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An Interview With Studs Terkel

PAUL M. HIRSCH
Northwestern University

Studs Terkel has described his writing for me as a “bottom-up history of ordinary people who have something real to say about themselves.” He is a legendary interviewer, prize-winning author, and oral historian. Terkel also hosted a lively interview program on Chicago radio stations for 52 years. He was awarded the Pulitzer Prize in 1985 for “The Good War”: An Oral History of World War II (Terkel, 1984). Since “retiring” in 1988, Terkel has remained very visible as a contemporary author and historical commenter. He has written four additional books and supervised the archiving (at the Chicago Historical Society) of the more than 7,000 hours of interviews and oral histories he has conducted.

Sociologists are especially familiar with three of Studs’s classics: Division Street: America (Terkel, 1965), in which his oral histories addressed how people experience class differences; Hard Times: An Oral History of the Great Depression (Terkel, 1970); and Working: People Talk About What They Do All Day and How They Feel About What They Do (Terkel, 1974). Working recorded personal testimonies about people and their jobs, providing lively portraits that inspired a successful Broadway musical.

During the summer of 1999, the American Academy of Management held its annual meetings in Chicago. Paul Adler, chair of the Critical Management Division, asked if Studs might be willing to meet with this group. When I conveyed this request, Studs replied that he would be delighted to meet with a group of “radical business professors” (p. xvi). After all, in Working, Terkel (1974) noted that in one of his early jobs, his “tenure was as uncertain as that of a radical college professor.” So, Terkel joined our group for its plenary meeting to discuss his books, general perspectives, and methods for interviewing and conducting oral histories.

I had the pleasure of “interviewing” this master interviewer. My goal was to ask a few leading questions and let Terkel go wherever he wished with them. Interestingly, his informal answers and stories always came back to the points he began with when addressing the questions asked. Here is the
transcript of our session at the Critical Management Division meetings of the American Academy of Management, held in Chicago in August 1999:

Paul Hirsch: I don’t know if you interviewed the man that robbed you the other day, but the story is, you not only interview subjects for oral history but can also talk to everyone else as well. Tell us a little bit about that, and your sense of how the world of work is changing.

Studs Terkel: Okay, it was the other night about 8 days ago. I was half asleep at the house; the wife is not very well, so the lights were out early. Now, your burglars are not like muggers. Burglars are not like robbers. Burglars do not want confrontation. They only go to houses that they think are vacant or that people are on vacation. It was dark early in my house, and I had the baseball game turned on without the sound, the Sox and Brewers; the Sox lost, of course. It’s about 10:30 that I turn it off, and some time near midnight a light goes on in the hallway, and I looked to see if my wife has gone to the bathroom, but she was not. Instead, a shadowy figure walks in, a guy, and it felt like a dream; ask if I was scared? No, it’s a dream, you see, and further, I don’t hear anything ‘cause without my hearing aid, I’m even deaf with it, but there in the bathroom, I am stone deaf, you see. So this big guy, can’t see his face, is saying something, and I don’t hear him, so I say, “Just a minute,” still thinking it’s a dream. I turn on the light, and he rushes towards me but doesn’t touch me, and it is about a 3- or 4-minute scene sort of choreographed by Ballanchine, with all the dance scenes more jazzy, like Bob Fosse, and not once did he touch me, but I was in a daze, dreamlike, and then I finally realized that he was saying, “Where’s the money?” And I could see my wife mouthing something, and I don’t hear him, so I say, “Take it easy,” because I feel like I am still in a dream. I am too dumb to be scared, and so by this time, I reach into my pocket to give him some dough. I had gone to the currency exchange that morning and had $250. In the old days, my fingers were more nimble, like safe crackers, see, so I can go and pick out a couple of bills and give them to him, except my hands are rough now, so I grabbed the whole roll of bills and gave them to him. He turns around, he does not want me to see his face, and he’s got my money in his hand, and he is counting it, and I said, “How about $20 to tide me over until tomorrow,” so without making a big deal of it, he hands me 20 bucks. I said, “Thank you,” and he mumbled, “You’re welcome.” Then he runs out, and I run after him because I am still not scared as to what is happening, and I see that he leaves the house, and I tried to figure out how he got in, and I see it was through a kitchen window.

So the other day, a reporter said, “Studs, there is an old saying, ‘A conservative is a liberal or a leftist who has been mugged or burgled.’ How do you feel now?”

I said, “I feel more left than ever.”

He said, “How come?”

Well, that moment, that epiphanic moment, when he is counting this roll of bills, which is my money. When he hands me 20 bucks charity, I say, “Thanks.” Isn’t that what the free market is all about? How does the big guy get the money, and from who? From guys like me and you, and he hands the charity to a nut called the foundation. I figure that’s how it works. I use that moment as a metaphor.

No, I didn’t get the interview. Once upon a time, I did slip on a cake of ice. There was a guy, I had something in my back; I couldn’t tell if it was a finger or a gun. I said, “Take it easy,” but it was very icy, and he slipped on the ice, so I pull him around, and we rolled around on the ice. He said, “Do I know you?” And so I give him my name, and I said, “What’s your name?” He said, “I’m not going to tell you.” He ran off and
ripped off a Timex that costs me 29 bucks; he got that. As he was running off, he said, “I hope that I haven’t hurt you, Studs,” and I said, “Get out of here.” Mike Royko then wrote that “he did not get the interview.” So in any event, all these incidents are about metaphors to me. So that is more or less how I work. Later on, I got scared, I wondered, what the hell am I doing? What I never do in the first place. Nonetheless, that’s an experience.

Paul Hirsch: One of the things you also told me is that we have a kind of version of Alzheimer’s about history.

Studs Terkel: Well, of course, that is history. I said we have a national Alzheimer’s disease.

Well, think about it, now. When we hear someone criticize big government; big government, though he doesn’t mind big government interfering with some of our rights, of course. When our daddies and granddaddies said that our asses were saved by big government, through the Depression, it was the New Deal that saved their asses. You know that Ronnie Reagan’s father and grandfather had their lives saved by a job on the WPA [Works Progress Administration]. Their town of Dixon, Illinois, was saved by the WPA. So this is what national Alzheimer’s disease is all about. There is no memory of past; no sense of yesterday at all. It was a 30-second sound bite, and then that’s it. So in a sense, it’s writing which rediscovers what history was all about. I hope that I have done some of that. That is the book on Hard Times. That is the idea.

What was it like to live in a certain moment of Depression? It was called relief in those days. So I’m working on what’s it like to do this job or that job, what’s it like to be that person? What was it like for the kids to see the old man come home, hard-working guy, come home at 1:00 in the afternoon with his tool chest on his shoulder? Or the wife, or a small businessman, what’s it like?

So in a sense, that is how I work, more or less: Improvise a great deal, follow out hunches. Sometimes, there is no rule of thumb when it comes to understanding people’s experience or ideology. For example, in the first book, Division Street: America, the first book of all the history that was the city of Chicago; it could be any city, just a large city. I call it Division Street: America ‘cause that’s a metaphor. There is a Division Street in Chicago. I meant “division street” as in separating us. There were many Appalachians, and as you know, a great many Blacks also came up from the South after World Wars I and II. This was a double journey for African Americans; large numbers following World War I and then more following. During the writing of the book, I leave this Appalachian grocery store, it’s raining like hell. With luck, I got a cab, and this guy driving a cab sees this big guy with a big tape recorder and he says, “Are you a journalist?” I said that I horse around, and he said, “Did you see the movie called Lord Jim?” My friend Joseph Conrad is Lord Jim; I said, “No,” but I know that I am stalling. He said, “It is about me, a coward who found his courage. That is why I joined the John Birch Society.” And I am thinking that I got to get this guy—he might have something interesting from the John Birch Society. And then, he goes on to tell me about his life, and I realize that it is not all that simple; this guy is scared stiff, he is nothing, he wants to be somebody one day. Some big shot invited him to join the John Birch Society and be with big shots. At the same time, he says that he is a jail guard, and he was fired from the job because he was fraternizing with the inmates, who were Black. So we have this kind of crazy conflict here in this guy.

I told this story to a friend of mine—a foreign scholar, brave women, who tried to save the cities solo. An Italian American housewife, she tried to save a big community in Chicago called Harrison Halstead. It would symbolize Chicago, a Jane Adams–like
Hull House, in a tremendous multicultural community. But of course, Mayor Daley the elder, Richard the first, and the bankers thought otherwise and selected it for making highways and expressways. This is also where University of Illinois, Circle Campus is. It is like a fortress, and there is no community. So Florence says to me, this guy that I was telling her about, this John Birch guy, she says, “I know him, he helped work in my campaign. He helped me.” Do you realize that many people, outsiders, who are part of the Reich, they joined that cause because they have been told or taught to. So there is no rule of thumb as to what makes people tick. That is what I have tried to uncover. Each individual is different. There is still a pattern, of course.

Coming back to Alzheimer’s disease and lack of central history, we think about labor unions and the beating that they have taken through the years: the big beatings, how the cold war played a tremendous role in the decline of labor unions. Even as unions come back, you know, with new constituents, the old timers—the old guys, White and Black—have lost their jobs; steel, packing house, farm equipment, down, down, down. But new industry, especially Service Employees Union, the biggest that there is, has new constituents, right, women, Third World, etc. But it took a big beating earlier, during the cold war, with George Meany, you know, playing ball. That knocked out all those who were active labor guys, who many would consider “Reds.”

When Ronnie Reagan was elected president, the first thing he did, in 1980 or 1981, was break the air controllers strike. Do you remember that? He broke the air controllers strike, and 80% of America applauded. By God, he showed them. What was the strike about? The strike was about time off for air controllers and treatment for mental cases, neurotic cases, nervous breakdowns, mostly time off for rest. Because what does an air controller do? In his hands, we know, is the fate of thousands of people every day, right? How many times have there been near misses? Near misses because of unseasoned air controllers? So Ronnie Reagan fires every member of the union, 11,000 seasoned workers. None of them went back; few went back to work, yet 80% applauded. They applauded even though the strikers were striking for passenger safety. That was the issue. Yet, they applauded the destruction of the strike, even though it was for passenger safety. Are we becoming necrophilic people? Do we love necrophilia? Is that what it is about? So in a sense, we forget about that, and at the same time, it becomes something interesting.

Do you remember the United Parcel Service [UPS] strike? Now, that won the affection of most America, didn’t it? Most were sympathetic. Why do you think that was? Because they were aware of something new on the horizon: the temp—the temporary.

Temps are those who work without benefits of any sort whatsoever; temps were George and Lenny, remember George and Lenny? Of Mice and Men. Remember Steinbeck’s play? They were temps. In the old days of temps, they were ranch hands, day workers, right. Well, George and Lenny now work in banks and insurance companies and in law firms, and so these become persons that a great many of us recognize. A temp is working next to me. I must be a temp next, too, without any benefits or seniority and so on. The temps made the UPS strike winnable. How come our jobless rate is so low? Because there are a lot of temps involved. I can’t get over this fact, that we have more and more talk about how business is better than ever, and yet, what are the new phrases? “Early retirement” and “downsized.” Sears retired 850 last week; ITT downsizes a couple of thousand each week. These are euphemisms for mass firings.
I love anecdotes. You don’t mind anecdotes? This is true, well, 95% true. I lived in the day where there was “haves” and “have-nots,” also a view or attitude of young people about labor unions. So, I’m waiting for a bus. I talk a great deal, and while waiting sometimes I talk to myself, and if I am the audience I am quite appreciative.

When I am talking like this, people always talk to me back and forth. But I can’t crack this couple. I am at the bus stop every day of the year, and they just look at me kind of strange. Well, I look kind of funny. I’ve got papers in my hand, and I look kind of raggedy. He is very handsome, you know, Brooks Brothers street dress. He has in his hand a fresh edition of the *Wall Street Journal*. She is a very stunningly beautiful woman in Bloomingdale’s clothes. She has the latest issue of *Vanity Fair*, of course.

They are waiting for the bus, and I said in a friendly, conversational manner, “Well, Labor Day is coming up.” He looks at me as though I am a no-account with bedbugs. Naturally, this is a challenge to me. My ego is hurt, and so I just start deliberately with Labor Day; I am egging him on. By the way, the bus is late in coming. On Labor Day, we used to march down Michigan Boulevard. Solidarity for whatever side you are on: UAW [United Auto Workers], CIO [Congress of Industrial Organizations], steelworkers. He looks at me and says that “we loathe unions.” Well, I’ve got a pigeon here.

So now I am the ancient mariner, and I fix him with my glimmering eye. I say to him, “How many hours a day do you work?” He said, “Eight.” He said, regally, “Eight,” and I said, “How come you don’t work 18 hours a day? Do you know why you work 8 hours a day? Four guys got hanged in Chicago for the right to an 8-hour day.”

That was the famous affair when someone threw a bomb in a crowd, and four guys got hanged. “Those guys got hanged for you to work only 8 hours.” Now, he and his girl looked terrified and tried to look for a way out of here, and I’ve got them pinned against a mailbox, and they can’t get away. No “buts,” and so I asked the next question: “How many hours a week do you work?” He said, “Forty hours.” By this time, he would say anything. “How come you don’t work 80 hours a week? You know why? ’Cause back in the ’30s guys nearly got their heads busted fighting for your 8-hour days.” By this time, they get on the bus and go to the back, and it was rush hour, and I never saw them again. But to this day, I’ll bet they’re gonna purchase the condominium that faces the bus stop, I’ll bet every morning she’s looking out of the windows wondering if that old man is still down there. Well, that statement is 95% true, but the fact is that it’s true.

Not all, but many of the young are learning about what good things have happened, that it is not all bad. Not a majority, but nonetheless a number, so this is how I work.

**Paul Hirsch**: Do you think that some of the downsized managers will think of themselves as workers?

**Studs Terkel**: I don’t know. That’s a hard one. The phrase *working class* is European. It was used a great deal before World War I. It’s an Old World phrase. Here, we are all middle class. You know, every presidential candidate says that he is working for the middle class. Everyone making 20,000 to 1 million bucks a year is middle class.

There is this young girl in the book *Working*. Her father is a garbage man, sanitation collector. I said to her, “Your father does terribly important work.”

She said that he is a sanitation manager. “A garbage collector,” I said. “You know Martin Luther King got killed fighting for them in Memphis?” She didn’t know what I was talking about. “He is doing far more important work than the guy selling a salve for headache, disease, or cigarettes or booze, so you are from a working-class family.”
“I beg your pardon,” she was furious. “I’m what? How dare you? We’re middle class,” she told me.

A language itself becomes perverted. Our very language becomes flexible, and so that’s part of it too. Take “things are getting better and better.” We’re also having bigger gaps and reaches between income groups. We don’t want to use the word class. That’s all right. Inequality is rising in the U.S., and in some sense, the middle does increasingly drop out. Today, you have corporations, but it doesn’t matter. You see, after all, what are our means of communication? TV is a big one; TV is a very big one. Well now, who owns NBC? General Electric, right? Can you picture Tom Brokaw, if there is a scandal involving General Electric and shifting the public, can you picture Tom Brokaw exposing that? CBS is owned by Westinghouse, right? Now, can you imagine Dan Rather exposing a Westinghouse scandal shifting the public? He would be out by tomorrow. ABC is owned by Disney, right? Can you picture Peter Jennings? He would be out. Need I mention Fox and Rupert Murdoch? You know, Mike Royko, he is a columnist in town, and he worked for the Chicago Sun-Times, and then Rupert Murdoch bought the Sun-Times, and he quit the Sun-Times to go the Tribune because he felt (about Murdoch) that no self-respecting fish would be wrapped in his paper. So the deck is stacked, let’s face it. We do the job as best we can to unstack the deck and leave some sort of equity, some sort of fair play as much as possible. The odds are pretty heavy, but it is worth the gamble.

Paul Hirsch: If you are going to interview somebody that you know you don’t like and you know does not like you either, what do you do?

Studs Terkel: Well, I interview a number of people who disagree with me, of course. That doesn’t mean that I am going to attack, of course not. I want to know what is it that makes a person tick. That cab driver I told you about, it is a good case in point, that cab driver. It’s a mixed bag. Let me tell you about Gerald L. K. Smith, do you remember Gerald L. K. Smith? He was the famous self-portrayed American fascist, and he was very eloquent. I interviewed him, and he liked my interview, and all I did was have him talk, and in talking, he exposed himself. But Smith was very eloquent. He was a friend of Huey Long. He was the guy that fought back during the ’60s, you know, against the civil rights and anti-Vietnam War demonstrations. Many young preachers took part in these. Priests and others with turned-back collars. Smith was furious at these guys. Remember, he is the Reverend Gerald L. K. Smith; “Don’t call me reverend, just call me Gerald L. K. Smith, don’t mind that reverend stuff.” And he is attacking these ministers who used religion as their protection, their collars as protection. He said, “Let them take off their collar, like me,” and he goes on to say, in his days of attacking Roosevelt, when all the guys tried to attack him, he jumps on the rock in Georgia, and he puts on his collar, saying “Who dare attacks me attacks a man of God.” So it is that same guy who is attacking others when he has done that same thing. Well, he liked the interview very much. This was in Eureka, Arkansas, where there is a statue of Christ. It spans four states, all white alabaster, and he points to that statue and says inside that there is music coming out. It has Kate Smith singing hymns, and Tennessee Ernie Ford. Smith says this is strictly stereofied and that Christ is stereophonic. It all comes out beautifully, and I continued the interview.

So who are the people I’m interviewing? They’re the nobodies of the world. I’ve done radio shows. I’ve worked two ways. These books that you’ve read, I hope some of these books, and on the radio. I’ve been on the same FM station for 45 years.

So out of that, I’ve written a book called The Spectator. My dream was to be a spectator, never participate in things.
Paul Hirsch: You said right at the beginning of Working that work is, by its very nature, violence, that alienation is everywhere.

Studs Terkel: Well that phrase alienation is an old-time phrase, you know? Used by you know who. His name is Marx. Mandatory retirement is connected with work. I don’t believe in mandatory retirement. I’m 87. I’ve been doing it since 50. However, if I were a spot welder at Ford or General Motors. The spot welder is the guy who has a 20-pound gun in his hand and shoots spots. He doesn’t see the end product. It might turn out to be an Edsel. He just always stands on his feet and shoots this all day long. Well, of course, he’s longing for 30 and out. Thirty and out is what the UAW won for him. Thirty years pension, out fishing, going somewhere. But maybe an old professor or teacher or something loves his work. At 75, he doesn’t want to quit yet. So I suggest mandatory retirement voluntarily, of course. Being a man at work is violence.

Paul Hirsch: Let’s talk about blue-collar blues being just as strong as white-collar moans. You use drones to describe bankers, accountants, and people behind . . .

Studs Terkel: Think of a banker who has finally made the distinguished Chicago banker news, but he’s forced to retire. He describes that moment when he loses power. There’s nothing quite like it. No one told him. It’s a loss of power as though his balls were cut. Everything cut, bleeding. There he is, impotent. That’s very dramatic. It’s very sad, too.

