Epstein's study, the women were

not evaluated as lawyers, but as "women lawyers". The master status (ascribed characteristics) may hide the actual performance and the token is forced to work harder to have achievements noticed. My local supervisor was evaluating performance and congratulating individuals on jobs well done; but when it came to a woman who had "outshined everybody", he wrote "and I want to thank Ann for being her voluptuous self". Kanter adds that individuals may respond to these performance pressures by overachievement or limit visibility and minimize sexual attributes to blend in.

During polarization, dominants may try to exaggerate differences by dramatizing masculinity and displays of sexual aggression. The men may apologize for swearing in front of a woman, but do it anyway. I recently heard a woman comment that she likes to turn the tables occasionally, and after swearing will turn to the men and apologize. Kanter (1977b:971) reported that women may not be included in the informal network and socialization process or be required to pass loyalty tests. A woman in the local university explained that no one told her about the "system" of the department. The loyalty tests may pressure the token to turn against their own group or sex. These in a sense are "rites of passage" and an individual may have to put up with the games until made to feel more a part of the group. A woman engineering technician reported that she had to put up with gags and tricks, and was always a source of humor for the group. She was even told wrong names for the tools used. In any case, the response of women in these situations may be isolation, resulting in further exclusion, or she may become an insider, which may result in "women-prejudiced-against-women" syndrome.

Assimilation may result in stereotypical or mistaken assumptions. A token woman manager may often be taken for a secretary, and many women have reported being the lone woman of a meeting and asked to take notes. There have been many times I have been put on the phone to answer someone's question, only to have the caller invariably say, "No, I wanted to speak to the man in charge." Kanter

(1977b:982:3) reports four kinds of stereotypical roles women may be assigned to:

1. Mother - to a group of men, she listens to their troubles and is rather safe in not being vulnerable to sexual pursuit,
2. Seductress - introduces element of sexual competition and jealousy,
3. Pet - is a symbolic mascot, "a cheerleader for the shows of male prowess that follow",
4. Iron maiden - for women who fail to fall into the other three categories. She is seen as strong or tough and insists on full rights in a group.

These attributed roles affect what men expect of women and interpret what she does.

The woman in a token position brings about a new role-relationship and men may feel awkward and not know what is appropriate action on their part. A woman may be seen as different and unpredictable. "Women were decidedly placed in the category of the incomprehensible and unpredictable. There were many reports that managers felt uncomfortable having to communicate with women" and managers admitted it was 90 percent their problem (Kanter, 1977a). Eventually, this awareness and role-relationship will become "old hat" as we become accustomed to the expectations.

Social Relations: Female-Female

What is the relationship of women in the hierarchy? These may need to be important considerations if women are to succeed, and they are doubly important if a woman is excluded from the informal group of men in like positions. The relationships in Kanter's study of tokenism on male-female all had sexual overtones. The female-female relationships are in new role-relations due to differential position. They are geared more on a friend or foe basis and can be categorized as follows: (These also apply to same status individuals.)

1. friend - The co-worker in your informal circle. She is the individual one may spend a lot of time talking to or "gossiping with". These are the individuals that make it worth your while to come to work (if in a low mobility position

and the job itself does not offer many rewards).

2. "Neutral Nora" is the woman that is just "there". She is not the woman you ask to go to coffee break or talk about at break. No one seems to know much about her, she's quiet, a loner, shy, OK I guess.

3. The biddy - She may very well be that woman middle manager of blocked mobility. Anyway, she's cranky, fussy about work, so you tend to ignore her.

4. The "other woman" - She is the "sex kitten", or "dumbo" that plays up to the men or goes along with their little games and cute shows of masculinity. She is seen as the competition in a sense, because she may be getting some extra rewards. A young woman in a local office suddenly had a thick "Southern accent" when helping the manager. It was also noted that she usually took an extra 15 minutes at break. The negative sanctions she met with could range to total ostracism from the group. Anyway, she was nice to have around - that is "to talk about".

All of this may seem very petty, but "coffee room" talk can make or break office social relationships. This is not a sexual difference and can be attributed to structural variables. As long as women are in blocked mobility positions, some may see their only way out their use of their charms, such as the 'other woman's". (Strangely enough, she was promoted - and past women who had been there much longer.) With tables turned, I have heard of men "pursuing" women managers, but to be sure, the incidents would be rare. In any case, if you become the woman ostracized from the informal group and do not fit into the male group, then it may be very difficult to continue working for the organization.