My idol was a British journalist who was a contemporary of Dickens. His name was Henry Mayhew. Henry Mayhew was a model for Macauley. Mayhew talked to the anonymous people of London, Birmingham, and Manchester. Those from the respectable round about; you know, the servant around the house, the chimney sweep, and the halter. The readers of the paper, the London Chronicle and the paper in Birmingham, were astonished by the thoughts of these people. He didn’t have a tape recorder; I do. The only other person who used a tape recorder as much as I did is Richard Nixon. I called him and me neo-Cartesians. I tape; therefore, I am. I hope we used the tape for different purposes.

Paul Hirsch: What are some of the things you see that are sources of inspiration?

Studs Terkel: Studs, most of us are knowledgeable about your book on working. The book is almost 30 years old. Do you think things have changed much?

Studs Terkel: Now, here I’m going to talk about the computer, technology. I’m a hypocrite, you know. I’m going to start with that right now. I don’t have a computer. I still work the typewriter, just learned to use an electric typewriter. When I hear the word hardware, I think of hammers, nails, pots, and pans. When I hear the word software, I think of pillowcases and Turkish towels.

The computer to me is a strange world. I find that you go into any city desk. The city room of a newspaper in the old days, there was noise, there was the human voice, there was sound, people running. When you go into a newspaper city desk, it’s dead silence. You’ve got reporters sitting next to each other, yet they’re planets apart. They’re all staring at this thing they call a terminal. I said, “Well, that’s a word.”

The New York Times has a story about a kid who’s saying, “I don’t leave my room. I knock out everything from here. I make dates with girls, I order pizza, and the crowning aspect is that I’ve got two roommates, and I don’t have to talk to them because of the computer.” That’s pretty horrifying stuff.

I’m condemning technology, but I had a quadruple operation recently; I was saved by the skilled hands of the surgeon and also by the machinery around him. So you see, it saved my life, and I’m an ungrateful wretch condemning it. You see, the computer-
ized world has two aspects to it. It’s made stuff easier in many ways. At the same time, I wonder about it.

Paul Hirsch: Many of us teach MBAs and people who will rise to heads of corporations. What responsibilities do you think we have to the working conditions of the working class?

Studs Terkel: I’m glad you asked that. It’s the perfect last question. I know that students need history, need the liberal arts, need everything. Teach what you yourself have felt, feel, and discover. Most young people are lost. You know that. Lost and worried what’s going to happen next. There’re few, the ones that you see on the Miller Lite commercials, the Bud commercials. That’s not a majority. The majority are kids who are wondering and lost, and they are more or less your disciples.
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The authors integrate research on the causes and consequences of sexual harassment victimization with organizational research to better understand the relationship between harassment and the work outcomes of job satisfaction, job stress, and intention to quit an organization. In doing so, the authors broaden the narrow conceptualization of organizational context that has been considered in previous research on sexual harassment. This broadened conceptualization incorporates features of modern organizational structure, including social integration, structural differentiation, decentralization, and formalization—all argued to indirectly control employees by increasing employee job satisfaction and commitment (and to ultimately increase productivity and reduce turnover). Although these features of modern organizational structure are not intended to reduce sexual harassment, the authors propose and find with a national sample of almost 6,000 employees that they have the unintended consequence of doing so. The authors also propose and find that this context-harassment linkage improves understanding of the often reported relationship between sexual harassment and job dissatisfaction, job stress, and intention to quit.
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In recent years, researchers have focused much attention on both the causes and the consequences of sexual harassment victimization (uninvited verbal or physical sexual attention) in the workplace. On one hand, research on

Authors’ Note: Correspondence regarding this article should be addressed to Charles W. Mueller, Department of Sociology, W140 Seashore Hall, University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA 52242; telephone: (319) 335-2491; fax: (319) 335-2509; e-mail: charles-mueller@uiowa.edu. We wish to thank James Bavendam for making the data available to us. The first author wishes to thank the Obermann Center for Advanced Studies for support services while working on this project.

WORK AND OCCUPATIONS, Vol. 28 No. 4, November 2001 411-446
© 2001 Sage Publications
the causes of sexual harassment has documented that organizational context and individual characteristics are among the most important predictors of sexual harassment (see Gruber & Bjorn, 1982; Gutek, 1985; Gutek & Morasch, 1982; Pryor, LaVite, & Stoller, 1993). Research on the consequences of sexual harassment, on the other hand, has identified links between victimization and a host of negative work outcomes, including increased job stress, loss of commitment to work, and decreased job satisfaction (see Crull, 1982; DiTomaso, 1989; Fitzgerald, Hulin, & Drasgow, 1995; Gutek, 1985; Gutek & Koss, 1993). Unfortunately, researchers typically have not focused on both the causes and the consequences of sexual harassment victimization within one, unified framework (for exceptions, see Fitzgerald, Drasgow, Hulin, Gelfand, & Magley, 1997; Glomb, Munson, Hulin, Bergman, & Drasgow, 1999). Indeed, in a recent review of the literature, Stockdale (1993) presented two separate models of sexual harassment processes: one that focuses on the causes of sexual harassment victimization and a second that focuses on the outcomes of such victimization.

We propose that this separation of causes from outcomes in the sexual harassment literature precludes researchers from exploring fully the relationships between organizational context, sexual harassment, and negative work outcomes. It could be the case, for instance, that the relationship between sexual harassment and negative work outcomes is due primarily to the fact that organizational context influences both victimization and negative work outcomes (see Hulin, Fitzgerald, & Drasgow, 1996, for a similar argument). This is a strong possibility given that research on job stress, worker commitment, and job satisfaction has consistently documented links between organizational context and these negative work outcomes (see Meyer & Allen, 1997; Spector, 1997). Moreover, Hulin et al.’s (1996) recent research suggests that organizational context, conceptualized in terms of climates that are specific to sexual harassment, accounts for more variance in the negative work outcomes of job stress and job withdrawal than does reported sexual harassment (see also Glomb et al., 1999). Our objective, then, is to propose and estimate a model of sexual harassment (operationalized as worker perceptions that sexual harassment is a problem for them) that takes into consideration both its causes and its consequences. In laying out and estimating this model, we extend research on sexual harassment in two important ways.

First, we broaden the definition of organizational context in our discussion of the causes of sexual harassment. Research on the causes of sexual harassment has traditionally conceptualized organizational context in reference to sexual harassment–specific features of organizations, including whether or
not an organization has policies regarding sexual harassment and/or the level of sexual harassment tolerance in the workplace. Along with these important contextual factors, we propose that organizational features that have not been designed specifically to target sexual harassment may also be important for understanding the likelihood of harassment. Specifically, we propose that modern organizational structures, which represent rational, employer-initiated control strategies designed to increase productivity and reduce turnover (e.g., Edwards, 1979; Hodson, 1999; Lincoln & Kalleberg, 1990; Marsden, Cook, & Kalleberg, 1996), are important for understanding not only productivity and turnover but also sexual harassment. In other words, modern organizational structures may have both anticipated (reduced turnover and increased productivity) and unanticipated (reduced sexual harassment) consequences. 

The second way in which we extend existing research is by assessing whether the relationships between organizational context, individual characteristics, and sexual harassment operate similarly for women and men. Existing research has focused primarily on uncovering the roots of sexual harassment for female employees because women are the most likely victims of such harassment. Nonetheless, some men experience sexual harassment in the workplace (see Berdahl, Magley, & Waldo, 1996; Gutek, 1985). Thus, it is important to understand whether the causes and consequences of sexual harassment are similar for women and men. We propose that the process leading to harassment is likely to be similar or sex neutral in some ways but different or sex specific in others. Specifically, we propose that the relationship between sexual harassment and individual characteristics is likely to be sex specific, as is the relationship between victimization and some of our measures of organizational context that are linked to male and female power differentials. The causal relationship between sexual harassment and the more general organizational context that we introduce here, however, is likely to generalize to both women and men. This is because these general contextual factors do not necessarily invoke power differentials that disadvantage women.

In the sections to follow, we first review literature on the determinants of sexual harassment. We then develop an argument for how features of modern organizational control unintentionally reduce harassment. In each section, we derive hypotheses that we then test separately for women and men using both ordered logit and ordinary least squares regression on a sample of employees from a national telecommunications company.
PREDICTING SEXUAL HARASSMENT VICTIMIZATION

Existing research on sexual harassment suggests that the likelihood of victimization varies across different individuals and different organizational contexts. The individuals who unequivocally have been shown to be most prone to sexual harassment are young, unmarried women (see De Coster et al., 1999; Fain & Anderton, 1987; Gutek, 1985). Additionally, there is evidence to suggest that women with greater organizational tenure and higher levels of education are at greater risk for sexual harassment (see De Coster et al., 1999; Tangri, Burt, & Johnson, 1982). The power-threat interpretation for these findings suggests that highly educated women, women with greater tenure, single women, and young women are likely to be viewed as status seeking and thereby a threat to traditional male authority (see De Coster et al., 1999; see also Gartner & McCarthy, 1991; and O’Brien, 1991, for similar arguments applied to femicide, rape, and other violent assaults against women). Thus, the women most likely to be harassed are those who threaten traditional male authority. We propose that this power-threat explanation for understanding sexual harassment victimization applies only to women and not to men because it invokes important structural and interactional power differentials between the sexes. Consistent with this proposition, researchers typically have not assessed the relationship between individual characteristics and harassment for men. Overall, then, we propose the following hypothesis about the relationship between individual characteristics and harassment:

Hypothesis 1: Women with greater tenure, single women, highly educated women, women in authority positions, young women, and non-minority-status women are more likely to be victims of sexual harassment than other women (because they are more likely to be viewed as threats to male authority).

Along with these individual characteristics, research on sexual harassment suggests that organizational context and job characteristics are important for predicting the likelihood of victimization. Indeed, proponents of organizational models of sexual harassment propose that organizational context is more important for understanding victimization than individual characteristics (see Fitzgerald et al., 1995; Glomb et al., 1999). The organizational contextual factors and job characteristics that have been the focus of research on sexual harassment include organizational climate and job-gender context (Fitzgerald et al., 1995; Fitzgerald, Drasgow, Hulin, Gelfand, &
Organizational climate refers specifically to environmental tolerance of sexual harassment, the implementation of policies or procedures to combat sexual harassment, and/or the perceived commitment of organizational officials to handling harassment problems (Gruber, 1998). Research findings consistently demonstrate that these contextual variables play an important role in reducing the chances of victimization for women (Glomb et al., 1999; Gruber, 1998; Pryor et al., 1995). Although existing research has not examined the effects of organizational context on male victimization, it is likely that these general organizational variables will reduce the likelihood of male sexual harassment because they are not sex specific, nor do they invoke power differentials between the sexes. As such, the second hypothesis we derive from sexual harassment research is as follows:

Hypothesis 2: Tolerance of sexual harassment in an organization will increase the likelihood of sexual harassment victimization for both men and women.

Along with environmental tolerance, research has suggested that job-gender context is an important environmental/contextual predictor of sexual harassment. The main features of job-gender context include the ratio of men to women in a work group and the gendered nature of jobs (Fitzgerald et al., 1995; Gutek, 1985; Gutek & Morasch, 1982; Hulin et al., 1996). Gutek, Cohen, & Konrad (1990) proposed a contact hypothesis for the relationship between sexual harassment and sex ratios in work groups. This sex-specific hypothesis suggests that harassment increases as contact with the opposite sex increases. Consistent with this hypothesis, research has demonstrated that women in male-dominated environments are more likely to be sexually harassed than women in female-dominated and/or gender-integrated environments (De Coster et al., 1999; Gutek & Cohen, 1985; Gutek & Morasch, 1982).

Although existing research has not examined the relationship between the sex ratios of work groups and male sexual harassment, a literal interpretation of the contact hypothesis might suggest that men should experience harassment more often in female-dominated work groups than in male-dominated or gender-integrated work groups. However, given that structural power differentials between the sexes are at the heart of this hypothesis and that the power dynamics are very different for a woman in a male-dominated work group than for a man in a female-dominated work group (Johnson, 1994), this literal interpretation is unlikely to apply. Thus, we derive only the following hypothesis about women:
Hypothesis 3: Women in male-dominated work groups will be more likely to be sexually harassed than women in female-dominated or gender-integrated work groups.

The next feature of job-gender context is the gendered nature of jobs, which refers specifically to whether a job is gender traditional, nontraditional, or integrated (see Gutek & Morasch, 1982). Research has demonstrated rather consistently that women in nontraditional or male-dominated occupations are more vulnerable to sexual harassment than those in either integrated or traditional occupations (see De Coster et al., 1999; Glomb et al., 1999). The explanation that has been offered for this relationship derives from the power-threat hypothesis discussed above. The suggestion is that women in male-dominated occupations may be viewed as challenging traditional convention and/or power structures that have typically benefited men. As is the case with sex ratios in work groups and with individual characteristics, the relationship between the gendered nature of jobs and sexual harassment is likely to be sex specific, applying only to women. In short, research on job-gender contexts suggests the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 4: Women in male-dominated occupations (or nontraditional occupations) will be more likely to be sexually harassed than women in traditional or gender-integrated occupations.

Overall, research on the causes of sexual harassment victimization identifies individual characteristics, organizational context, and job characteristics as important predictors of victimization. We advance this general model of the causes of victimization by extending the conceptualization of organizational context beyond harassment-specific contexts, such as environmental tolerance of sexual harassment. To do this, we draw on organizational research on social control in modern organizations.

STRUCTURE AND SOCIAL CONTROL
IN MODERN ORGANIZATIONS

The crux of our argument is that the organizational context that is relevant to understanding sexual harassment is much broader than simply programs and/or policies directly targeted at reducing the harassment. In fact, workplace features that are not aimed at targeting sexual harassment may combine with explicit policies and/or programs to reduce harassment in the workplace. The specific features of organizations we focus on are those that have been identified in the organizational literature on modern methods of worker
Theories of modern methods of employer control of workers suggest that employers rely on indirect rather than coercive strategies of control in the workplace (e.g., Edwards, 1979; Hodson, 1999; Lincoln & Kalleberg, 1990; Marsden et al., 1996; Osterman, 1994). The general argument suggests that the social control of employees by employers has moved away from direct (and coercive) supervisory control and machine or technical control (Edwards, 1979) toward a more corporatist form whereby organizational structures are introduced to enhance employees’ job satisfaction and commitment to an organization and to cultivate a sense of community in the workplace. The satisfied and committed workers who are produced by this type of control are expected in turn to be more self-directed, cooperative, and motivated to work on their organization’s behalf. As a consequence, productivity is expected to be high, and turnover is low when this type of indirect control is used.

In discussing these modern, indirect methods of employer control, Lincoln and Kalleberg (1990) identified four structural properties of organizational context that are supposed to produce increased satisfaction and commitment. These structural properties include (a) social integration, such that employees are socialized into a strong organizational culture of coworker support, which produces expressive social relations among employees that extend beyond the workplace; (b) structural differentiation, whereby individual mobility associated with internal job ladders is facilitated; (c) decentralization in decision making, which results in a sense of employee autonomy and a perception of partnership in running the company; and (d) formalization and legitimacy, whereby order is maintained in the firm through a system of rules and procedures that protect employee rights and that delineate obligations in an impersonal and legitimate manner. Research has supported the argument that these structural properties of organizations play an important role in increasing job satisfaction and organizational commitment and in reducing turnover (Lincoln & Kalleberg, 1990; Marsden et al., 1996; Mueller, Boyer, Price, & Iverson, 1994; Wallace, 1995). In short, these factors benefit organizations by controlling turnover and creating employee integration, commitment to the organization, and employee job satisfaction.

We extend organizational research by suggesting that these modern methods of employer control benefit organizations by also controlling the unprofessional behavior of sexual harassment in the workplace. Specifically, we propose that social integration, structural differentiation, decentralized decision making, and formalization are likely to reduce harassment because individuals and coworkers in organizations characterized by these factors feel
empowered and/or committed to protecting one another and/or themselves from sexual harassment. Moreover, employees in these organizations will feel that they have a stake in not sexually harassing fellow employees. One can see these mechanisms play out in several ways. First, employees who are socially integrated into a strong culture that produces expressive social relations among one another may feel compelled to protect one another from sexual harassment (see De Coster et al., 1999). Second, structural differentiation is likely to control sexually harassing behaviors because employees know that unprofessional behaviors such as sexual harassment may hinder their internal mobility potential. Finally, decentralization and formalization are likely to reduce harassment because individuals feel empowered to protect themselves and their fellow coworkers from sexual harassment. Individuals are likely to feel such empowerment because they feel a sense of partnership in contributing to the company and because formal rules are in place to protect their rights, even though these rules are not necessarily specific to sexual harassment. Overall, then, our prediction is formalized as follows:

**Hypothesis 5:** The structural work conditions specified by the model of modern methods of organizational control, including social integration, structural differentiation, decentralization in decision making, and formalization, will reduce the likelihood of sexual harassment victimization for both women and men.

**THE CONSEQUENCES OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT VICTIMIZATION**

Although organizational research has documented strong links between the organizational variables just discussed and negative work outcomes (e.g., Hom & Griffeth, 1995; Meyer & Allen, 1997; Spector, 1997), research on sexual harassment has not considered these organizational variables when assessing the relationship between harassment and work outcomes. This is somewhat surprising given that both organizational research and research on the consequences of sexual harassment focus on the same dependent variables, namely, work outcome variables such as job satisfaction, intention to quit, and job stress.

Existing research on sexual harassment and work outcomes has demonstrated that individuals who are sexually harassed are likely to experience diminished job satisfaction, loss of motivation for work, job stress, and loss of commitment to work, among several other negative outcomes (see Crull, 1982; DiTomaso, 1989; Fitzgerald et al., 1995; Glomb et al., 1999; Gutek & Koss, 1993). Much of this research, however, has not taken organizational
context into account when documenting these relationships. We argue that
the relationship between sexual harassment and work outcomes can be better
understood by considering the organizational context in which both occur.
Indeed, Hulin et al. (1996) reported that organizational context, conceptual-
ized in terms of job-gender context and climates specific to sexual harass-
ment, accounts for more variance in job stress and job withdrawal than does
sexual harassment. Consistent with this empirical evidence, Fitzgerald et al.
(1997) considered both organizational context and harassment as predictors
of negative work outcomes in their specification of a sequential model con-
sisting of the following links: (a) Organizational context, including job-
gender context and organizational climates specific to sexual harassment,
influences sexual harassment; and (b) sexual harassment in turn influences
the work outcomes of work withdrawal and job withdrawal (see also Glomb
et al., 1999).

We propose that broadening the definition of organizational context to
include the contextual variables that have been at the center of organizational
research on work outcomes (i.e., variables from modern models of organiza-
tional control) may require some alterations to this sequential chain. Spe-
cifically, we propose that organizational context, including job-gender con-
text, organizational climates specific to sexual harassment, and the structural
work conditions specified by the model of modern organizational control,
influence both sexual harassment and negative work outcomes directly, thus
helping account for the reported relationship between harassment and nega-
tive work outcomes (see Figure 1, which is discussed in more detail below).
Consistent with this, our final hypothesis is as follows:

Hypothesis 6: The relationship between sexual harassment victimization and the
work outcomes of job satisfaction, intention to quit, and job stress can be
explained by organizational context, including job-gender context, organiza-
tional climates specific to sexual harassment, and the structural work condi-
tions specified by the model of modern methods of organizational control.