Now how does the woman manager or administrator fit into these categories? First, it may depend on whether she is moving up within the organization or coming from outside. If she is moving up into a position often held by women, she probably will not have any problems, if there has been a good relationship. If the woman moving up or the woman coming into the organization are into a position

previously not held by a woman, she will probably have to prove herself. There may be more pressure on the woman if she is seen to be "leaving her friends". There may also be much jealousy involved as one woman who had worked as a legal secretary said, "I won't work for a female lawyer." She was meaning that if another woman can be in that position, then she ought to be able to do it. Some women who see themselves in terminal positions are jealous of other women who can move up. Women managers may be under more pressure to dispel the "female boss" stereotype. Eventually, the woman will come to be categorized in one of the four mentioned above.

The female manager has a unique relationship with the female secretary. Not only is she trying to prove herself and dispel the female boss myth, but she finds herself in a relationship where the secretary does indeed demonstrate one or all of the work attitudes Kanter mentions. The woman manager may not have been concerned with "rewarding" co-workers before, but now finds herself in a situation where a secretary is very used to praise. Many women administrators have commented on the need to reward to get along. The engineering technician found her work wasn't being typed or put at the bottom, until she began commenting on how good everything looked and her appreciation. A woman official in Salina commented that she rewards by bringing flowers to the secretaries. Rewards (through praise) become very important if in a position that is of limited mobility, and women may put up with a great deal to receive them.

All of this is important in the sense that women would like to advance in the hierarchy and gain power, and one way may be through gathering allies - having support. We can better understand social relationships through awareness. A better understanding of all social relationships is necessary, and a woman manager or supervisor who has this awareness will do a better job and serve as a role model for more to follow. A woman not understanding the behavior behind "tokenism" or why the secretary prefers not to do her work, may give in to the undue

pressure. The woman manager is in a double bind situation, not only a new role as a token, but also new role-relationships with other women.

In using the "structuralist" model it has been shown that women are relegated to positions that are limited in upward mobility. Women are in a separate market limiting access to positions of power. The nature of the bureaucracy gives rise to such a dual market.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND FUTURE PROJECTIONS

Change in the System

Sex roles have changed in the last 100 years. In earlier society, they were more traditional and roles were not questioned. As society becomes more industrialized, the roles become more questionable. The women's movement of today has brought more awareness and consciousness; a questioning and impetus to this self reflection. Only recently has social research focused on women, and through these efforts we begin to have a better understanding of where women are today and their roles in society and the bureaucratic social structure. There is still a reluctance of society to adjust to the changing roles of women as most women still bear the heaviest share of responsibility for home and children, and until recently, most women accepted their position in society.

Research in sex roles has yielded many debates and models to answer the question of sex differences. Sociobiological theorists would argue that there are innate differences between the sexes, and various socialization theories provide other reasons to account for women's roles today. Current research suggests that the social structure itself is an important limiting factor. "A number of structural and situational variables are more important determinants of the organizational behavior of women (and men) than sex differences or global social roles. These variables include: opportunity structure, internal labor markets, dominance structures, and sex ratios within and across hierarchical levels" (Kanter, 1976). Women are in a separate labor market from men; they are relegated to positions that are limited in upward mobility and access to positions of power. Women are not only in separate labor markets from men but "female labor markets can be differentiated on the basis of skill and education" and this "implies that female labor markets are also differentiated according to social status, because this is closely related to educational attainment" (Oppenheimer, 1970:139).

Lower-class women generally do not qualify for white-collar jobs while middle-class do qualify.

The women's movement is not asking to take all women of their positions and place them all at strategic points in the hierarchy, but that individuals have the freedom to choose their occupations and the opportunity to advance or move up. The bureaucratic structure that gives rise to separate markets needs to be realized to bring about change. Women should not be forced into management positions, but at present many need an extra push or be encouraged to try something different. Again, men in similar circumstances may have the same fear of the unknown.

Society as well as the structure of the labor market is not likely to be changed dramatically in the near future, as sex roles and stereotypes are deeply embedded within our value system. "Mythologies do change as their support falls away, and perhaps we might find some cheer in the fact that men who habitually work with women, as equals in man's world, seem to be less disturbed by the ideas of equality for women than men who don't (Janeway, 1973:104). Will change come about for the future, and how can change be brought about?