DATA, MEASURES, AND METHODS

DATA

We use data collected in 1993 from a national company in the U.S. tele-
phone industry. This organization is a prototype high-performance work
organization (HPO). It came into existence in the 1980s along with many
other fledgling organizations in the telecommunications industry. It never did
have the traditional bureaucratic structure claimed for pre-HPO organi-
zations. From the beginning, it had a lean management structure, one in which management was constantly challenged to meet goals and to innovate in the very competitive telecommunications industry and one in which employees were empowered to help meet these goals.

Across approximately 200 physical locations of the company, a total of 6,485 employees (3,316 women and 3,169 men) responded to a questionnaire developed and administered by an outside research organization. This represents a 98% response rate.$^{10}$

This data set is especially suited for assessing our arguments because it contains information on organizational context, individual characteristics, sexual harassment victimization, and negative work outcomes. Moreover, the same data were used recently to study the relationships between individual characteristics, some of the contextual variables we discuss, and sexual harassment (see De Coster et al., 1999). We go beyond this recent study by incorporating a broader definition of organizational context, by assessing the relationship between sexual harassment and negative work outcomes, and by focusing on both female and male experiences of harassment. Because we hypothesize that some of the predictors of sexual harassment victimization are sex specific, we present analyses separately for women and men. The respective listwise deletion numbers of cases are 3,101 women and 2,694 men. Descriptive data for the variables in the study are given in Table 1.

MEASURES

Figure 1 depicts a model of the relationships we assess in this research. The figure consists of five blocks of variables: (a) individual characteristics that we expect to influence both sexual harassment and work outcomes; (b) organizational-level predictors of sexual harassment derived from previous research on the causes of sexual harassment; (c) organizational-level predictors of sexual harassment derived from organizational research on modern methods of organizational control; (d) sexual harassment; and (e) work outcomes, including job stress, intention to quit, and job satisfaction.$^{11}$

The individual characteristics in the model include age, education, organizational tenure, marital status, race, and managerial status. These variables are included in the model because they have been shown to influence sexual harassment for women (see De Coster et al., 1999; Fain & Anderton, 1987; Gutek, 1985; Tangri et al., 1982). Additionally, these individual characteristics are systematically included in the organizational social control literature for statistical control purposes to ensure unbiased estimates of the organizational structural characteristics on work outcomes (e.g., Lincoln &
Kalleberg, 1990). Descriptions of these measures can be found in the Appendix.

The organizational context variables are separated into two sets: those that have been considered in previous sexual harassment research and those that we have derived from the organizational literature on work outcomes. The contextual variables from the harassment literature include job-gender context and organizational climates specific to sexual harassment. In addition, we include location size as a control variable because previous research

### TABLE 1: Descriptive Data for Sample: Female and Male Employees (N = 5,795)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women (n = 3,101)</td>
<td>Men (n = 2,694)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>15.714</td>
<td>3.511</td>
<td>15.977</td>
<td>3.467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job stress</td>
<td>8.432</td>
<td>2.852</td>
<td>8.702</td>
<td>2.739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to quit</td>
<td>7.134</td>
<td>3.017</td>
<td>7.490</td>
<td>3.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual harassment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very high harassment</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High harassment</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral harassment</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low harassment</td>
<td>0.393</td>
<td>0.489</td>
<td>0.373</td>
<td>0.484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very low harassment</td>
<td>0.528</td>
<td>0.499</td>
<td>0.590</td>
<td>0.492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing on harassment question</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>31.505</td>
<td>7.616</td>
<td>32.926</td>
<td>8.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>14.500</td>
<td>1.690</td>
<td>15.03</td>
<td>1.650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>31.600</td>
<td>28.090</td>
<td>31.700</td>
<td>28.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>0.493</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0.579</td>
<td>0.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White race</td>
<td>0.838</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td>0.832</td>
<td>0.374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>0.164</td>
<td>0.370</td>
<td>0.288</td>
<td>0.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job-gender context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage men (location)</td>
<td>0.372</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>0.538</td>
<td>0.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage men (occupation)</td>
<td>0.429</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.598</td>
<td>0.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerant sexual harassment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.819 0.857</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.858 0.805</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location size</td>
<td>130.972</td>
<td>141.071</td>
<td>121.208</td>
<td>144.570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern organizational control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>15.366</td>
<td>3.340</td>
<td>15.572</td>
<td>3.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworker support</td>
<td>15.492</td>
<td>3.614</td>
<td>15.434</td>
<td>3.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor support</td>
<td>19.320</td>
<td>4.346</td>
<td>19.691</td>
<td>4.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion opportunity</td>
<td>10.591</td>
<td>2.694</td>
<td>10.532</td>
<td>2.689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive justice</td>
<td>13.804</td>
<td>4.171</td>
<td>13.739</td>
<td>3.964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formalization</td>
<td>15.254</td>
<td>2.973</td>
<td>15.125</td>
<td>2.840</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
suggests that work locations with many employees produce anonymity, which may allow for more sexual harassment (De Coster et al., 1999). Consistent with previous harassment research, job-gender context is tapped by the percentage of men in a work location and by the percentage of men in an occupation (Hulin et al., 1996; Fitzgerald et al., 1995; Gutek, 1985). These variables capture the two important dimensions of job-gender context, namely, the sex ratio of work groups and the gendered nature of jobs. Organizational climate is measured by the availability of information on how to resolve sexual harassment problems. This is similar to sexual harassment literature measures of policies for resolving or dealing with sexual harassment in the workplace. When individuals report that resolution information is readily available, the organizational climate is coded as being less tolerant of sexual harassment than when individuals report that such information is not readily available. Finally, location size is measured by the number of employees in a work location.

---

**Figure 1: Organizational Context and Sexual Harassment Victimization**
The next block of organizational context variables captures the structural features of organization discussed in theories of modern methods of employer control of workers. Coworker and supervisor support capture social integration, autonomy captures worker participation, promotion opportunity captures mobility/career development, and formalization and distributive justice capture formalization/legitimacy. These are standard indicators used by other researchers who have linked modern social control factors with negative work outcomes (see Lincoln & Kalleberg, 1990; Mueller et al., 1994; Wallace, 1995).

The next variable in our model is sexual harassment victimization. In the sexual harassment literature, sexual harassment victimization has been measured in various ways (Arvey & Cavanaugh, 1995), ranging from self-reports of whether or not employees have experienced sexual attention in the workplace to company reports of how many individuals have made formal complaints of harassment. Following De Coster et al. (1999), we measure sexual harassment with a single self-report item: “Sexual harassment is not a problem for me at work.” The response categories on the Likert-type scale (with the percentages responding in parentheses) are strongly agree (52.8% female, 59.0% male), agree (39.3% female, 37.3% male), neutral (4.3% female, 2.5% male), disagree (2.2% female, 0.6% male), strongly disagree (1.0% female, 0.4% male), and no response (0.3% female, 0.1% male). These data show that the vast majority of men and women do not consider sexual harassment to be a workplace problem for them in this organization. This distribution appears low relative to past self-report estimates of sexual harassment prevalence. Saunders (1992) reported a 17% prevalence rate among women when only harassment by supervisors was included, whereas Gutek (1989) reported a rate of 50% when coworker harassment was also included. However, our measure is different from others because it relies on a person’s perception that the harassment is a problem. The fact that our measure of harassment taps perceptions that sexual harassment is a problem at work allows us to deal with problems that have arisen in prior research that focused on both men and women as victims of sexual harassment. Studies indicate that social-sexual behaviors in the workplace have different subjective meanings for men and women (see Berdahl et al., 1996; Garlick, 1994; Gutek et al., 1990). Specifically, studies demonstrate that women are more likely than men to view social-sexual behaviors at work as harassing behaviors. Because men and women perceive different behaviors as harassing, it is difficult to use typical, objective measures of sexual harassment such as the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (Fitzgerald et al., 1995) when studying the causes and consequences of sexual harassment for both men and women. Using individual perceptions of harassment as a problem helps us deal with this issue by
avoiding differences between men and women in the types of objective behaviors that are viewed as harassing versus those that are viewed as not harassing. Rather than tapping the different types of objective behaviors men and women have experienced, we assess whether or not individuals perceive sexual harassment at work to be a problem. The cross-sex validity of this measure is demonstrated by the fact that women (3.2%) were more than 3 times as likely as men (1.0%) to agree or strongly agree that sexual harassment is a problem. Finally, De Coster et al. (1999) provided additional arguments for the validity of this perceptual measure.\

The final variables in our model are the work outcome variables. Consistent with both the organizational and sexual harassment literatures, we examine job satisfaction, job stress, and intention to quit the organization as work outcomes. Job satisfaction is the degree to which an employee likes his or her job (Locke, 1969). Job stress is the degree of anxiety and tension associated with one’s job (see Hodson & Sullivan, 1995). Finally, intention to quit is the negative version of what Halaby (1986) referred to as rational, affectively neutral commitment to the organization (see Mueller, Wallace, & Price, 1992). All three variables are tapped by multiple-indicator scales with high reliabilities (see the Appendix).

It is important to emphasize that although these work outcomes are represented in Figure 1 as causally subsequent to sexual harassment, our argument is that both victimization and these outcomes are consequences of the exogenous variables in our model. Put another way, we are not arguing that sexual harassment is a critical mediator of exogenous effects. Consistent with the research we reviewed above, we expect that most of these features of organizational control will have direct effects on the three outcomes.

LOGIC OF ANALYSIS

In our analyses, we first establish the links between perceptions of sexual harassment and the factors we have identified as determinants of harassment victimization: individual characteristics of victims, the sexual harassment–specific contextual factors, and the more general contextual modern social control factors. We conduct this analysis in two stages. First, we regress sexual harassment on the predictor variables derived from previous research on sexual harassment to demonstrate that our findings are consistent with previous research that has used objective measures of harassment victimization rather than perceptions of such victimization. The hypotheses derived from previous sexual harassment research are Hypotheses 1 through 4, and
Figure 1 depicts these paths with dotted lines directed toward perceptions of sexual harassment. Next, we include our measures of organizational context derived from research on modern methods of employer control of employees. This allows us to test Hypothesis 5 and our more complete model of the causes of sexual harassment (and hence perceptions of such victimization), which is depicted by the solid lines directed toward perceptions of sexual harassment in Figure 1.

Because perceptions of sexual harassment victimization is a highly skewed ordinal rather than an interval-level variable, we estimate ordered logit models (Long, 1997) to assess these relationships. Our purpose is to demonstrate that (a) our findings match those of previous research on sexual harassment when we look at individual characteristics and organizational context specific to sexual harassment and (b) the structural features of the organizations discussed in theories of modern methods of employer control of workers have the unintended yet beneficial effect of reducing sexual harassment.

We continue our analyses by focusing on the negative work outcomes of job satisfaction, job stress, and intention to quit. We conduct this portion of the analysis in three steps. First, we establish the zero-order relationship between perceptions of sexual harassment and negative work outcomes. Next, we include variables derived from previous research on harassment victimization in our regression equation. With this equation, we expect to find that individual characteristics, sexual harassment–specific contexts, and perceptions of sexual harassment combine to influence negative work outcomes (see the dotted paths in Figure 1). Finally, we include our modern methods of employer control variables in this equation. This allows us to test Hypothesis 6, which proposes that the contextual variables influence both negative work outcomes and perceptions of victimization. More importantly, we expect the effect of perceptions of victimization on the three negative work outcomes to be reduced substantially in magnitude after the organizational context factors are controlled.

For this part of the analysis, we use ordinary least squares regression with a set of dummy variables representing the different levels of sexual harassment perceptions. We also include a dummy variable for missing data on perceptions of harassment victimization to investigate the possibility that those individuals who did not respond to this question are fearful of reprisal if they report that they perceive sexual harassment to be a problem. For all of our analyses, the equations are estimated separately for women and men because some of our hypotheses are sex specific.
RESULTS

DETERMINANTS OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT VICTIMIZATION

Table 2 shows the ordered logit results for our equations predicting perceptions of sexual harassment for women and men. Equation 1 (Table 2) regresses victimization on individual characteristics and the sexual harassment–specific contextual variables. This equation is derived directly from previous research on sexual harassment. The results of this model demonstrate that women with greater tenure and who are single are more likely than other women to report that sexual harassment is a problem for them at work. This is consistent with Hypothesis 1 and with the power-threat hypothesis (De Coster et al., 1999; Tangri et al., 1982). As predicted, these effects are sex specific: Neither organizational tenure nor marital status influences men’s perceptions of harassment victimization. Although the effect of tenure on perceptions of sexual harassment is not significantly different across sex \((p > .05)\), the effect of marital status on these perceptions is significantly stronger for women than men \((p < .05)\).15

For men, the only important individual-level predictor of perceptions of sexual harassment is education. Specifically, men with higher levels of education are less likely to view sexual harassment as a problem, and this difference is significantly different across sex \((p < .05)\). Taken together, these findings suggest that consistent with our predictions, the power-threat hypothesis applies to women and not to men. However, this hypothesis is not supported when we assess the effects of race, education, and age on female harassment victimization. Perhaps this is because these characteristics select individuals into different types of organizational contexts (i.e., male-dominated occupations and/or locations), which in turn influence perceptions of harassment victimization. If this is the case, we would not detect these effects here because they are mediated by the organizational context variables.

The contextual variables derived from the sexual harassment literature also influence victimization perceptions. Consistent with Hypothesis 2, tolerance of sexual harassment in an organization increases the likelihood that both men and women view sexual harassment to be a problem for them at work. Thus, the influence of this contextual variable on perceptions of sexual harassment is sex neutral, suggesting that sexual harassment intolerance helps provide a safer and less hostile environment for both women and men.16 In addition, women in male-dominated work groups and in male-dominated occupations are more likely than other women to perceive sexual harassment as a problem at work. These findings are consistent with Hypotheses 3 and 4, and the latter finding provides additional support for the power-threat
TABLE 2: Determinants of Sexual Harassment: Female and Male Employees (ordered logit)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Equation 1 Women</th>
<th>Equation 2 Women</th>
<th>Equation 2 Men</th>
<th>Equation 3 Women</th>
<th>Equation 3 Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victim characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age(^a)</td>
<td>-0.053 (0.504)</td>
<td>0.150 (0.565)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.025 (0.519)</td>
<td>0.137 (0.588)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.011 (0.023) (\times 100)</td>
<td>-0.071 (0.027) (\times 100)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.012 (0.023)</td>
<td>-0.090 (0.028)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure(^a)</td>
<td>0.348*** (0.139)</td>
<td>0.188 (0.154)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.226 (0.145)</td>
<td>0.025 (0.162)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>-0.154* (0.075)</td>
<td>-0.076(^b) (0.090)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.157* (0.077)</td>
<td>-0.074 (0.092)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White race</td>
<td>0.021 (0.100)</td>
<td>-0.209 (0.109)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.053 (0.103)</td>
<td>-0.278(^b) (0.112)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>0.005 (0.107)</td>
<td>-0.151 (0.102)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.121 (0.113)</td>
<td>-0.059 (0.107)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job-gender context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage men (location)</td>
<td>0.941*** (0.256)</td>
<td>0.149(^b) (0.230)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.037*** (0.263)</td>
<td>-0.084(^b) (0.238)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage men (occupation)</td>
<td>1.590*** (0.340)</td>
<td>0.264(^b) (0.276)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.456*** (0.347)</td>
<td>0.202(^b) (0.284)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerant sexual harassment</td>
<td>1.090*** (0.046)</td>
<td>1.058*** (0.055)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.980*** (0.047)</td>
<td>0.959*** (0.057)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerant sexual harassment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location size(^a)</td>
<td>0.028 (0.026)</td>
<td>-0.012 (0.030)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.028 (0.027)</td>
<td>0.026 (0.031)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern organizational control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>-0.027* (0.013)</td>
<td>-0.052*** (0.015)</td>
<td>-0.022 (0.014)</td>
<td>-0.036* (0.016)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworker support</td>
<td>-0.036** (0.011)</td>
<td>-0.047*** (0.013)</td>
<td>-0.033 (0.012)</td>
<td>-0.054*** (0.013)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor support</td>
<td>-0.050*** (0.010)</td>
<td>-0.070*** (0.012)</td>
<td>-0.055 (0.011)</td>
<td>-0.067*** (0.013)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion opportunity</td>
<td>-0.078*** (0.016)</td>
<td>-0.077*** (0.018)</td>
<td>-0.052 (0.017)</td>
<td>-0.075*** (0.019)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive justice</td>
<td>-0.011 (0.010)</td>
<td>0.008 (0.012)</td>
<td>-0.008 (0.010)</td>
<td>0.014 (0.010)</td>
<td>0.013 (0.013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formalization</td>
<td>-0.101*** (0.015)</td>
<td>-0.068*** (0.017)</td>
<td>-0.072*** (0.016)</td>
<td>0.042* (0.016)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Standard errors are given in parentheses.
a. The coefficient has been multiplied by 100 to remove leading zeros.
b. The male-female coefficient difference is statistically significant at \(p < .05\).
*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.
hypothesis. As predicted, these job-gender context variables do not influence men’s perceptions of harassment victimization, and the differences across sex are significant for both the gender composition of the work group \( p < .05 \) and the gender composition of the occupation \( p < .01 \). This supports our earlier prediction that these contextual variables would have sex-specific effects. Overall, the relationships reported in existing research on sexual harassment victimization receive general support in Equation 1, even though our measure of harassment is a measure of perceptions rather than one of objective behaviors.

Next, we add our variables that tap modern methods of organizational control to the regression equation. These results are presented in Equation 3 (Table 2). For the most part, the effects from Equation 1 are unaltered, with the exception that White racial status now reduces victimization perceptions for men, and the effect of organizational tenure is no longer significant for women. This latter finding indicates that women who have been with an organization for a longer period of time may be more likely to perceive their coworkers and supervisors as supportive or may be more likely to view the rules of the organization as just and thereby are less likely to experience sexual harassment as a problem at work. The organizational context variables of harassment tolerance, gender composition of work groups, and gender composition of occupations operate the same as in Equation 1, in which the modern organizational control variables were not considered. Thus, the effects of these variables still operate as expected and in ways consistent with Hypotheses 2 through 4.

Hypothesis 5 is also supported in this model. The variables that tap the structural work conditions specified by the model of modern methods of control, including autonomy, coworker support, supervisor support, promotion opportunity, and formalization, each influence perceptions of harassment in the predicted direction for both women and men. Specifically, work contexts that exhibit coworker support, supervisor support, promotion opportunities, and formalization produce less sexual harassment for both sexes, as hypothesized. The expected effect of autonomy is also found for men but not for women, although the difference across sex here is not significant \( p > .05 \). Overall, our results from this model suggest that although modern strategies for controlling employees are not designed intentionally to reduce sexual harassment in the workplace, they seem to have the unintended, beneficial effect of doing so. Moreover, these contexts have an influence on perceptions of harassment victimization that is above and beyond the influence of environmental tolerance or nontolerance for harassment. It is important to note that the effect of environmental tolerance on perceptions of sexual harassment remains significant for both men and women even when these
organizational context variables are considered. This indicates that even though modern methods of organizational control operate unintentionally to reduce perceptions of harassment victimization, sexual harassment–specific policies provide additional protection to employees above and beyond these general contexts. Therefore, it appears that although explicit policies against sexual harassment are indeed necessary and beneficial in organizations and workplaces, the general workplace environment can work alongside such policies to help reduce harassment victimization.

**DETERMINANTS OF WORKPLACE OUTCOMES**

In the next series of analyses, we assess the relationship between individual characteristics, organizational context, perceptions of sexual harassment, and work outcomes. This allows us to assess our hypothesis that the relationship between sexual harassment and work outcomes is due primarily to the organizational context that affects both (Hypothesis 6). We examine the relationship between perceptions of harassment victimization and each of our three work outcomes separately below.

**Job Satisfaction**

To assess the hypothesis that the relationship between perceptions of sexual harassment and job satisfaction is due to organizational context, we first assess the zero-order relationship between perceptions of victimization and job satisfaction to document that these variables are indeed related. Given that very high harassment perceptions is the reference category, Equation 1 in Table 3 demonstrates that women in categories of lower harassment perceptions are significantly more satisfied with their jobs. In fact, there is a convincing pattern of increasing job satisfaction with reduced perceptions of harassment victimization. Although this pattern is weaker for men, we note that men who are harassed are less likely to report that they are satisfied with their jobs.

Equation 2 adds the individual characteristics and organizational context variables that have been considered in previous research on sexual harassment, including the degree to which the climate is tolerant of sexual harassment, job-gender context, and location size. The effect of sexual harassment perceptions on job satisfaction is left essentially unchanged for both women and men. This indicates that although victim characteristics and these organizational contextual factors are related to both perceptions of sexual harassment (Table 2) and job satisfaction (Table 3), they do not account fully for the relationship between job satisfaction and perceptions of sexual harassment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Equation 1</th>
<th>Equation 2</th>
<th>Equation 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual harassment^a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High harassment</td>
<td>1.917**</td>
<td>0.523</td>
<td>1.717*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.723)</td>
<td>(1.316)</td>
<td>(0.709)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral harassment</td>
<td>1.759**</td>
<td>0.802</td>
<td>1.540*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.667)</td>
<td>(1.092)</td>
<td>(0.655)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low harassment</td>
<td>2.514***</td>
<td>1.269</td>
<td>2.070**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.607)</td>
<td>(1.019)</td>
<td>(0.599)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very low harassment</td>
<td>4.124***</td>
<td>2.962*</td>
<td>3.435***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.605)</td>
<td>(1.017)</td>
<td>(0.604)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing harassment</td>
<td>4.458***</td>
<td>3.606</td>
<td>4.013**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.339)</td>
<td>(2.189)</td>
<td>(1.315)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age^b</td>
<td>2.729**</td>
<td>3.546***</td>
<td>3.503***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.817)</td>
<td>(0.863)</td>
<td>(0.706)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>–0.044</td>
<td>–0.145***</td>
<td>–0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.037)</td>
<td>(0.041)</td>
<td>(0.032)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure^b</td>
<td>–0.108</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>0.420*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.228)</td>
<td>(0.235)</td>
<td>(0.198)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>0.242*</td>
<td>0.385**</td>
<td>0.209*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.122)</td>
<td>(0.138)</td>
<td>(0.105)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White race</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>–0.306^d</td>
<td>0.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.163)</td>
<td>(0.170)</td>
<td>(0.140)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>1.221***</td>
<td>0.790***</td>
<td>0.479**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.173)</td>
<td>(0.153)</td>
<td>(0.153)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job-gender context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage men (location)</td>
<td>1.212***</td>
<td>0.009^d</td>
<td>1.346***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.422)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.363)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage men (occupation)</td>
<td>–0.939</td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td>–0.572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.556)</td>
<td>(0.429)</td>
<td>(0.477)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerant sexual harassment organiza-</td>
<td>–0.371***</td>
<td>–0.495***</td>
<td>–0.156*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tional climate</td>
<td>(0.076)</td>
<td>(0.085)</td>
<td>(0.066)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location size &amp;c</td>
<td>–1.606***</td>
<td>–2.133***</td>
<td>–1.016*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.431)</td>
<td>(0.453)</td>
<td>(0.372)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern organizational control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>0.210***</td>
<td>0.182***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.019)</td>
<td>(0.021)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworker support</td>
<td>0.065***</td>
<td>0.060**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.016)</td>
<td>(0.017)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the next equation, Equation 3, we add our variables representing the four features of modern organizational control. Each of the variables representing these features of modern organizational control has a positive effect on job satisfaction, which is consistent with previous research in the sociology of work (Lincoln & Kalleberg, 1990; Marsden et al., 1996; Mueller et al., 1994; Wallace, 1995). More importantly, this equation reveals that the effect of perceptions of sexual harassment on job satisfaction is reduced to nonsignificance for both men and women. Thus, when we look at the work outcome of job satisfaction, we find support for Hypothesis 6, which states that the relationship between sexual harassment and work outcomes is due to common causes: the features of the organizational context.

### Job Stress

We next assess the relationship between harassment and the work outcome of job stress. As can be seen in Table 4, the same series of equations is estimated. With one minor exception, the same pattern of results is found for job stress as for job satisfaction. Specifically, there is a significant zero-order effect of sexual harassment perceptions on job stress, with a reduction in job stress as perceptions of victimization decrease (see Equation 1). As with
satisfaction, this relationship is stronger for women than for men. Moreover, this relationship is left unchanged when we include in the model individual characteristics and the contextual variables from previous sexual harassment research (see Equation 2). When the modern control features of organizations are introduced into the model (Equation 3), however, the relationship between perceptions of sexual harassment and job stress is reduced to nonsignificance. This is because the features of modern organizational control influence both sexual harassment and job stress. Again, our findings provide support for Hypothesis 6, which proposes that the relationship between sexual harassment and negative work outcomes can be explained by organizational context, when broadly defined.

**Intention to Quit**

Finally, Table 5 displays the same set of equations for the work outcome of intention to quit the organization. Again, the pattern of results is quite similar to those for job satisfaction and job stress. Equation 1 demonstrates a clear, positive, zero-order relationship between perceptions of sexual harassment victimization and intention to quit for women, and a much weaker but similar relationship for men. When we introduce the individual characteristics and the contextual variables from previous sexual harassment research in Equation 2, this relationship remains significant for both men and women. With the introduction of the modern organizational control variables in Equation 3, this relationship is reduced to nonsignificance for men. However, for women, there remains a significant difference between those who strongly agreed and those who strongly disagreed to the item “Sexual harassment is not a problem for me at work”: Those strongly perceiving sexual harassment as a problem intend to quit more than those strongly perceiving sexual harassment as not a problem. The dramatic reduction in the strength of the effect, however, matches our main hypothesis. Consistent with Hypothesis 6, then, modern organizational control factors serve to unintentionally reduce perceptions of sexual harassment in the workplace, and this accounts for the observed link between sexual harassment and the intentions of men to quit the company and nearly accounts for the relationship between victimization perceptions and intentions of women to quit the company.

**CONCLUSIONS**

The present study makes several contributions. First, by drawing together organizational research and sexual harassment research, this study demon-
### Table 4: Determinants of Job Stress: Female and Male Employees (ordinary least squares regression)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Equation 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Equation 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Equation 3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual harassment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High harassment</td>
<td>–0.392</td>
<td>–0.148</td>
<td></td>
<td>–0.336</td>
<td>–0.256</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>–0.395</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.599)</td>
<td>(1.067)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.582)</td>
<td>(1.034)</td>
<td>(0.545)</td>
<td>(0.977)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral harassment</td>
<td>0.824</td>
<td>–0.523</td>
<td></td>
<td>–0.665</td>
<td>–0.634</td>
<td>–0.012</td>
<td>–0.462</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.553)</td>
<td>(0.886)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.537)</td>
<td>(0.858)</td>
<td>(0.504)</td>
<td>(0.811)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low harassment</td>
<td>–1.725**</td>
<td>–1.368</td>
<td></td>
<td>–1.491**</td>
<td>–1.490</td>
<td>–0.465</td>
<td>–0.719</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.503)</td>
<td>(0.826)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.492)</td>
<td>(0.802)</td>
<td>(0.483)</td>
<td>(0.760)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very low harassment</td>
<td>–2.352***</td>
<td>–1.771*</td>
<td></td>
<td>–2.008***</td>
<td>–1.858*</td>
<td>–0.597</td>
<td>–0.770</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.501)</td>
<td>(0.824)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.496)</td>
<td>(0.804)</td>
<td>(0.469)</td>
<td>(0.764)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing harassment</td>
<td>–3.781***</td>
<td>–0.939</td>
<td></td>
<td>–3.371***</td>
<td>–0.782</td>
<td>–2.206*</td>
<td>0.356</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.110)</td>
<td>(1.775)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.080)</td>
<td>(1.718)</td>
<td>(1.011)</td>
<td>(1.623)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.290</td>
<td>–0.974</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>–0.311</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.670)</td>
<td>(0.700)</td>
<td>(0.629)</td>
<td>(0.665)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.120***</td>
<td>0.161***</td>
<td>0.128***</td>
<td>0.160***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.030)</td>
<td>(0.033)</td>
<td>(0.028)</td>
<td>(0.032)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>1.059***</td>
<td>1.498***</td>
<td>0.881***</td>
<td>1.446***d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.187)</td>
<td>(0.191)</td>
<td>(0.176)</td>
<td>(0.181)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>–0.232</td>
<td>0.165d</td>
<td>–0.202*</td>
<td>0.216d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.100)</td>
<td>(0.112)</td>
<td>(0.094)</td>
<td>(0.105)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White race</td>
<td>0.388**</td>
<td>0.563***</td>
<td>0.450***</td>
<td>0.439***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.134)</td>
<td>(0.138)</td>
<td>(0.125)</td>
<td>(0.130)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>1.162***</td>
<td>0.579***</td>
<td>1.409***</td>
<td>0.664***d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.142)</td>
<td>(0.124)</td>
<td>(0.137)</td>
<td>(0.120)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job-gender context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage men (location)</td>
<td>0.663</td>
<td>0.860**</td>
<td>0.684*</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.346)</td>
<td>(0.288)</td>
<td>(0.325)</td>
<td>(0.273)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage men (occupation)</td>
<td>1.297**</td>
<td>–0.080d</td>
<td>1.248**</td>
<td>–0.166d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.457)</td>
<td>(0.349)</td>
<td>(0.427)</td>
<td>(0.329)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerant sexual harassment orga-</td>
<td>0.133*</td>
<td>0.208**</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nizational climate</td>
<td>(0.063)</td>
<td>(0.069)</td>
<td>(0.059)</td>
<td>(0.066)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location size</td>
<td>–1.443***</td>
<td>–0.008d</td>
<td>–1.765***</td>
<td>–0.382d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.353)</td>
<td>(0.368)</td>
<td>(0.333)</td>
<td>(0.349)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern organizational control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>–0.108***</td>
<td>–0.065***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.017)</td>
<td>(0.019)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworker support</td>
<td>–0.054***</td>
<td>–0.067***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.014)</td>
<td>(0.016)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor support</td>
<td>–0.035*</td>
<td>–0.026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.014)</td>
<td>(0.015)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
strates that organizational contextual factors that ostensibly have no connection with sexual harassment do influence such victimization or at least perceptions of such victimization. Second, it demonstrates that the often found relationship between sexual harassment and negative work outcomes may be explained by these organizational contextual factors. Third, by examining our hypotheses across sex, this study shows that the contextual variables derived from organizational research and some sexual harassment–specific contextual variables are sex neutral in their influence on sexual harassment.

From a sociology of work and organizations perspective, our first finding allows us to reflect back to Merton’s (1957) classic commentary on functionalist theory and the unintended consequences of structural features of any social system (see also Portes’s [2000] address on sociology as analysis of the unexpected). Although we eschew the functionalist tone of Merton’s argument, our analysis is consistent with his conclusions and shows that modern control mechanisms purposely adopted by employers produce more than the anticipated or intended outcomes of increased job satisfaction, lessened stress, and greater intentions to stay with the organization. These modern control mechanisms also reduce sexual harassment victimization in the workplace. We argue that this is for the following reasons: (a) Employees who are socially integrated into a strong culture that produces expressive social relations among them feel compelled to protect one another from
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Equation 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Equation 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Equation 3</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual harassment¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High harassment</td>
<td>–1.790**</td>
<td>–0.108</td>
<td>–1.566**</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td>–0.943</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.605)</td>
<td>(1.146)</td>
<td>(0.599)</td>
<td>(1.129)</td>
<td>(0.547)</td>
<td>(1.001)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral harassment</td>
<td>–1.719**</td>
<td>–0.031</td>
<td>–1.444**</td>
<td>–0.022</td>
<td>–0.681</td>
<td>0.436</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.558)</td>
<td>(0.951)</td>
<td>(0.553)</td>
<td>(0.937)</td>
<td>(0.506)</td>
<td>(0.831)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low harassment</td>
<td>–2.318***</td>
<td>–1.092</td>
<td>–1.922***</td>
<td>–0.845</td>
<td>–0.726</td>
<td>0.436</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.506)</td>
<td>(0.887)</td>
<td>(0.506)</td>
<td>(0.876)</td>
<td>(0.465)</td>
<td>(0.779)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very low harassment</td>
<td>–4.191****</td>
<td>–2.779**</td>
<td>–3.590</td>
<td>–2.415**</td>
<td>–1.911***</td>
<td>–0.586</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.506)</td>
<td>(0.885)</td>
<td>(0.510)</td>
<td>(0.877)</td>
<td>(0.471)</td>
<td>(0.783)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.121)</td>
<td>(1.906)</td>
<td>(1.111)</td>
<td>(1.876)</td>
<td>(1.015)</td>
<td>(1.663)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age¹</td>
<td>1.731*</td>
<td>–0.870*</td>
<td>1.238*</td>
<td>–0.288</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.690)</td>
<td>(0.765)</td>
<td>(0.632)</td>
<td>(0.681)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.202***</td>
<td>0.259***</td>
<td>0.191***</td>
<td>0.223***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.031)</td>
<td>(0.036)</td>
<td>(0.028)</td>
<td>(0.032)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure¹</td>
<td>0.356</td>
<td>0.443*</td>
<td>–0.369</td>
<td>0.238**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.192)</td>
<td>(0.208)</td>
<td>(0.178)</td>
<td>(0.185)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>–0.002</td>
<td>–0.264*</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>–0.223*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.103)</td>
<td>(0.122)</td>
<td>(0.094)</td>
<td>(0.108)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White race</td>
<td>–0.259</td>
<td>0.173*</td>
<td>–0.141</td>
<td>–0.006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.137)</td>
<td>(0.150)</td>
<td>(0.126)</td>
<td>(0.133)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>–0.657***</td>
<td>–0.451**</td>
<td>–0.175</td>
<td>–0.118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.147)</td>
<td>(0.136)</td>
<td>(0.137)</td>
<td>(0.123)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job-gender context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage men (location)</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>0.481</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>–0.117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.356)</td>
<td>(0.314)</td>
<td>(0.326)</td>
<td>(0.280)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage men (occupation)</td>
<td>–0.199</td>
<td>0.331</td>
<td>–0.432</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.470)</td>
<td>(0.381)</td>
<td>(0.429)</td>
<td>(0.337)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerant sexual harassment organizational</td>
<td>0.298***</td>
<td>0.270***</td>
<td>0.150*</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>climate</td>
<td>(0.065)</td>
<td>(0.075)</td>
<td>(0.059)</td>
<td>(0.067)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location Size¹</td>
<td>–0.304</td>
<td>0.168***</td>
<td>–0.714*</td>
<td>0.121**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.364)</td>
<td>(0.040)</td>
<td>(0.334)</td>
<td>(0.036)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern organizational control</td>
<td>–0.114***</td>
<td>–0.081***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>(0.017)</td>
<td>(0.019)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
sexual harassment; (b) structural differentiation controls sexually harassing behaviors because employees know that unprofessional behaviors, such as sexual harassment, may hinder their internal mobility potential; and (c) decentralization and formalization reduce sexual harassment because individuals feel empowered to protect themselves and their fellow coworkers from sexual harassment. Even if one puts a negative “spin” on this form of modern social control and views it as just another ingenious method devised by employers to disguise the exploitation of workers (see Clawson, 1980; Edwards, 1979; and Hodson, 1999), the unintended, beneficial outcome of reduced sexual harassment cannot be denied. Although this is a discovery of unexpected consequences in social life, it is important to emphasize that theoretically, these findings were not unexpected. Based on previous sexual harassment research, which has hinted that organizational factors that are not specifically directed at sexual harassment might reduce harassment victimization (De Coster et al., 1999), we began with the hypothesis that these general contextual variables likely would have the unintended consequence of reducing sexual harassment.

Our second important finding suggests that sexual harassment and negative work outcomes are related because they are the products of similar
Sexual harassment is related to job dissatisfaction, greater job stress, and intention to quit, but this co-occurrence of harassment victimization problems and other negative work outcomes is best explained by the shared, unpleasant work environment in which these problems are generated. Statistically, such a finding is usually interpreted as a spurious relationship and thus not causal. We want to emphasize that sexual harassment is real and that its effects are real. Our research helps in better understanding the total organizational context in which this harassment occurs and affects worker outcomes.

When taken as a whole, these two findings, and the third about sex-neutral effects, have important implications for policy. Our findings show that both environmental nontolerance of sexual harassment and general organizational context operate side by side to reduce harassment victimization for both women and men. This suggests that workplace sexual harassment occurs in a total organizational context, which includes the general day-to-day strategies used to organize work and more specific policies and procedures that indicate to workers that sexual harassment is not tolerated. The fact that these general contextual factors operate similarly for female and male employees suggests that contrary to what many employers may believe, all employees will benefit when a desirable social environment is created and when a proactive stance against sexual harassment is adopted. Although women experience sexual harassment more often than men and also are harassed for reasons that are sex specific and that reflect power differentials between the sexes, the fact that specific harassment policies and more general work contexts reduce harassment victimization for both women and men should be a consideration for organizations and/or corporations when making important decisions about general and specific policies and procedures.

We close with five caveats. First, we studied a national organization with many locations and work units, but it is still only one organization. Moreover, it is one of the new HPOs. Consequently, our findings should be generalized cautiously until additional research on other populations and settings is conducted. The fact that this is an HPO (with empowered employees) appears to explain the generally low levels of sexual harassment perceptions we observed but does not appear to have compromised the data in other ways. For instance, we still detect considerable variation in organizational context variables across work settings, and it is these organizational context variables that explain the sexual harassment–negative work outcomes relationship. Research based on a heterogeneous sample of organizations, however, with more variation on all variables in the model, should provide even stronger support for our arguments.
Second, our measure of sexual harassment victimization is a perceptual measure of the degree to which employees experienced sexual harassment as a problem in the workplace. Note, however, that the empirical findings for estimating models similar to those in existing sexual harassment studies demonstrate consistency between our findings and the findings of previous studies, in which the measures of harassment typically tap objective behaviors. Thus, we believe that our findings are more than suggestive and indeed can inform sexual harassment research more generally. Specifically, our findings should serve as a caution to researchers who examine the relationship between sexual harassment victimization and negative work outcomes without considering the broader organizational context of these problems. We encourage future research that examines our model with objective and behavioral measures of sexual harassment.