Bureaucracies are increasing, the number of people employed in them is increasing, but the percentage of women in management or upper levels has not increased significantly. We can be encouraged that the percentages of women in many professional schools has doubled in recent years, and that role models are expanding with the increased numbers of working women. One woman commented, "My daughter is more liberal than I am, and I in turn am more liberal than my mother." The changes are coming, even though slowly. For some there have been a change in attitudes that has resulted in changing behavior; but for many more, there will need to be a change in their behavior that will result in changed attitudes.

How can we bring about change in the bureaucratic social structure?

Certainly not without more conflict and stress, and an understanding of the social relationships. Women need an increased awareness that they too have a right to self actualize; that women can hold positions of responsibility; that it is not inherent in females to be limited to certain traditional roles; and that the social structure limits mobility. Behavior changes will cause conflict and strain in the normative structure. Increasing the numbers of women wanting change will eventually bring change throughout the organization. "Changed norms may stimulate a new behavior pattern in one sector of an organizational environment. Organizational incumbents confront this new behavior pattern and must derive some means of coping. And these coping behaviors...alter the future performance structure and the strain pattern (Haas and Drabek, 1973:120).

We need to see some change on many dimensions, both within and outside the bureaucracy. Many attitudes may be shaped by the bureaucracy, but still many women today are not prepared to enter the labor market. Prepared in the sense that many vocational counselors still persist in encouraging only traditional jobs. Men as well need a liberation, and a knowledge of what jobs entail. For all workers, job counseling should look at individual interests and abilities, and how can these best be met within an organization.

We all need communications training and how we can best relate to one another as individuals, and an understanding of social relationships so we can give and get what we need. Many times assertive training can be useful - if even to land the first job.

Kanter (1977c:31) points out that some companies have attempted to change the secretarial position and resulting work attitudes. They have begun a centralized appraisal system for promotions, have generated job descriptions, and have announced job openings. "To restructure the job to enhance opportunity and eliminate patrimonial inequities, to simultaneously provide outlets for personalized relationships and personal territory - this is the dilemma of corporate

bureaucracy" (Kanter, 1977c:31). She also feels that despite "the contemporary controversy over affirmative action quotas, numbers do appear to be important in shaping outcomes for disadvantaged individuals. Women (or members of any under-represented category) need to be added to total group or organization membership in sufficient proportion to counteract the effects of tokenism" (Kanter, 1977b: 988). She concludes that it is the nature of the hierarchy that must be changed to promote equality. "At the present time, one of the most promising structural interventions is 'flex time' or flexible working hours. Flex time not only re-arranges working hours and can thus help women with family responsibilities, but also brings with it many other modifications of the organization of work" (Kanter, 1976c:288).

Concluding Remarks

Further research in all of the areas mentioned above will provide added understanding, which is necessary to bring about equality in the work force. We need additional information on the internal labor market for many organizations, and how this system has screened in only certain categories of individuals. How has veteran preference handicapped women? What are the mechanisms by which employers eliminate women applicants? There have been reported cases of overexaggeration of job requirements and duties specified during the interview.

There has been a changing of roles for women that has been more pronounced for women on the homefront, but the revived impetus of the women's movement will carry the change through the bureaucratic social structure.

"A man is not an equalitarian in principal until he seeks and enjoys a reciprocal relation of equality; and the test of this is to be found not in a man's dislike of other's superiority, but in the dislike of their inferiority, and in the relish for a social relationship in which each looks upon the other with a level eye." --

Ralph Barton Perry

APPENDIX:LABOR FORCE STATISTICS

STATISTICS - U.S. DEPT. OF LABOR

Table 1 - WOMEN IN THE LABOR FORCE, SELECTED YEARS, 1870 - 1976

(Women 16 years of age and over)

Date	Number (in thousands)	As percent of all workers	As percent of woman population
HIGHLIGHTS ¹			
1976.....	38,414	40.5	47.3
1975.....	36,998	39.9	46.3
April 1974.....	35,165	39.3	45.0
April 1970.....	31,293	38.1	43.2
Midsixties (April 1965).....	25,831	35.0	38.8
Start of the sixties (April 1960)....	22,985	33.3	37.4
Midfifties (April 1955).....	19,987	31.2	34.8
Korean War (April 1953).....	19,116	30.6	34.0
Pre-Korean War (April 1950).....	17,882	29.1	33.0
Post-World War II (April 1947).....	16,150	27.6	30.9
World War II (April 1945).....	19,290	36.1	38.1
Pre-World War II (March 1940).....	13,783	25.4	28.9
LONG TERM TRENDS ²			
1930 (April).....	10,396	21.9	23.6
1920 (January).....	8,229	20.4	22.7
1910 (April).....	8,076	21.2	
1900 (June).....	4,999	18.1	20.0
1890 (June).....	3,704	17.0	18.2
1880.....	2,647	15.0	
1870.....	1,836	15.0	

1 Civilian labor force

2 Decennial census figures cover persons 14 years of age and over in the total labor force.

Sources: U.S. Bureau of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1977
U.S. Dept. of Commerce, 1975:128
U.S. Dept. of Labor, 1976:11

Table 2 - OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF THE
LABOR FORCE, BY SEX:
1900-1976

Major occupation group	<u>Percent Distribution</u>				
	<u>Females</u>				
	1900	1940	1950	1960	1976
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Nonfarm occupations	81.0	96.0	96.4	95.6	98.7
Manual occupations	63.1	51.1	43.0	40.5	35.5
Craftsmen, foreman, and kindred workers	1.4	1.1	1.5	1.2	1.6
Operatives and kindred workers	23.7	19.5	19.6	5.2	11.8
Laborers	2.6	1.1	0.8	0.4	1.1
Private household workers	28.7	18.1	8.7	8.9	3.1
Other service workers	6.7	11.3	12.4	14.8	17.9
Nonmanual occupations	17.9	44.9	53.4	55.4	63.1
Professional, technical and kindred workers	8.2	12.8	12.5	12.4	16.0
Managers, officials and proprietors	1.4	3.3	4.4	5.0	5.5
Clerical and kindred workers	4.0	21.4	27.8	30.3	34.9
Sales workers	4.3	7.4	8.7	7.7	6.7

Source: Oppenheimer, 1970:149
U.S. Dept. of Commerce, 1977:35
U.S. Dept. of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1977:8

Table 3 - FEMALE LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION BY AGE:
1900-1976

Work Rates by Age						
	1900	1940	1950	1960	1970	1976
Total, 14 years and older (16 years and older after 1970)	20.0	25.8	29.0	34.5	43.3	47.3
14 to 24 years	29.0	30.8	32.5	32.5		
25 to 34 years	19.4	33.3	31.8	35.3	45.0	57.1
35 to 44 years	15.0	27.2	35.0	42.6	51.1	57.8
45 to 54 years	14.2	22.5	32.9	46.6	54.4	55.0
55 to 64 years	12.6	16.8	23.4	35.0	43.0	41.1
65 years and over	8.3	6.1	7.8	10.3	9.7	8.2

Sources: Oppenheimer, 1970:8
U.S. Dept. of Commerce, 1976:28
U.S. Dept. of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1977

Table 4 - WOMEN IN FEDERAL CIVIL SERVICE,
SELECTED YEARS, 1939-1973¹

Year	Number	As percent of total employment
1973.....	643,647	34.0
1972.....	671,150	33.7
1970.....	654,450	33.1
1968.....	664,496	34.0
1958.....	533,001	24
1952 (Korean War).....	601,215	25
1947 (return of World War II Veterans).....	444,194	24
1944 (World War II peak).....	1,110,545	37
1939.....	172,733	19

1 Data are for October of each year except 1944 (July) and 1958 (December). Years 1939-58 refer to civilian employees in the continental United States. Data for the years 1968-73 include full-time white-collar employees with the following exceptions: Foreign nationals employed overseas; Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System; members and Employees of Congress; National Security Agency; Central Intelligence Agency; White House Office; Architect of the Capitol; Botanic Gardens; ungraded employees in the Judicial Branch.