Third, our data are cross-sectional, which makes conclusions about causal relationships less certain. For example, it is likely that employees who experience sexual harassment are generally more negative about the organization. Because our measures of the features of modern organizational control are perceptual, these perceptions could reflect (be caused by) these negative orientations. Although we are convinced that our causal ordering is solidly grounded in theory and previous research, this type of data problem points to the need for longitudinal research designs.

Fourth, although we discuss the unintentional consequences of organizational structures throughout, we do not mean to imply that organizations do not intentionally introduce changes designed to reduce sexual harassment. For example, the institutional literature (e.g., Dobbin, Sutton, Meyer, & Scott, 1993; Edelman, 1990, 1992; Sutton & Dobbin, 1996; Sutton, Dobbin, & Meyer, 1994) has demonstrated that organizations react with increased formalization to legal pressures. In terms of sexual harassment, this formalization is designed to “keep the government away” and avoid legal sanctions, but of course, it also actually reduces sexual harassment.

Fifth, the above policy implications are based on the assumption that these particular modern organizational structures and social control strategies will continue to be used by employers. As numerous accounts (e.g., Clawson, 1980; Doeringer, 1984; Edwards, 1979; Jacoby, 1985) have shown, employers are quite good at adjusting their management styles to maintain social control in the midst of changes in technology, union activism, competition, and government involvement. In short, these “high-commitment” and “high-performance” workplaces might be replaced with other forms of control. The economic downturns and increased global competition in the 1980s resulted in considerable organizational downsizing, more flexible employment
relationships, and an increased reliance on a contingent workforce. Recent research (Appelbaum et al., 1999), however, strongly suggests that the modern structures and social control features are not incompatible with organizational success during such times. Nevertheless, it remains to be seen whether organizations will continue to encourage high levels of support, justice, and employee empowerment. If they do not, our research findings suggest that sexual harassment could increase.

**APPENDIX**

**Measurement**

*Sexual harassment victimization* is measured by the respondent’s response to the item “Sexual harassment is not a problem for me at work.” Response categories are 5 (*strongly agree*), 4 (*agree*), 3 (*neutral*), 2 (*disagree*), and 1 (*strongly disagree*). This is treated as an ordinal scale in the ordered logit analysis and as a set of dummy variables for the ordinary least squares regression. The categories in the tables are labeled *very low harassment, low harassment, neutral harassment, high harassment, and very high harassment*.

**Work Outcomes**

*Job satisfaction* is measured by four items: (a) “I find real enjoyment in my job,” (b) “Most days I am enthusiastic about my job,” (c) “I am very satisfied with my job,” and (d) “I like my job better than the average person does.” Cronbach’s alpha is .93.

*Job stress* is measured by three items: (a) “The worries of my job follow me home at night;” (b) “Although my job has some stress, it is not a problem for me” (R); and (c) “The demands of my job interfere with my personal or family life.” Cronbach’s alpha is .79.

*Intention to quit* is measured by four items: (a) “I am quite content to remain employed in this organization” (R), (b) “I would probably be happier at a different organization,” (c) “I would prefer to work somewhere else if I could,” and (d) “If another company offered me a similar job at the same rate of pay, I would take it.” Cronbach’s alpha is .89.

**Victim Characteristics**

*Age* is age in years.

*Education* is number of years of formal education.

*Organization tenure* is the number of months worked in the organization.

*Married* is a dummy variable for marital status, with married coded as 1 and not married coded as 0.

*White race* is a dummy variable for race, with White coded as 1 and non-White coded as 0.

*Manager* is a dummy variable for manager status, with manager coded as 1 and nonmanager coded as 0.
Organizational Context

Job-Gender Context

Percent male at location is the percentage of male employees of all organization employees at the location.
Percent male in the occupation is the percentage of male employees of all organization employees in the respondent's occupation.
Tolerant organizational climate is measured by the item “I know what steps to take to resolve a sexual harassment problem.”
Location size is the number of employees at the location.

Modern Organizational Control

Autonomy is measured by four items: (a) “I have adequate freedom as to how I do my job,” (b) “My job allows me to make most decisions on my own,” (c) “I have a lot of ‘say’ over what happens on my job,” and (d) “I have input on decisions that affect me.” Cronbach’s alpha is .85.
Coworker support is measured by four items: (a) “My work group works well together as a team,” (b) “We successfully resolve conflict within our work group,” (c) “We have good communication between the employees of our work group,” and (d) “The employees in our work group coordinate efforts well with each other.” Cronbach’s alpha is .90.
Supervisory support is measured by five items: (a) “My manager responds to my concerns,” (b) “My manager is accessible,” (c) “My manager genuinely listens to me,” (d) “If I have a problem, I know I can go to my manager for help,” and (e) “My manager takes decisive action when needed.” Cronbach’s alpha is .90.
Promotion opportunity is measured by three items: (a) “I have the opportunity for increased responsibility,” (b) “Our organization does a good job of promoting from within,” and (c) “Our organization effectively communicates job opportunities to its employees.” Cronbach’s alpha is .70.
Distributive justice is measured by four items: “How fair has the organization been in rewarding you when you consider the (a) “responsibilities that you have,” (b) “effort you have put forth,” (c) “demands of your job,” and (d) “work that you have done well.” Response categories are 5 (very fair), 4 (fair), 3 (neutral), 2 (unfair), 1 (very unfair). Cronbach’s alpha is .94.
Formalization is measured by four items: (a) “I have been clearly told what is important about my job,” (b) “I know how I am supposed to do my job,” (c) “Too often it is not clear what I should be doing” (R), (d) “I clearly know how my work will be evaluated.” Cronbach’s alpha is .77.

NOTE: R = reverse coded. Unless indicated otherwise, the multiple-item scales used Likert-type items. The response categories were 5 (strongly agree), 4 (agree), 3 (neutral), 2 (disagree), 1 (strongly disagree).

NOTES

1. Sexual harassment victimization is the complete name for the concept in which we are interested. It refers to what employees experienced. Because this name is lengthy and somewhat clumsy, we often simplify by referring to sexual harassment, harassment, harassment victimization, or victimization. These are meant to be synonyms.
2. Our argument concerning unanticipated consequences of general organizational context is consistent with previous research on sexual harassment that suggests that general organizational context and work group culture are important for understanding sexual harassment (see De Coster, Estes, & Mueller, 1999). General organizational context and work group culture have been argued to influence sexual harassment by (a) influencing whether or not individuals at work will look out for one another and thereby protect their coworkers from sexual harassment and (b) facilitating or hindering an individual’s ability and willingness to pursue formal and informal mechanisms of social control, thereby protecting himself or herself from sexual harassment (De Coster et al., 1999).

3. An alternative explanation for the relationships between age, marital status, and sexual harassment suggests that young, single women simply lack power and that sexual harassment is an expression of male power over these vulnerable and powerless women (see MacKinnon, 1979). However, this explanation is contradictory to the findings regarding organizational tenure and education levels.

4. Gutek and Morasch (1982) suggested that although this may reflect the fact that nontraditionally employed women actually do experience more sexual harassment, it might also simply indicate that these women are more aware of such behaviors.

5. This argument has also appeared under the labels of high-commitment work systems (Fink, 1992; Guest, 1992; Osterman, 1994, 1995) and high-performance work systems (Appelbaum, Bailey, Berg, & Kalleberg, 1999).

6. Organizational formalization used to be viewed from a Marxist perspective as producing alienated, dissatisfied employees. Edwards (1979) was one of the first to emphasize that formalization (bureaucratic control) could actually deflect employee unhappiness with management. Lincoln and Kalleberg (1990) emphasized the legitimacy-producing positive effect of formalization on employee satisfaction and commitment, and Wallace (1995) found positive effects of formalization on organizational commitment.

7. This less coercive and less direct approach to social control, although open to criticism from the radical camp that the employer is still in control, can be interpreted as more “altruistic control” because the employees benefit in several significant ways: increased participation, advancement opportunities, integration into the organization, and satisfaction with their jobs. Even with the recent movement initiated by employers toward downsizing, more flexible employment relationships, and a larger contingent workforce (see Leicht, 1998), this more indirect approach to social control is still prominent in the modern workplace: Employers generally want satisfied and committed employees.

8. Of these four features, only structural differentiation (promotion opportunities) relies on self-interest as the direct motive for not engaging in sexual harassment. The influence of the other three workplace features is premised on the importance of the formation of a sense of community that encourages employee cooperation, participation, and due process in resolving conflicts.

9. Referring to Osterman’s (1994) four core criteria for an HPO, this organization had job rotation and employee problem-solving groups, and it relied on total quality management, with over 50% of its employees involved.

10. On the basis of personal communication with the survey research organization, we determined that the unusually high response rate occurred for three reasons. First, employees were told that data aggregated by work group would be used to identify areas that needed improvement. The employees knew that another survey would be undertaken the following year that would allow them to assess changes in their work groups. Second, management cooperated by scheduling rooms where employees could complete the questionnaire during working hours.
Third, completing the questionnaire was generally viewed as part of being a good organizational citizen in an organization that had a reputation of being “worker friendly.” All of this is consistent with this organization being an HPO, that is, one in which employees are actively involved in decision making and are encouraged to make their complaints and concerns known. The survey, although sponsored by the company, was viewed by employees as another way to become involved and state their feelings.

11. Although our data are cross-sectional, this does not necessarily threaten the arguments we make. The causal ordering between the exogenous variables and work outcomes has been well established in the modern organizational control literature, and it would seem unlikely that an employee’s satisfaction, intention to quit, and/or experiences with sexual harassment would have dramatic effects on such things as the job–gender context and the methods through which employers control and organize work. Organizational structures and control strategies are more likely determined by a combination of efficiency concerns (see Scott, 1998) and institutional constraints (Edelman, 1990; Sutton & Dobbin, 1996). The above review of the “consequences of sexual harassment” supports the effect of victimization on the three outcomes. Our model portrays both victimization and the three outcomes as consequences of the organizational context.

12. At the time of the data collection (1993), a written (and posted) sexual harassment policy for this telecommunications company was part of a new employee’s orientation packet. Some work groups received sexual harassment training, but this was the exception rather than the rule. If someone had a sexual harassment problem, he or she was encouraged to take advantage of a general open-door policy of contacting his or her boss, that boss’s boss, and so on all the way to the president’s office if need be. This was not formalized, however, and in general, the organization was known for low formalization at all levels and across departments. What all of this means is that company sexual harassment policy was standardized and thus a constant for all employees. However, implementation of this policy across locations and work groups could be an entirely different story, and we believe that the measure of employee knowledge (awareness) of this policy and the procedures for resolving complaints taps this variability.

13. De Coster et al. (1999) offered three reasons for their claim of a valid measure. First, the negative wording, with not underlined and in bold, forces the respondent to consider the implications of the emphasized not. Second, as would be expected, men perceived sexual harassment to be less of a problem than women. Only 3.5% of men were neutral, agreed, or strongly agreed that sexual harassment was a problem; this percentage for women was 7.5%. Third, because studies have shown that women may not recognize sexual harassment as harassment per se or may reinterpret harassment perhaps to maintain “just world” beliefs (Stockdale, 1993), most employees likely do not translate sexual harassment experiences into sexual harassment problems. In sum, we have a measure that identifies the smaller number of employees who take the extra step of defining the experiences as a problem, which may be a more valid measure for the purposes at hand.

14. We decided to use a set of dummies for this part of the analysis rather than assume an interval variable or convert it into a dichotomy. This is a measure unique to this study, and we believe that it represents an ordinal scale; using dummy variables to represent the different levels allows for ordinality and allows us to see the pattern. Converting to a dichotomy creates two problems. First, the location of the cutoff for harassment versus not harassment is not at all clear. Second, information is lost when a dichotomy is used. We were curious, however, and did estimate some models with harassment as an interval variable (coded as 1 to 5) and as a dichotomy (using several different cutoffs). The patterns found in our tables are also apparent when these other operationalizations are used.

15. In expressing some concerns about our measure of sexual harassment, a reviewer suggested that the positive tenure effect for women (Table 2) could reflect a cumulative sexual harassment effect rather than being the consequence of others viewing women with tenure as
power threats. Our measure of sexual harassment does not allow us to adjudicate between these two accounts. In support of our measure, however, the same reviewer identified validating data coming from our finding of no effect of managerial status on harassment. There would have been a positive effect if the respondent perceived sexual harassment as a problem for him or her not because of personally experiencing harassment but because he or she supervised employees who experienced sexual harassment.

16. We believe that this probably represents a conservative estimate of the effects of organizational tolerance. Our measure captures employee awareness rather than the actual existence of policies.

17. Equation 2 (Table 2) includes only the organizational control variables and serves as a reference model when evaluating Equations 1 and 3. It shows the robustness of the modern social control factors after controls.

18. The results here also demonstrate that the small number of women who did not answer the question about sexual harassment had the highest level of job satisfaction. This strongly suggests that these women did not refuse to respond because they were victims of harassment and feared reprisal.

19. Only women who did not respond to the sexual harassment question are still significantly different (less stress) than those who reported very high harassment.
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Prominent explanations from the sociological and management literatures are used to formulate expectations regarding group differences in the acquisition of control over monetary resources at work between White, Black, and Latino men. Data from the Multi-City Study of Urban Inequality show a large net racial gap between Black and White men in the odds of controlling monetary resources but no net authority gap between White and Latino men. Workplace diversity, in the form of racial and ethnic heterogeneity between coworkers and supervisors, does not impede the authority chances of White men, but having a female supervisor does. Moreover, consistent with the particularistic manipulation hypothesis, there is evidence that the processes leading to control over monetary resources differ significantly between White and minority men, but the relative strength of support for this hypothesis varies in a manner that represents a clear racioethnic hierarchy in authority opportunities. The implications of these findings for individuals and organizations are discussed.

Particularism in Control Over Monetary Resources at Work
An Analysis of Racioethnic Differences in the Authority Outcomes of Black, White, and Latino Men

RYAN ALAN SMITH
Rutgers University

In the past 20 years, the examination of racial stratification at work, based on analyses of Black and White differences in the attainment of job authority, has emerged as an important area of sociological investigation. This small but burgeoning body of research has broadened understanding regarding racial differences in authority outcomes. For example, on average, Blacks are only half as likely as Whites to have job authority (Kluegel, 1978; McGuire & Reskin, 1993; Mueller, Parcel, & Tanaka, 1989; Smith, 1999; Wilson, 1997); the magnitude of the racial gap in high authority has remained firmly intact for over two decades (Smith, 1999); and Blacks receive a lower
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income return to authority than Whites (Kluegel, 1978; McGuire & Reskin, 1993; Smith, 1999). Such disparities prevail even when extensive controls for possible race differences in human capital investments and structural location in the labor market are considered.

Despite this emerging literature, surprisingly little is known about whether the authority experiences of Blacks and Whites are similar to or different from those of Latino Americans. In particular, researchers have no idea whether the models used to explain the authority outcomes of Blacks and Whites are applicable to Latino Americans. Given the widespread increase in immigration from Latin American countries in the past two decades and the well-documented increase in the multiracial composition of the United States labor force, a pattern that is projected to significantly increase well into the next millennium (Judy & D’Amico, 1997), an extension of the race and job authority literature to an assessment of the authority experiences of Latino men, in absolute terms and relative to their White counterparts, is overdue. Toward this end, two important questions frame the present analysis: (a) What is the magnitude of the net racioethnic gap in authority between White men and minority men? and (b) Are there systematic differences between White men and minority men in the processes that lead to control over monetary resources?

THEORIES OF GROUP INEQUALITY IN AUTHORITY

HUMAN CAPITAL AND STRUCTURAL THEORIES

Early attempts to explain the racial gap in job authority relied primarily on two established theoretical paradigms: human capital explanations derived from neoclassical economics and structural explanations developed from sociology. Human capital explanations of group differences in authority have also been characterized as “individual” or “supply-side” explanations because the variables used to represent the human capital attributes of workers are either directly or indirectly under the control of the individual. Such measures typically include education, work experience, job tenure, training, and the number of hours worked per week (Becker, 1971). Because it is primarily the individual who has control over his or her human capital investments, group inequality in socioeconomic status in general and inequality in authority outcomes in particular are said to flow from differential investments in these human capital attributes. Alternatively, the structural explanation for group differences in authority outcomes takes into account the demand side of the employment relationship. A governing tenet of this
approach is that racial disparities in socioeconomic outcomes flow from the fact that minorities are disproportionately located in marginalized structures of the economy. Such structures are often operationalized at the levels of organizations (Baron & Bielby, 1980), occupations (Jacobs, 1992), jobs (Collins, 1997; Tomaskovic-Devey, 1993), labor market sectors (Beck & Horan, 1978), and even authority hierarchies (Kluegel, 1978; McGuire & Reskin, 1993; Mueller et al., 1989; Smith, 1999; Wilson, 1997). Importantly, it is known that the additive effects of both human capital and structural factors constitute a necessary but not a sufficient condition for fully explaining the Black-White gap in job authority.

In addition to assessments of the magnitude of the racial gap in job authority, researchers have also explored whether the processes that lead to authority systematically differ by race. In this pursuit, the concept of “particularistic manipulation” has been used to explain how and why such processes might differ.

PARTICULARISTIC MANIPULATION IN THE DETERMINANTS OF JOB AUTHORITY

Particularistic manipulation may be defined as a form of in-group preferential treatment whereby in ostensibly meritocratic workplaces, normative modes of minority exclusion from opportunities to demonstrate job-relevant promotion criteria produce racial differences in authority attainment (Kluegel, 1978; Mueller et al., 1989; Wilson, 1997). That is, the particularistic manipulation thesis argues that the processes that usher candidates into positions of authority systematically differ by race. For example, the human capital investments of Blacks as well as their location within the structure of the economy are said to be more determinative of their authority attainment than those of Whites. Why should the formal labor market credentials and structural positioning of Blacks be more predictive of their authority chances? A threefold proposition undergirds the thesis of particularism: First, promotion within authority hierarchies is often based on vague and difficult-to-measure criteria, such as loyalty to the organization, sound character, and leadership potential (Kluegel, 1978; Mueller et al., 1989). Second, identifying prospective authority candidates and taking advantage of opportunities to train subordinates for such positions usually occur during informal modes of social interaction both within and outside the workplace. Finally, relative to Whites, Blacks (and perhaps other minorities) have fewer opportunities to engage in such informal interactions. This means that lacking information about the organizational loyalty, good character, and leadership skills of Blacks when making decisions about whether to promote them into
positions of authority, gatekeepers are forced to rely more heavily on assessments of more observable and easy-to-measure criteria, including human capital credentials (i.e., education, work experience, job tenure, and prior promotional status) and labor market positioning (i.e., location within occupational structures and broad employment sectors). In this vein, particularistic manipulation is not unlike statistical discrimination because both are premised on the notion that Blacks are less likely than Whites to display loyalty and leadership potential (Mueller et al., 1989; Thurow, 1975).