Source: U.S. Dept. of Labor:1976

Table 5 - NUMBER AND PERCENT OF WOMEN IN FULL-TIME
FEDERAL WHITE-COLLAR EMPLOYMENT, BY
GENERAL SCHEDULE AND EQUIVALENT GRADES
OCTOBER 31, 1973

GS Grade	Number	As percent of total employment
Total.....	643,647	34.0
01.....	2,610	68.5
02.....	27,773	77.2
03.....	82,470	77.2
04.....	124,801	74.5
05.....	119,634	56.2
06.....	122,097	24.4
07.....	56,312	41.6
08.....	16,376	35.1
09.....	43,860	28.5
10.....	6,000	18.3
11.....	21,319	13.8
12.....	11,343	8.1
13.....	5,492	5.1
14.....	2,174	4.1
15.....	1,183	3.9
16.....	130	2.2
17.....	48	1.6
18.....	8	1.4
Above 18.....	17	2.8

Source: U.S. Dept. of Labor:1976

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ashley, Jo Ann.
1977 Hospitals, Paternalism, and the role of the Nurse. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Athos, Anthony G., and Robert E. Coffey.
1968 Behavior in Organizations: A Multidimensional View. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Boslooper, Thomas., and Marcia Hayes.
1973 The Femininity Game. New York: Stein and Day.
- Blau, Peter M.
1955 The Dynamics of Bureaucracy. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
1956 Bureaucracy in Modern Society. New York: Random House.
1971a and Marshall W. Meyer, Bureaucracy in Modern Society. 2d ed. New York: Basic Books.
- Blum, Albert A., Marten Esty, James W. Klein, Wesley A. Wildman, and Leo Troy. (eds.)
1971 White Collar Workers. New York: Random House.
- Burke, Peggy.
1974 "Confessions of a Former Sexist." WomenSports. April
- Chafe, William H.
1972 The American Woman: Her Changing Social, Economic, and Political Roles, 1920-1970. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Grozier, Michel.
1964 The Bureaucratic Phenomenon. University of Chicago Press.
- Epstein, Cynthia Fuchs.
1970 Womens Place: Options and Limits in Professional Careers. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.
1971 "Women Lawyers and Their Profession: Inconsistency of Social Controls and Their Consequences for Professional Performance." In Athena Theodora (ed.) The Professional Woman. Massachusetts: Schekman.
- Etzioni, Amitai.
1973 "The Woman's Movement - Token vs. Objectives." in Annual Editions: Readings in Sociology. Guilford, Conn.: Dushkin Publishing Co.
- Flexner, Eleanor.
1972 Century of Struggle. N.Y.: Atheneum.
- Goldberg, Philip.
1971 "Are Women Prejudiced Against Women." In Athena Theodore (ed.) The Professional Woman. Massachusetts: Schenkman.
- Haas, J. Eugene, and Thomas E. Drabek.
1973 Complex Organizations: A Sociological Perspective. New York: MacMillan Co.

Hennig, Margaret., and Anne Jardim.

- 1977 "What Girls Must Learn from Boys about Winning." in Working Woman.
Sept.

Hersey, Paul., and Kenneth H. Blanchard.

- 1972 Management of Organizational Behavior: Utilizing Human Behavior.
(2d ed.) New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Hochschild, Arlie Russell.

- 1973 "A Review of Sex Role Research." American Journal of Sociology.
May, 78:4.

Hoffman, Lois W., (ed.)

- 1975 Women and Achievement. Washington D.C., Hemisphere.

Horner, Matina.

- 1971 "Fail: Bright Women." In Athena Theodore (ed.), The Professional Woman. Massachusetts: Schenkman.

Jackson, Patricia.

- 1977 "Competition and the Working Woman." Woman's World. March.

Janeway, Elizabeth.

- 1973 "The Weak are the Second Sex." The Atlantic. November.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss.

- 1975 "Woman and the Structure of Organization: Explorations in Theory and Behavior." In M. Millman and R. M. Kanter (eds.) Another Voice: Feminist Perspectives on Social Life and Social Science. New York: Doubleday.
- 1976a "The Impact of Hierarchical Structure on the Work Behavior of Women and Men." Social Problems. 23:4 April.
- 1976b "The Job Makes the Person." Psychology Today. May.
- 1976c "The Policy Issues: VI." Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society. 1:3.
- 1977a "Managers." in Men and Women of the Corporation. New York: Basic Books.
- 1977b "Some Effects of Proportions on Group Life: Skewed Sex Ratios and Responses to Token Women." American Journal of Sociology. March.
- 1977c "Where Secretaries Stand in the Power Play." in Working Woman. October.

Kreps, Juanita.

- 1971 Sex in the Market Place: American Women at Work. Baltimore: John Hopkins Press.
- 1975 Sex, Age, and Work. Baltimore: John Hopkins Press.

Langer, Elinor.

- 1970 "Inside the New York Telephone Company: and "The Women of the Telephone Company." The New York Review. March.
- 1977 "Forum: Why Big Business is Trying to Defeat the ERA - The Economic Implications of Equality." in Ms. May.

Leavy, Jane.

- 1977 "A Tomboy Who Wants Out." WomenSports. January.

- Lyle, Jerolyn. R., and Jane L. Ross.
1973 Women in Industry. Mass: Lexington Books.
- Maccoby, Eleanor, E., and Carol Nazy Jacklin.
1974 "What We Know and Don't Know about Sex Differences." Psychology Today. Dec.
- Mednick, Martha T., Sandra, Schwartz Tangri, and Lois W. Hoffman, (eds.)
1975 Women and Achievement. Washington D.C.: Hemisphere.
- Montagna, Paul D.
1977 Occupations and Society: Toward a Sociology of the Labor Market. New York: John Wiley and Sons Inc.
- Oppenheimer, Valerie Kincade.
1970 The Female Labor Force in the United States. Berkeley: Univ. of California.
- Parrish, John B.
1975 "Women in Professional Training: An Update." Monthly Labor Review. 98.
- Perrow, Charles.
1970 Organizational Analysis: A Sociological View. Calif. Brook/Cole Publishing Co.
- Pincus
1977 "Alice Paul: Last of the Suffragists: First of the New Women." Working Woman. September.
- Ritzer, George.
1977 Working Conflict and Change. (2nd ed.) Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Schuman, Wendy.
1977 "What the Action is for You Know." Working Woman. October.
- Spradley, James P., and Brenda J. Mann.
1975 The Cocktail Waitress. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Suter, Larry E., and Herman P. Miller.
1973 "Income Differences Between Men and Career Women." American Journal of Sociology.
- Theodore, Athena (ed.)
1971 The Professional Woman. Massachusetts: Schenkman.
- U.S. Dept. of Commerce
1975 Historical Statistics of the U.S.: Colonial Times to 1970. U.S. Govt. Printing Office.
1976 A Statistical Portrait of Women in the U.S. Washington D.C.: U.S. Govt. Printing Office.
1977 Population Characteristics. April, Washington D.C.: U.S. Govt. Printing Office.

U.S. Dept. of Labor.

- 1962 Women in the Federal Service. Washington D.C.: U.S. Govt. Printing Office.
- 1976 1975 Handbook on Women Workers. Washington D.C.: U.S. Govt. Printing Office.
- 1977 U.S. Working Women: A Databook. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin 1977. Washington D.C.: U.S. Govt. Printing Office.

Verheyden-Hilliard, Mary Ellen.

- 1975 "Nontraditional, Societal and Parental Pressure." Woman Power. U.S. Dept. of Labor, Nov. 7-11.

THE CHANGING AMERICAN WOMAN:
HER ROLE FROM THE HOME TO THE
LABOR FORCE AND BUREAUCRATIC
SOCIAL STRUCTURE

by

DONNA LYN ALLEN

B.A., Washburn University, 1971

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Sociology

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1977

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to discuss the changing roles of the American woman from the home to the labor market and bureaucratic social structure. The history of the traditional "women's role" and women's participation in the labor market is discussed to provide a basis on which to compare. Role conflict develops when traditional roles assigned become altered.

Bureaucracies are an increasing phenomenon, and it is important to have an understanding of how women fit into that type of social organization. Characteristics and attributes that are often assigned to women in the work force are actually behavioral responses resulting from the nature of the hierarchy on the job. The circumstances that have given rise to tokenism will have an effect on the resulting social relationships.

The bureaucratic structure gives rise to a dual labor market, with women being in a separate market from men. Women are placed in a class within the hierarchy that limits mobility into positions of power.

The recent revival of the women's movement has brought an increasing awareness of labor force injustices and a need for understanding role relationships; not only male-female, but female-female. As women move into positions of responsibility, new role-relationships develop.