As a subtle form of discrimination, particularistic manipulation may encumber the mobility of Blacks even in organizations that purport to adhere to race-neutral promotion policies (Kluegel, 1978). This suggests that all things being equal, findings regarding the relatively slower rate of promotion for Blacks (Baldi & McBrier, 1997; Greenhaus, Parasuraman, & Womble, 1990; Nkomo & Cox, 1990), the limits placed on their movement into managerial and professional occupations (Federal Glass Ceiling Commission, 1995; Wilson, Sakura-Lemessy, & West, 1999), and their exclusion from authority positions at work (Kluegel, 1978; Mueller et al., 1989; Smith, 1997) may all result from particularistic modes of discrimination.

Within the context of authority research, few direct empirical tests of the particularistic manipulation thesis have been conducted, and none have gone beyond analyses of Black and White men. What little is known confirms the presence of race differences in the processes that lead to job authority (Mueller et al., 1989; Wilson, 1997). Mueller et al.’s (1989) analysis of the 1972 and 1975 waves of the Panel Study of Income Dynamics showed that the determinants of “span of control” and “span of responsibility” differed significantly between Black and White men, and job tenure and work experience were more powerful predictors of authority for Black men than White men. On the basis of these findings, Mueller and colleagues concluded that relative to their White counterparts, Black men get promoted into authority positions on the basis of more “observable, identifiable criteria.”

Additional analyses of how Black and White men reach authority positions (Wilson, 1997) and managerial-administrative and professional-technical occupations (Wilson et al., 1999) underscore two important tenets of particularism: There are race differences in the factors that usher men into positions of authority and upper-tier occupations, and relative to White men, Black men’s advancement into authority positions is more a function of their human capital credentials, paths to promotion, and experience at a similar level in the occupational structure. Overall, this research concluded that the two groups take different paths to authority: Black men traverse a more “circumscribed route” compared with White men.
RELATIONAL DEMOGRAPHY AND THE AUTHORITY ATTAINMENT PROCESS

Within the context of an increasingly diverse workforce, the concept of “relational demography,” drawn from the management literature, provides an additional explanation for possible racioethnic differences in the processes that lead to authority. In the past two decades, managerial scholars and practitioners have been faced with the challenge of how to effectively manage an increasingly diverse workforce. The relational (or organizational) demography literature informs this challenge (Pfeffer, 1983). This approach, which is primarily based on the analysis of work groups, posits that one’s demographic characteristics (e.g., race, sex, age, etc.) in relation to those of others influence interactions between coworkers and supervisors in a manner that mediates a variety of individual- and organizational-level outcomes at work (Tsui, Egan, & O’Reilly, 1992; Tsui & O’Reilly, 1989). That is, similarities or differences in the racioethnicity and gender characteristics of one’s coworkers and superiors may either enhance or decrease one’s workplace experiences. A consistent finding that has important implications for explaining group differences in job authority suggests that heterogeneous group interaction (i.e., workplace diversity) fosters negative workplace experiences and decreased mobility chances (Tsui et al., 1992; Tsui & O’Reilly, 1989). In this regard, two studies are particularly instructive. Tsui and O’Reilly’s (1989) analysis of 272 superior-subordinate group dyads showed a clear association between increasing dissimilarity in superior-subordinate demographic characteristics and the propensity of superiors to perceive demographically different subordinates as less effective, less personally attractive, and more likely to experience role ambiguity. Similarly, Tsui et al. (1992) found that increasing work unit diversity produced lower levels of psychological attachment among group members, with White men experiencing larger negative effects for increased unit heterogeneity than non-Whites and White women. In sum, the relational demography literature suggests that racioethnic and gender diversity differentially affects the workplace outcomes of minority groups and White men. On one hand, workplace diversity may actually enhance the authority outcomes of minorities because they would have more opportunities to interact with coworkers and superiors who share their group identity characteristics (Fernandez, 1975; Kluegel, 1978). On the other hand, workplace diversity may decrease the authority attainment of White men if a critical mass of their coworkers and/or superiors are of different racioethnic or gender identities. According to Mueller, Finley, Iverson, & Price (1999), Whites are not accustomed to working in heterogeneous work settings and may therefore “perceive their authority and access to resources as threatened” (p. 191).
Presaging the relational demography literature, Kanter’s (1977) idea of “homosocial reproduction” suggests that all else being equal, men in positions of authority are more likely to promote subordinate men than women because men dominate such positions and are therefore more likely to advance subordinates who are more like themselves in gender and social background. By way of extending Kanter’s logic to accommodate a broader interpretation of dominant-subordinate group relations, it stands to reason that if having a male supervisor negatively affects the authority chances of women, having a female supervisor may in fact impede the authority outcomes of men. This assumption is consistent with the finding that unit heterogeneity has more of a negative effect on Whites and men than non-Whites (Tsui et al., 1992). However, little is known about the authority chances of subordinate men in general and subordinate White men in particular when women occupy positions of authority at work.

EXPECTATIONS ABOUT THE AUTHORITY ATTAINMENT OF LATINO MEN

The dearth of studies on the authority status of Latino Americans, coupled with few examinations of their experiences in professional and managerial occupations, leaves expectations about their authority attainment difficult to formulate. Latino Americans are a very diverse group with wide variations in their economic, social, and political experiences. Latino American groups include descendants and recent immigrants from Mexico, Puerto Rico, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Colombia, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Honduras, Argentina, Ecuador, and Peru. Analysis of Current Population Survey (CPS) data shows that Mexican Americans who reside mainly in western states averaged wages 21% lower than those of Whites between 1979 and 1989, a disparity that is attributed to youth, English language deficiencies, and lower educational attainment (Trejo, 1997). Other analyses underscore the significance of within-group wage differences among Latinos. According to Browne (1999, p. 5), median annual earnings both ebbed and flowed for all men between 1969 and 1996, but Puerto Rican, Cuban, and “other Latino” men showed steady increases in their wages over this time period, whereas Latino men of Mexican, Central American, and South American descent did not.

Moreover, Puerto Ricans, who represent 10% of Latinos in the U.S., are disproportionately represented among citizens who have comparatively lower levels of education, English deficiencies, and poverty (Cintron-Velez, 1999). In fact, some scholars have compared the overall socioeconomic status of Puerto Ricans to that of low-income Blacks, arguing that Puerto Ricans
too should be counted among the truly disadvantaged in society (Tienda, 1989, 1990). Reimers (1992, p. 30) reported that not only did Latino men’s annual earnings deteriorate during the 1980s relative to their White and Black counterparts, but they earned 6.5% more than Black men leading up to 1984 but earned less than Black men after 1985. However, there is evidence that the occupational and income achievements of Latino men are very similar to those of White men. Stolzenberg’s (1990) analysis of CPS data showed few differences in occupational attainment between Whites and Latinos if Latinos spoke English well and had at least 12 years of education. Similarly, England, Christopher, & Reid’s (1999, p. 155) assessment of National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (NLSY) data showed that Latino men are much closer to White men in mean hourly earnings than either White women, Black men, or Black women.

Like other minorities, the cultural styles and group identity characteristics of Latino Americans working in predominantly White establishments may influence their work outcomes. Some qualitative assessments suggest that Hispanic managers may differ from other groups in the way they approach their work and in their leadership styles. For example, Ferdman and Cortes’s (1992) in-depth interviews of 46 Hispanic managers revealed a preference on the part of Hispanic managers for interpersonal relationships at work, participatory leadership styles, a desire to resolve interpersonal and work-related problems at work openly, and a penchant for completing work assignments even at the expense of violating the formal chain of hierarchical command. However, whether such tendencies enhance or detract from the authority outcomes of Hispanics was beyond the scope of Ferdman and Cortes’s analysis.

What can be expected about the authority status of Latino American men in absolute terms and relative to White men? Some analyses would lead one to expect similarities in the authority attainment of Latino Americans and Whites once important human capital measures are taken into account (Stolzenberg, 1990; Tienda & Lii, 1987). However, the preponderance of evidence suggests that it is logical to anticipate a net racial/ethnic gap in authority between White men and Latino men and some evidence of particularism in Latino men’s authority chances (Chiswick, 1988; Tienda, 1990; Tienda & Wilson, 1992).

Three formal hypotheses structure the analysis presented below. On the basis of prior assessments of the net racial gap in authority between Black and White men and observed socioeconomic differences between Latino men and their White counterparts, I propose the following hypothesis, net of important control factors:
Hypothesis 1: A racioethnic gap in authority exists between White men and minority men.

With regard to the relational demography thesis, I propose that if diversity in the workplace produces larger negative effects for Whites and men than non-Whites and women (Tsui et al., 1992), and if workplace diversity actually improves the authority chances of minority men (Fernandez, 1975; Kluegel, 1978; Mueller et al., 1989), then it is reasonable to expect:

Hypothesis 2: The racioethnic and gender diversity of coworkers and supervisors has more of a negative effect on the authority chances of White men than on those of minority men.

Finally, in line with the particularistic manipulation thesis, I propose the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 3: Racioethnic differences exist in the determinants of authority, and the positive effects of human capital and structural variables on control over monetary resources are greater for minority men than White men.

DATA AND METHODS

The data for testing these hypotheses come from the 1994 Multi-City Study of Urban Inequality (MCSUI; see the Appendix for a complete description of the sample and the variables used in the analysis). The MCSUI involved a multistage, stratified, random sample of Black, White, and Latino respondents from three large, metropolitan cities: Atlanta, Boston, and Los Angeles. The MCSUI provides oversamples of minorities, but to sustain samples large enough to facilitate multivariate analysis, the data from the three cities were pooled. Individuals who were in the military, institutionalized, not currently in the labor force, or younger than 18 years old were excluded from the analysis. These restrictions left 493 Black, 566 White, and 544 Latino men. (For a fuller description of the MCSUI data, see Johnson, Oliver, & Bobo, 1994). The terms Black and African American, Latino and Hispanic, and influence pay and control monetary resources are used interchangeably throughout the article.

DEPENDENT VARIABLE

The dimension of authority examined here assesses whether a respondent had control over monetary resources in the form of authority to influence the
pay of others. According to Wright, Baxter, and Birkeland (1995, p. 414), this is a form of “sanctioning authority” because those who possess it have the capacity to impose rewards and punishments on subordinates. Respondents were asked, “Do you influence or set the rate of pay received by others?” If they answered “yes,” the value of the variable is 1; otherwise, it is 0. It is important to note that for the purposes of this article, the focus is on racial differences in the relative proportion of men with authority to control monetary resources and the proportion of men without such control.

INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

*Personal attributes.* To assess the racioethnic gap in the odds of controlling monetary resources, I include racioethnic dummy variables for Black men and Latino men, with White men as the reference category. Several household characteristics are taken into account, including marital status (1 = married, 0 = not married), whether a respondent had children living in the household (1 = children, 0 = no children), and household size (1 to 12 people).

*Human capital characteristics.* Education is included in all models as measured by a series of dummy variables for college, some college, and high school, with some high school as the reference group. Experience is included as an independent variable because it has positive implications for authority attainment (Kluegel, 1978). Respondents were queried about the number of years worked since leaving school. Also, job tenure, as measured by the number of years worked at the current job, and job training should increase the likelihood of attaining positions of authority. Job training is a dummy variable coded 1 if a worker had had job training and 0 if they had not. The number of hours worked in a given week is positively associated with the acquisition of authority (Smith, 1997), as is whether a man was ever promoted by his last employer. Weekly hours is a continuous measure, and promotional status is coded 1 if a respondent had ever been promoted by a “last employer” and 0 if they had not.

*Structural factors.* Occupational location is likely to influence authority attainment because authority opportunities vary across occupations, and minorities are more likely to be concentrated in occupations that bring with them comparatively fewer opportunities to acquire positions of authority, such as clerical, craft, and service occupations (Kluegel, 1978; McGuire & Reskin, 1993; Mueller et al., 1989; Smith, 1997). The occupational categories are coded as dummy variables representing professional/technical,
managerial, sales, clerical, service, and craft/repair occupations (the reference category). In addition, employment sector, defined in terms of whether a worker was employed in a private firm or not (1 = yes, 0 = no), is included in the analysis because racial disparities in authority and occupational attainment have been shown to be much less acute in public jobs than private jobs (Fernandez, 1975; Wilson, 1997). Also, both firm size and union membership are taken into consideration because of prior findings showing that firm size is associated with the vertical and horizontal complexity of authority structures, and union membership has been shown to have a negative effect on the authority attainment of some men (Kluegel, 1978; Mueller et al., 1989). Firm size is coded as dummy variables for small firms (fewer than 50 employees), medium-sized firms (51 to 500 employees), and large firms (501 or more employees). Union status is coded 1 if the respondent was a union member and 0 otherwise.

Relational demography. The MCSUI data offer three sets of variables that are rarely found in other data but are very important as factors that could potentially influence the authority attainment process of minorities and White men. For the first two, race of most employees and race of supervisor, respondents were asked, “What is the race and ethnicity of most employees doing the kind of work you do at this location?” They were also asked, “What is your immediate supervisor’s race or ethnic origin—would you say White, Black/African-American, Latino, Asian, or something else?” In both cases, the variables are coded as three dummy variables: Black (non-Hispanic), Latino, and Asian, with White as the reference group. Finally, a sex of supervisor variable was constructed on the basis of the question “Is your immediate supervisor a man or a woman?” (1 = female, 0 = male).

PLAN OF ANALYSIS

I estimate a logistic regression model using maximum likelihood procedures. The dichotomous measure of authority assumes the following form:

\[
\log \left( \frac{Pr(\text{influence pay} = 1)}{Pr(\text{influence pay} = 0)} \right) = a + b_{1} \text{racioethnicity} + \sum_{i} b_{X_i},
\]

where \(Pr(\text{influence pay} = 1)\) is the probability of a person having authority to influence the pay of others, as defined above; \(Pr(\text{influence pay} = 0)\) is the probability of a worker not having authority to influence the pay of others; and racioethnicity represents dummy variables for Black and Latino men, with White men as the comparison group. \(X_i\) are blocks of personal attributes,
human capital credentials, structural indicators, and relational demography factors. For a more simplified interpretation of the results, I offer odds ratios ($e^b$) instead of the logit coefficients ($b$). To examine the net racioethnic gap between White men and the two minority groups, two dummy variables for Black and Latino men (with White men as the comparison group) are entered into the equation along with the vectors of labor market credentials discussed above (see Table 2, Model I). A statistically significant odds ratio that is greater than 1 on any of the racioethnic dummy variables suggests that relative to White men, the net marginal odds of gaining access to authority positions that grant men control over monetary resources (versus not having such authority) are lower for the minority group in question (Hypothesis 1).

Finally, models used to test expectations drawn from the relational demography literature (Hypothesis 2) and hypotheses based on the particularistic manipulation argument (Hypothesis 3) are similar to Model I except for three important distinctions: The race dummy variables are omitted, variables representing the racioethnic relational demography factors are added, and logistic regression models are generated separately for each racioethnic group (see Table 2, Models II through IV).

**RESULTS**

Descriptive results of the overall proportion of minority men and White men with the authority to control monetary resources at work are reported in Table 1. There are important differences in the proportion of minority men and White men who control monetary resources at work. Chi-square tests of racioethnic differences in authority between White men (12.3%) and their Black (4.9%) and Latino (7.6%) counterparts are statistically significant. These results suggest a racioethnic hierarchy in control over monetary resources, with White men on top, followed successively by Latino and Black men. (See the Appendix for remaining descriptive statistics of all variables used in the analysis.)

**TABLE 1:** Percentage Distribution of Authority to Influence the Pay of Others by Racioethnic Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Difference From White Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>8.0***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>4.7**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01. ***p < .001.
Table 2 presents the results of four logistic regression models, with control over monetary resources as the dependent variable. Findings regarding the net racioethnic gap in authority, the effects of relational demography, and evidence of particularism in minority men’s authority chances are presented in order.

**NET RACIOETHNIC GAPS IN THE ODDS OF CONTROLLING MONETARY RESOURCES**

Consistent with prior authority studies, the results in Model I of Table 2 show that Black men with similar human capital investments and structural characteristics as White men are only half as likely to control monetary resources at work (odds ratio = 0.518). Importantly, the nonsignificant odds ratios representing the influence of racioethnicity on the odds of Latino men (1.000, ns) controlling monetary resources (relative to their White counterparts) reveal no evidence of a net racioethnic gap between Latino and White men.5

As with prior research, education is an important authority-enhancing characteristic. Model I shows that men who have graduated from college are more than twice as likely as high school dropouts (the reference category) to control monetary resources (odds ratio = 2.119). Not surprisingly, unit increases in job tenure, weekly hours, receiving a prior promotion, working in a professional occupation, and working for private firms significantly improve the odds that men will influence the pay of others. However, two factors appear to significantly decrease the chances of a man controlling monetary resources at work: union membership and having a female supervisor. Men who are union members are about 70% less likely than nonunion men to have authority over the pay of others (odds ratio = 0.30), and men who have female supervisors are about 42% less likely than other men to control monetary resources (odds ratio = 0.58). Although the negative effect of union membership on men’s authority chances is consistent across multiple authority studies (Kluegel, 1978; Mueller et al., 1989; Wilson, 1997), this is the first time that having a female supervisor has been found to impede the authority attainment of men.

**EFFECTS OF RELATIONAL DEMOGRAPHY ON CONTROLLING MONETARY RESOURCES**

Predictions from the relational demography literature suggest that racioethnic diversity in the form of heterogeneity among coworkers and supervisors should have more of a negative influence on White men’s than minority men’s authority chances. The effects of relational demography
### TABLE 2: Logistic Regression Estimates of Odds Ratios for Authority to Influence the Pay of Others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Full Model</th>
<th>Particularistic Manipulation Models</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full White</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0.518*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married (1 = yes)</td>
<td>1.150</td>
<td>2.662**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children (1 = yes)</td>
<td>1.224</td>
<td>1.649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household size</td>
<td>0.977</td>
<td>0.796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>2.119*</td>
<td>3.949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>1.585</td>
<td>3.560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>1.357</td>
<td>3.404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>1.013</td>
<td>1.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job tenure</td>
<td>1.034*</td>
<td>1.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job training</td>
<td>1.033</td>
<td>1.349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly hours</td>
<td>1.031***</td>
<td>1.024*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever promoted (1 = yes)</td>
<td>3.261***</td>
<td>2.304**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional/technical</td>
<td>3.783***</td>
<td>5.888***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td>1.340</td>
<td>1.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>1.219</td>
<td>1.642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>1.356</td>
<td>1.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>1.159</td>
<td>1.464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union (1 = yes)</td>
<td>0.300***</td>
<td>0.120**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (1 = yes)</td>
<td>2.378**</td>
<td>1.721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 to 500 employees (medium)</td>
<td>1.071</td>
<td>1.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501 or more employees (large)</td>
<td>0.913</td>
<td>1.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational demography</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female supervisor</td>
<td>0.580*</td>
<td>0.409*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race of most employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0.385</td>
<td>1.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.898</td>
<td>2.618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race of supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1.176</td>
<td>1.713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1.803</td>
<td>0.441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log likelihood</td>
<td>−502.2</td>
<td>−188.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo-$R^2$</td>
<td>0.221</td>
<td>0.258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1,894</td>
<td>566</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.
indicators in Models II through IV show that workplace diversity has very little impact on the authority chances of men, but when it does, its effects appear to support the relational demography hypothesis. This conclusion is drawn from the effects (and lack thereof) of the vector of relational demography factors shown in Table 2, Models II through IV. Two findings are worth reporting. First, in support of Hypothesis 2, White men who have female supervisors are 60% less likely than White men with male supervisors to control monetary resources (odds ratio = 0.409), a finding that is not present for either minority group. Second, lending some credence to the idea that diversity helps minority workers, Latino men’s odds of controlling monetary resources are increased by 3.5 times the odds of not controlling monetary resources if the majority of their coworkers are Asian American instead of White (odds ratio = 3.547). Latino men are the only group that appears to explicitly benefit from employee diversity.

TESTS OF PARTICULARISTIC MANIPULATION

The question of whether the determinants of control over monetary resources systematically differ between minority and White men is addressed by the blocks of independent variables presented in Models II through IV in Table 2. Importantly, the relative strength of support for the particularistic manipulation thesis varies depending on which minority group is compared with White men. Overall, the significant determinants of authority do differ between minority and White men, but only certain kinds of human capital and structural factors have a greater effect on the authority outcomes of minority men than White men. The following observations sustain these conclusions.

First, as predicted, most of the significant determinants of authority for minority and White men are different. In fact, the positive effects of having received a promotion and working in a professional occupation on authority are the only two factors that all three groups of men have in common. Beyond this, the differences between minority and White men far outweigh the similarities. For example, White men benefit from being married and from unit increases in the number of hours they work per week, factors that do not enhance the authority chances of minority men. Two factors significantly detract from White men’s odds of controlling monetary resources: being a union member and having a female supervisor. Although Model I (the Full Model) revealed that union membership and having a female supervisor detracts from men’s authority chances, Models II through IV shed further light on this finding by showing that such effects are only evident for White and Latino men. For example, being a union member negatively affects
White and Latino men’s odds of controlling monetary resources, and the negative impact of having a female supervisor is only present for White men.

Second, relative to White men, Black men’s formal credentials and labor market location are more powerful precursors to their authority attainment, suggesting that they reach authority positions on the basis of more restricted and circumscribed criteria. In Model III, Black men’s likelihood of controlling monetary resources is improved by nearly 11 times the odds of not controlling monetary resources if they have graduated from college (relative to Black men who have less than a high school education), but the nonsignificant effects on any of the educational measures for White men (Model II) suggest that their net authority chances are far less dependent on their educational attainment. Both Black and White men benefit from having received a prior promotion, but the effect of this variable is greater for Black men, indicating that it is a more important determinant of their authority chances. The benefits of working in a professional occupation are virtually identical for Black and White men, but unlike White men, Black men’s authority chances are significantly improved if they work for private firms (7.243, p < .05). Also, in contrast to Whites, there is something about working in a medium-sized firm, relative to a small firm, that significantly decreases Black men’s odds of controlling monetary resources (0.148, p < .01).

Finally, a comparison of the models for White men (Model II) and Latino men (Model IV) shows that even though Latino men share a wider range of similarities with White men than Black men, there is still some evidence that Latino men reach authority through a comparatively tighter set of restrictions relative to their White counterparts. Specifically, both White and Latino men benefit from receiving a prior promotion and working in professional occupations, but the fact that the magnitudes of the effects of both factors are twice as large for Latino men than White men suggests that these indicators are more important for the authority chances of Latino men than White men. Being a union member significantly decreases the authority chances of both groups, presumably because of the perceived disloyalty associated with this status (Kluegel, 1978; Mueller et al., 1989). Several differences are noteworthy. However, unlike White men, Latino men’s authority chances are not enhanced by unit increases in weekly hours or by being married, nor is there evidence that Latino men are disadvantaged by having a female supervisor.

Overall, despite some similarities, and with varying degrees of confirmation, the determinants of control over monetary resources do differ between minority and White men, both in terms of the separate effects of factors that either enhance or impede the authority attainment process and in terms of the magnitude of the effects of specific human capital and structural variables on the authority chances of men.
DISCUSSION

In this article, I set out to examine the net authority gap between White men and their Black and Latino counterparts, the effects of relational demography indicators on the authority outcomes of men, and whether the processes that lead men into positions of control over monetary resources differ between White and minority men. The findings reported here are consistent with past authority studies based on samples of Black and White men, but by extending this research to examinations of the relative authority experiences of Latino men, knowledge of who gets authority in the workplace and why has been significantly expanded. The interpretation of the findings may be delineated along three main points. First, there is partial support for the expectation of a net authority gap between White and minority men. Black men who are matched with White men on their personal attributes, human capital characteristics, structural location in the economy, and demographic composition of the workplace are less than half as likely as White men to control monetary resources (Hypothesis 1). To my knowledge, this finding has been consistent and robust across all authority studies regardless of the dimension of authority under consideration (Kluegel, 1978; Mueller et al. 1989; Smith 1997, 1999; Wilson, 1997). Importantly, the absence of a net racioethnic gap between White men and their Latino counterparts strongly suggests that the relative strength of racioethnic identity as well as its implications for authority outcomes varies significantly by minority status. Latino men overcome authority differences with White men by equalizing their educational investments (according to supplemental analysis).

Second, in support of Hypothesis 2, there is evidence that workplace diversity decreases the authority chances of White men but does little to enhance the authority prospects of minority men (Mueller et al., 1999; Tsui et al., 1992). There is no evidence that minority men are hurt by workplace diversity. In fact, Latino men appear to benefit from working with mostly Asian employees. But the strongest evidence in favor of Hypothesis 2 shows that White men suffer more from gender diversity, in the form of having a female supervisor, than from racioethnic diversity among coworkers and supervisors. That having a female supervisor impedes the authority chances of White men is especially noteworthy in light of the fact that a full 15% of White men have female supervisors (see the Appendix). In addition to supporting predictions from the relational demography literature, this finding suggests an extension of Kanter’s (1977) notion of “homosocial reproduction,” whereby female subordinates are less likely than male subordinates to ascend the power structure if they have male superiors. One possible
explanation points to the importance of dominant-subordinate group relations as a factor that influences the authority attainment process for not just minorities and women but for White men as well. That is, like minorities and women, White men may be susceptible to similar discriminatory processes or at least to feelings of alienation at work (Tsui et al., 1992) if they are in subordinate positions, if they represent a numerical minority in a given work setting, and if their primary group identity characteristics differ significantly from their superiors. This suggests that not race per se nor gender per se but dominant-subordinate group relations (Blumer, 1958) within authority structures, coupled with a worker’s racioethnic and/or gender identity, combine to generate and sustain group disparities in workplace outcomes.

Finally, I tested the thesis of particularism, which suggests that not only are the overall determinants of authority different for minority and White men, but the magnitudes of the effects of human capital and structural predictors of authority are greater for minority men than White men (Hypothesis 3). Again, the strongest support for this hypothesis comes from analysis of Black men relative to White men. Tighter scrutiny of Black men’s educational credentials, promotional status, and private sector employment is strongly suggestive of particularistic mobility processes. To a lesser extent, particularism is a function of Latino men’s prior promotional status and their location in professional occupations. Finally, the finding that being married serves as an authority-enhancing feature for White men not only underscores the idea that the determinants of authority are different for minority and White men but also corroborates prior research that reports a “marital bonus” received by White men in managerial and professional occupations (Korenman & Neumark, 1991).

CONCLUSION

This study shows that when it comes to gaining access to job authority, a clear racioethnic hierarchy exists, with White men on top and Latino and Black men (in that order) at the bottom. More than any other group, Black men experience discrimination in the authority attainment process, even when they are matched with Whites on all relevant background factors. Researchers who have studied the causes of Black-White differences in the determinants of promotion (Baldi & McBrier, 1997), access to managerial and professional occupations (Wilson et al., 1999), and executive positions (Thomas & Gabarro, 1999) confirm the existence, either directly or indirectly, of this pattern.
Several policy implications and future research avenues flow from these results. First, the finding that prior promotional status is a stronger predictor of minority men’s authority chances is consistent with the idea that minority men have certain limits placed on their access to informal mentorship opportunities. Thus, organizational elites must be encouraged and rewarded for establishing and cultivating informal mentorship ties that cut across race, ethnicity, and gender boundaries. This is particularly important given evidence that the further one moves up the authority structure, the more personal relationships and sponsorship bonds become important (Baldi & McBrier, 1997; Greenhaus et al., 1990; Nkomo & Cox, 1990; Thomas & Gabarro, 1999; Wilson, 1997). Second, the findings here underscore the continued need to guard against institutional forms of prejudice and discrimination that limit even the most talented minorities from attaining authority at work. A formal zero-tolerance policy against discrimination and sustained affirmative efforts to recruit, retain, and promote minorities are obvious solutions. Also, whether under the rubric of diversity training or some other organizational program, proactive efforts will have to be made to raise the level of awareness concerning the negative impact of group identity on workplace mobility. Importantly, the findings here demonstrate that minorities should not be viewed as the only beneficiaries of such programs. Indeed, the fact that the authority chances of White men are significantly decreased if they have a female supervisor is an issue that also falls squarely within the policy domains of workplace diversity efforts. Within this context, the proper design, implementation, and measurement of diversity training programs aimed at eradicating artificial barriers to authority for all workers must be accepted as part of the main human resource functions of an organization.

By all accounts, race, ethnicity, diversity in the workplace promises to increase in the coming decades. Future examinations of race, ethnicity differences in authority attainment should consider additional dimensions of authority beyond what is offered here. Group differences in authority outcomes are likely to vary depending on the type of authority measure under consideration (Mueller et al., 1989). Also, an examination of minority women is needed, especially the dual role that race, ethnicity, and gender play in structuring their authority outcomes (see, e.g., McGuire & Reskin, 1993). Finally, this article has barely scratched the surface regarding the effects of workplace diversity on authority outcomes. What is certain is that the effects of race, ethnicity, and gender diversity at work differentially influence the authority outcomes of workers, but the precise delineation of who is affected, when, how, and in what organizational context awaits future research.
APPENDIX
Sample Characteristics by Racioethnicity for Men: Multi-City Study of Urban Inequality, 1992 to 1994 (means and percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Black (N = 493)</th>
<th>White (N = 566)</th>
<th>Latino (N = 544)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married living with partner (%)</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children living in household (%)</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People in household (mean)</td>
<td>2.4 (1.6)</td>
<td>2.4 (1.3)</td>
<td>3.7 (2.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human capital</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College (%)</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college (%)</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school (%)</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some high school (%)</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total experience (mean)</td>
<td>23.0 (16.0)</td>
<td>24.4 (17.0)</td>
<td>17.0 (12.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job tenure (mean)</td>
<td>6.9 (8.3)</td>
<td>7.8 (8.7)</td>
<td>4.3 (4.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job training (yes) (%)</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly hours (mean)</td>
<td>40.7 (12.0)</td>
<td>44.0 (13.0)</td>
<td>40.6 (11.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever promoted (%)</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private company (%)</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union member (%)</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structural</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional/technical (%)</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial (%)</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales (%)</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical (%)</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service (%)</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft/repair (%)</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Firm size</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer than 50 employees (small) (%)</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>67.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 to 500 employees (medium) (%)</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501 or more employees (large) (%)</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relational demography</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race of most employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (%)</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black (%)</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian (%)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic (%)</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>71.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race of supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (%)</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>50.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black (%)</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian (%)</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic (%)</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex of supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male (%)</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>88.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female (%)</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTES

1. Cox (1993) used this term as a shorthand way of denoting the racial classification of Blacks and Whites and the ethnic classification of Latinos.

2. The MCSUI data also include samples of Asian Americans, but they were omitted from the present analysis because of small sample sizes. The MCSUI data also include samples of respondents from Detroit, but the questions that form the main dependent variable in this study were not asked of Detroit respondents.

3. The small number of men (5) reporting their occupations as “operatives” were collapsed into the craft/repair category.

4. Although a separate analysis of the authority experiences of Asian men is not included in this study, I retain the use of two potentially important predictors of authority: whether a man’s immediate supervisor was Asian American and whether most of the employees doing the kind of work that a respondent did were Asian American. Both variables tap into the degree and type of diversity at a respondent’s place of employment.

5. Further analysis (not shown) reveals a large authority gap between Latino and White men that completely disappears once education is entered into the equation.

6. Consistent with Wilson’s (1997, p. 53) approach, I used log likelihood ratio tests to first establish a basis for comparing blocks of coefficients for White men with those of Black and Latino men, respectively.
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The authors study the effect of unionization on gender wage differentials for production workers in nine U.S. manufacturing industries. They find that the wage gap is significantly smaller in unionized establishments for six of the industries, even after controlling for occupation and establishment gender composition. But this union effect does not hold within three industries. The authors conclude that unionization generally reduces wage inequality between blue-collar men and women, but the effect might be contingent both on the overall proportion of women in an industry and on union characteristics. The authors discuss the implications of these findings for income inequality and union policies.
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Salary differences between women and men in the United States remain substantial, despite the similarity in their skill levels (Blau & Kahn, 1995). The ratio of women’s to men’s earnings, which had been rising since the 1970s, stabilized during the 1990s, with women’s weekly wages representing approximately 76% of men’s (Blau & Ehrenberg, 1997). This earnings gap has been explained by different mechanisms, including human capital and seniority differences between men and women; gender segregation by occupation, firm, and industry; and employer discrimination against women.
Human capital explanations focus on workers’ education and accumulated experience. Because women traditionally have different educational backgrounds, shorter tenures, and more interrupted careers than men, these variables explain part of the wage gap (Blau & Beller, 1988; Gunderson, 1989). Gender segregation across occupations (Sorensen, 1989), industries (Hodson & England, 1986), and firms (Groshen, 1991) accounts for another large component of the gap. The still “unexplained” portion of wage differentials is usually interpreted as evidence of employer discrimination.

Looking specifically at employer-based inequality, one research stream emphasizes organizational characteristics (Baron, Mittman, & Newman, 1991; Reskin, 2000). This work has focused mostly on the negative effect of job and establishment gender segregation on earnings (Huffman & Velasco, 1997; Tomaskovic-Devey, 1993, 1995). For example, Nelson and Bridges (1999), in several case studies of between-job wage differences, concluded that the gender compositions of occupations and the gender of individual employees are more predictive of pay disparities than are market pay rates. Through organizational processes such as hiring and promotion, men and women are allocated to gender-segregated work units or job titles, with predominately female jobs receiving lower pay than predominately male jobs (Bielby & Baron, 1984; Bridges & Villemez, 1994; Maume, 1999). These lower earnings of women relative to men because of gender segregation within employers cannot be explained by lower productivity (Tomaskovic-Devey & Skaggs, 1999) and are not mitigated by employer policies such as formalization of employment procedures (Huffman & Velasco, 1997).

Adding to this research on organizational characteristics, we explore the effects of unionization on wage differentials by gender within nine manufacturing industries. Unionization has rarely entered studies of employer-based gender inequality, except as a control variable (e.g., Tomaskovic-Devey & Skaggs, 1999). This is surprising because perhaps the most important factor influencing wage determination within firms is whether wages are subject to collective bargaining. Statistics indicate that union membership helps raise workers’ pay in general and narrows the income gap that leaves women and minorities at a disadvantage. For example, the Economic Policy Institute (1999) reported that union workers overall earn 32% more than those not in unions. The union wage benefit is most pronounced among women and minorities: In 1998, women in unions earned 39% more than their nonunion counterparts. These statistics suggest the potential relevance of unions in reducing the gender wage gap, but research evidence is scant (Gander, 1997; Nelson & Bridges, 1999).
In this article, we suggest that unionization reduces the gender wage gap for several reasons. First, unions tend to establish wage-setting, bureaucratic procedures that reduce wage dispersion among employees covered by the same collective bargaining agreement, especially those working in the same occupation (Freeman & Medoff, 1984). Therefore, unionization should reduce the wage gap for women working alongside men in the same establishments and jobs. Second, unions tend to reduce wage differentials within establishments, as well as across establishments, on the basis of set pay for specific jobs (Freeman, 1980). This wage homogenization tendency would reduce wage differences between segregated female and male jobs. Third, the management of unionized establishments is more likely to adhere to such bureaucratic wage rules, reducing arbitrariness in wage rates and consequently reducing the potential for discrimination (Cornfield, 1987). Finally, a more direct mechanism through which unions might reduce the gender gap in pay is explicit efforts to restore pay equity, that is, to raise pay in mostly female jobs relative to predominantly male jobs (Acker, 1989).

To examine whether unions help reduce the pay gap between men and women working in similar occupations, our study looks at within-establishment union effects in production jobs, using individual-level data from nine industries. Because collective bargaining takes place at the establishment level, one needs information on both individual and establishment attributes, and such data are difficult to find. The Industry Wage Surveys (IWS) of the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) provide these data. We include in the study nine manufacturing industries that vary substantially in the proportions of men and women employed, from 5% to 92% female. Within each industry, surveys include a representative sample of several hundred establishments and several thousand employees, facilitating the generalization of results to each particular industry and providing a unique opportunity to test the effects of collective bargaining on wages.

These IWS data overcome three important shortcomings common to prior studies of organizational determinants of the gender gap. According to Huffman and Velasco (1997), prior data have (a) concentrated on census occupational categories rather than specific work settings, (b) downplayed organizational attributes, and (c) focused on small samples of establishments in specific labor markets. By contrast, the IWS provide data on manufacturing industries with information on a large proportion of each employer’s workforce and extensive detail on establishment characteristics. Besides unionization, variables include organizational attributes such as region, establishment size, and gender composition. Data on individuals include
detailed occupation and pay method, well-known variables affecting the wage gap.

In sum, our study adds to recent research on organizational determinants of the earnings gap between men and women in several ways. First, we focus on a critical determinant of wages: unionization. Second, we test our hypothesis across occupations, establishments, and industries that vary in the gender composition of the labor force and in the levels of unionization. These features allow a more precise study of the relationship between wage differentials and unionization than other data sets in which employees are not matched with their firms, only a few firms are surveyed, or only information on broadly defined occupations is included (Anderson, Doyle, & Schwenk, 1990; Huffman & Velasco, 1997). Before presenting our results, we elaborate on the theoretical rationale for our proposition.

**EFFECTS OF UNIONIZATION ON THE GENDER WAGE GAP: THEORY AND EVIDENCE**

How does unionization affect the gender gap in pay? Research suggests that wage determination differs in unionized and nonunionized establishments. We look at how these wage determination processes affect gender wage inequality, distinguishing between indirect and direct effects of unions.

**THEORY: INDIRECT EFFECTS**

Indirect effects occur because unions put in place bureaucratic systems that tend to lower pay variation for all employees. First, union policies generally aim to obtain pay equality across and within establishments, standardizing wage levels and thus reducing wage dispersion among workers covered by union contracts (Card, 1992; Freeman & Medoff, 1984). Though not universally applied, standard-rate wage policies can be defined as “uniform piece or time rates among comparable workers across establishments and impersonal rates or ranges of rates in a given occupational class within establishments” (Freeman, 1980, p. 4). A consequence of standard wage rates is the minimization of the impact of individual differences among workers in similar jobs within establishments. Some evidence exists that unions reduce the gap between White and Black men (Freeman & Medoff, 1984). Likewise, unions may reduce the gender gap through adherence to wage rates assigned to job classification systems. Therefore, within a given establishment and occupation, wage variation for men and women will be reduced, assuming other individual characteristics such as seniority remain constant. As long as
both men and women occupy similar jobs and are covered by similar collective bargaining agreements, wage differences between them should be lower.

These collective bargaining wages are associated with bureaucratic procedures set up over time to regulate labor-management relationships and reduce subjective pay allocations by supervisors (Slichter, Healy, & Livernash, 1960). Previous research on ethnic differences in layoff chances suggests the importance of these procedures: In unionized workplaces, management’s adherence to bureaucratic rules such as seniority make these rules better predictors of layoff chances across ethnic groups (Cornfield, 1987). Among nonunionized workers, by contrast, the determinants of ethnic inequality in layoffs are less clear. Applying the same logic, we expect the management of a unionized firm to follow collective bargaining outcomes in wage setting, thereby generating more predictable wages for male and female employees than would be the case in nonunionized workplaces, where managerial discretion is greater.

**THEORY: DIRECT EFFECTS**

In addition to indirect effects, we expect unionization to have a direct influence on the wage gap. Because more women are currently organized than ever before, some unions have adopted pay equity as a strategy to eliminate the pay gap. They have also adopted policies to combat the gender segregation of occupations, which is related to the wage gap (Hallock, 1993). These strategies do not always arise spontaneously, but at the request of female members (Howell & Mahon, 1996). Regardless of the motivation, such pay equity policies would increase the earnings of women more than those of men, thereby narrowing the gender gap. Although this effect seems rather obvious, empirical research is scant and inconclusive, with some studies suggesting that unions have neglected women’s issues (Cook, 1991).

In summary, theory suggests that unions would reduce gender gap by virtue of indirect effects in reducing wage dispersion within firms and a potentially direct effect in setting pay equity policies.

**EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE**

Evidence for these unionization effects seems to exist only for male workers. The effect of unions on female wage inequality is relatively understudied (Pfeffer & Ross, 1981), and little research exists on the gap itself. Studies of wage policies under collective bargaining agreements indeed indicate that unionization reduces wage dispersion among union members by equalizing wages across and within establishments. This evidence comes primarily
from all-male data sets (Lewis, 1986). For example, Freeman’s (1980) study focused on men and the wage differential between white- and blue-collar workers within establishments. Pfeffer and Ross (1980) also showed that among men, unions operate to reduce wage differentiation and individual characteristic effects. Evidence for women is inconclusive at best. A few studies have looked at union wage premiums for women only (Main & Reilly, 1992) and found that unions have no effect on wage dispersion among women (Pfeffer & Ross, 1981). In a recent study based on Current Population Survey data for individuals between 1973 and 1992, DiNardo, Fortin, and Lemieux (1996) found that the presence of unions explains an important portion of wage inequality among men only and that changing unionization patterns explain relatively little of the recent rise in female wage dispersion.

Although they are important, these studies are applicable to comparisons of within-gender samples. Research focusing on how unions affect the wage differential between men and women is even scarcer. Unlike our study, the few articles that have looked at unions and the gender gap have focused on the public sector because most unionized women work there (Baron & Newman, 1990; Bridges & Nelson, 1989) or used individual-level data aggregated across national economies without considering establishment-level information on collective bargaining coverage (Doiron & Riddell, 1994; Even & Macpherson, 1993; Freeman & Leonard, 1987).

Because the theoretical mechanisms reviewed above operate at the establishment level, so do the data we use in this study. Our choice is important for several reasons. First, collective bargaining agreements usually differ among establishments and specify wage rates for different jobs so that every employee working in a given job earns approximately the same amount. Second, evidence highlights the role of employer policies in shaping the wage gap (Groshen, 1991; Milkman, 1987). Interemployer wage differentials account for a great share of the gap between men and women because men tend to work in higher pay firms (Gunderson, 1989; Halaby, 1979). Third, gender segregation is strongly related to the wage gap, especially segregation within jobs and establishments (Huffman & Velasco, 1997; Petersen & Morgan, 1995). Therefore, firm-level data with information on wage-setting processes are critical to understanding gender-related wage differentials.

In sum, in this study, we ask: How does unionization affect the gender wage gap among individual men and women working in the same establishment who are covered by similar collective bargaining agreements? Is the gap smaller in unionized than in nonunionized establishments? We investigate this question by adding an interaction term of unionization and gender to an equation containing individual and establishment characteristics. We expect this interaction to be positive.
DATA

The IWS of the BLS provide nationwide data on establishment and production workers’ characteristics. We obtained access to nine manufacturing industries that vary widely in their proportions of men and women employed: industrial chemicals, nonferrous foundries, paints and varnishes, textile dyeing and finishing, wood household furniture, cotton fiber textiles, wool textiles, miscellaneous plastics, and men’s and boys’ shirts. Our main criterion in selecting these industries was to cover the spectrum from low to high proportions of women in an industry’s workforce, that is, to obtain broad variation in our independent variable while varying also the type of product manufactured. These are almost all of the manufacturing industries included in the IWS between 1974 and 1985 (U.S. Department of Labor, 1976a, 1976b, 1977a, 1977b, 1977c, 1977d, 1977e, 1977f, 1982).1 In 1985, the IWS stopped including questions about employee gender, so later surveys are not valid for our research question. Therefore, we have access to most of the manufacturing industries surveyed during the period, precisely the same industries studied in other research on the wage gap (Groshen, 1991; Petersen & Morgan, 1995).2

In each industry, the BLS drew a stratified random sample of establishments, including a sufficient mix of union and nonunion establishments to test our prediction. The number of establishments surveyed ranges from 57 in the wool textiles industry to 876 in the miscellaneous plastics industry. Data on establishment characteristics include size, region, urban area, and technology. These data are combined with information on individuals, including gender, occupation, establishment, method of wage payment, and hourly earnings. Our unit of analysis is the individual employee.

Apart from the contributions to research already explained, there are several methodological advantages to using these data. First, wage data used for our dependent variable are in hourly earnings form. Because one confounding factor in explaining gender wage differences is that men and women work different numbers of hours, our data avoid the drawback of having to control for the estimated number of hours worked.

Second, potential gender bias in the sample of occupations surveyed is reduced because only production workers are included. Moreover, the data on hourly earnings are collected for narrowly defined occupations representative of the range of activities performed in the industry (Anderson et al., 1990). Thus, results are generalizable within industries. The surveys provide detailed occupational coding, which often corresponds to the listing in the Dictionary of Occupational Titles (U.S. Department of Labor, 1977a). For example, in the miscellaneous plastics industry, the list of detailed
occupations includes titles such as “extrusion-press operators (set up and operate)”; “extrusion-press operators (operate only)”; “plastic cutters, machine”; and “scrap-preparing operators.” Similarly, in the textile dyeing and finishing industry, occupational titles distinguish among “printers, machine”; “printers, screen (automatic flat)”; “printers, screen (automatic rotary)”; and “printers, screen (hand).” With this level of detail, as Groshen (1991) explained, “classifications are not aggregated to avoid combining similar male and female jobs into apparently integrated occupations” (p. 460). By controlling for job title, we can also assume that skill level within occupation is close to constant, thus controlling for different returns to education and skill for men and women (Lemieux, 1993). The number of occupations surveyed per industry ranges from 19 in paint and varnishes to 71 in wool textiles.

Our key independent variables are gender and unionization. Gender is measured by an indicator variable that takes the value of 1 when the employee is female and 0 otherwise. Regarding unionization, the IWS classify a worker as unionized if the majority of production workers in the establishment are covered by collective bargaining agreements. Therefore, the definition of union status is at the establishment level: A worker scores 1 for the unionization variable if most workers in his or her establishment are covered by a collective bargaining agreement, whether or not that worker is a union member. In manufacturing, this measure is practically the same as unionization rate.

Descriptive statistics for the key variables used are presented in Table 1. We first report average wages for all employees in each industry and then for men and women separately. In all industries, women’s mean hourly wage is lower than men’s. The ratio of women’s to men’s pay ranges from 0.78 in miscellaneous plastics to 0.93 in cotton and fiber textiles. Hourly wages in industrial chemicals are the highest among both men and women: 6.47 and 6.20, respectively. The extent of union coverage ranges from approximately 21% in cotton textiles to about 80% in industrial chemicals. Aside from cotton, the industries at the lower end of the union representation scale tend to be textiles: wool textiles (26.2%) and men’s and boys’ shirts (33.5%). On average, more men than women work in unionized establishments.

The percentage of women in these industries varies widely from 5.6% in industrial chemicals to 92.7% in men’s and boys’ shirts. Not surprisingly, textiles employ greater proportions of women than other industries. Segregation seems common in textiles: Descriptive statistics show that women always work with more women in the establishment than men do.

Control variables at the establishment level include size and geographical location because previous research has shown that union workers tend to be concentrated in large firms, which often pay more than small ones, and in
### TABLE 1: Variable Means by Industry and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Hourly Wage</th>
<th>Union</th>
<th>Percentage Women</th>
<th>N Occupations</th>
<th>N Establishments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial chemicals</td>
<td>6.460</td>
<td>6.470</td>
<td>6.220</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.02)</td>
<td>(1.01)</td>
<td>(1.17)</td>
<td>(0.40)</td>
<td>(0.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paint and varnishes</td>
<td>5.210</td>
<td>5.260</td>
<td>4.770</td>
<td>0.710</td>
<td>0.710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.03)</td>
<td>(1.02)</td>
<td>(1.02)</td>
<td>(0.45)</td>
<td>(0.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonferrous foundries</td>
<td>4.690</td>
<td>4.780</td>
<td>4.030</td>
<td>0.640</td>
<td>0.650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.20)</td>
<td>(1.21)</td>
<td>(0.88)</td>
<td>(0.48)</td>
<td>(0.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textile dyeing and finishing</td>
<td>3.960</td>
<td>4.110</td>
<td>3.420</td>
<td>0.450</td>
<td>0.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.98)</td>
<td>(1.02)</td>
<td>(0.53)</td>
<td>(0.50)</td>
<td>(0.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood household furniture</td>
<td>3.040</td>
<td>3.190</td>
<td>2.810</td>
<td>0.370</td>
<td>0.380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.81)</td>
<td>(0.82)</td>
<td>(0.73)</td>
<td>(0.48)</td>
<td>(0.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wool textiles</td>
<td>3.180</td>
<td>3.290</td>
<td>3.030</td>
<td>0.260</td>
<td>0.280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.61)</td>
<td>(0.65)</td>
<td>(0.49)</td>
<td>(0.44)</td>
<td>(0.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton fiber textiles</td>
<td>3.110</td>
<td>3.230</td>
<td>2.970</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>0.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.52)</td>
<td>(0.57)</td>
<td>(0.42)</td>
<td>(0.41)</td>
<td>(0.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous plastics</td>
<td>3.310</td>
<td>3.750</td>
<td>2.940</td>
<td>0.520</td>
<td>0.560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.88)</td>
<td>(0.98)</td>
<td>(0.58)</td>
<td>(0.50)</td>
<td>(0.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s and boys’ shirts</td>
<td>3.340</td>
<td>3.920</td>
<td>3.290</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>0.330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.75)</td>
<td>(1.13)</td>
<td>(0.69)</td>
<td>(0.47)</td>
<td>(0.47)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

urban areas, which have higher pay than rural areas. Establishment size is measured by six dummy variables, region by four dummy variables, and city size by one dummy variable taking a value of 1 if a firm is located in a metropolitan area. Because gender segregation within firms explains a large portion of earnings inequality between men and women (Bielby & Baron, 1984; Bridges & Nelson, 1989), we control for the proportion of women in an establishment’s workforce.

Variables used as controls at the individual level include detailed occupation dummies (which vary by industry) and incentive pay, a dummy that takes a value of 1 if an employee receives incentive compensation. This last control is important because historical research has shown that the method of payment tends to vary between men and women (Goldin, 1986).

### METHOD

We estimated three standard log-wage equations using ordinary least squares (OLS) regression analysis. The dependent variable in these equations
is the natural logarithm of hourly earnings. This semilogarithmic form of wage equation facilitates interpretation of estimated effects: The coefficients approximate the percentage change in wage level resulting from a unit increase in the independent variable.

We assume the same wage determination model for men and women. The basis for this premise is the fact that within an establishment, one can reasonably assume that all employees are covered by the same collective bargaining agreement and therefore that wages are set for union as well as nonunion workers. Thus, collective bargaining coverage is the appropriate measure of union status to determine union effects on the earnings of men and women in a given work unit.

Table 2 shows the estimates of an OLS model where the log of hourly earnings ($W$) is regressed on a gender dummy ($1 = \text{Female}$), a union dummy ($1 = \text{Union}$), an interaction variable ($\text{Female} \times \text{Union}$), and the vector of control variables. The model is as follows:

$$W = \alpha + \beta_1F + \beta_2U + \beta_3(F \times U) + \beta_4(X)$$
In this model, $\beta_1$ measures the gender gap in nonunion establishments and $\beta_1 + \beta_3$ measures the gender gap in union establishments. The reference group is men working in nonunionized establishments. This specification empirically addresses the research question of whether the gender gap differs between union and nonunion establishments (measured by $\beta_3$). This interaction evaluates whether collective bargaining not only affects wages but also increases wages more for women than men (i.e., if the gender effect is less negative in unionized establishments), thereby lowering the gender wage gap.

RESULTS

The three main coefficients reported in Table 2 are those for the variables female, union, and the interaction between the two. In all industries but one, the coefficient for female is negative and significant, indicating that being a woman in a nonunionized establishment is associated with lower wages by a factor ranging from 8.8% in paints and varnishes to 2.9% in textile dyeing and finishing. Only in men’s and boys’ shirts is the gender coefficient not significant, if negative, probably because the overwhelming majority of workers in this industry are women.

Estimated union coefficients suggest that collective bargaining coverage is associated with higher wages in almost all the industries studied. These coefficients are positive and significant in seven out of nine industries, ranging from 0.8% in cotton and fiber textiles to 17% in men’s and boys’ shirts. In wood and household furniture, the coefficient is positive but not statistically significant. The only negative union effect is for industrial chemicals; as Anderson et al. (1990) also reported, the wage difference between union and nonunion workers is only 2%, even though 61% of the production workers in this industry are unionized.

As predicted, the interaction between the union and female variables is positive and significant in six of the nine industries, with coefficient values ranging from 1.2% in cotton and fiber textiles to 8.7% in paint and varnishes. For the remaining three industries, one coefficient is not significant at conventional levels (miscellaneous plastics), and two are negative and significant (textile dyeing and finishing and men’s and boys’ shirts). These results suggest that in most cases, unionized establishments have lower wage gaps between men and women. Consider the nonferrous foundries industry as an example. The estimated gender coefficient indicates that being a woman in a nonunionized establishment in this industry is associated with an approximately 5.7% lower pay rate. For women working in a union establishment,
however, the net effect results from adding the female, union, and interaction coefficients ($-5.7% + 5.6% + 2.3% = 2.2%$). A wage advantage of about $2.2\%$ accrues to women covered by collective bargaining, compared with a wage gap of about $-5.7\%$ in nonunion establishments, all other factors kept constant. In sum, in six industries, unionization is associated with a narrower wage gap between unionized men and women relative to men and women in similar jobs in nonunionized establishments.

The two industries with a negative and significant interaction of the female and unionization variables are textiles: men’s and boys’ shirts and textile dyeing and finishing. In these industries, the gender gap in pay is greater in unionized than nonunionized establishments.

Note also that women receive higher wages when unionized, although comparing women in unionized and nonunionized establishments is not the focus of this article. For example, in industrial chemicals, the predicted log wage difference between the two groups of women is $0.035 - 0.018 = 0.017$. That is, women in union establishments earn about $1.7\%$ higher wages than nonunion women. If similar calculations are done for all industries, women in unionized establishments do earn somewhat more than other women in all but one of the industries, with a gain ranging from about $1.7\%$ to $14\%$. In sum, women gain from unionization both relative to men (as shown by the significant interactions) and in absolute terms (the coefficient for union plus the coefficient for the interaction add to a positive effect).

The estimated effects of control variables are consistent with prior research. For example, the percentage of women in an establishment has a negative effect on wages in all industries except men’s and boys’ shirts (an industry where $92\%$ of establishments’ workforces are female). Incentive pay has a positive and statistically significant effect on workers’ wages in all but one industry. The size of the city where an establishment is located and an establishment’s size are positively related to pay levels.

Overall, our estimates are consistent with previously reported studies using similar data, but also reveal that unionization is a significant determinant of the gender wage gap.

**DISCUSSION**

Our purpose was to determine whether collective bargaining coverage narrows the gender wage gap among manufacturing employees. Our findings provide compelling evidence that the estimated pay disparity between men and women is smaller in unionized establishments in six of the nine industries studied, encompassing a large portion of the manufacturing workforce.
That is, blue-collar women generally benefit from working in unionized plants.

Our findings also corroborate previous research showing the negative impact of establishment gender composition on wages and the need to consider organizational attributes in studies of wage inequality (Huffman & Velasco, 1997; Tomaskovic-Devey, 1993, 1995). Our study expands this literature by showing the influence of labor unions in reducing gender wage differentials and theorizing about the direct and indirect effects of collective bargaining on the gender wage gap.

Several reasons may explain the lack of significance or negative interactions found in three industries. These reasons include industry characteristics such as the percentage of women in the workforce, the percentage of women organized, and union characteristics. The first potential explanation is the different proportion of women across manufacturing industries. In fact, two of the three industries (miscellaneous plastics and men’s and boys’ shirts) have the largest percentages of women in our sample. In both men’s and boys’ shirts and textile finishing, women’s premium for being unionized is smaller than men’s, whereas in all other industries, women reap even higher percentage gains from unionization than men. In short, unionization seems to reduce within-establishment gender gaps in pay in most industries, but not in the most female-dominated industries. Moreover, the negative interaction between the union and female variables may indicate a relative weakness of predominantly female unions.

The different findings across industries may also reflect varied levels of commitment by different unions to pay equity issues. This commitment has historically been less consistent across U.S. unions than among unions in other countries such as the United Kingdom and Canada (Hallock, 1993). Specifically, U.S. unions have placed less emphasis on obtaining equitable wages for all workers, and fewer have set up special women’s divisions (Cook, 1991). The AFL-CIO has endorsed but not necessarily bargained for pay equity, and that at the request of its female members (England, 1992). This attitude among U.S. unions dates back at least one century and seems related to two factors. On one hand, women’s unions united in leaguers that took a political approach, allying themselves more with the women’s movement than with the labor movement (Jacoby, 1994). On the other hand, male unions either paid less attention to gender wage inequality or were constrained in their demands by managerial conditions. For example, when the issue of wage inequality with women was raised, management often proposed to limit men’s wage increases to pay for the equity differential, thus discouraging male workers from effectively demanding equity (Acker, 1989; Hallock, 1993). These two forces might have hindered some unions’ ability
to close the gender gap, especially in those industries where women make up the majority of the workforce.

Another relevant union characteristic that may vary by industry is the number of women occupying leadership positions. Women are often absent in executive union jobs (Cook, 1991), and even when they are present, they tend to be leaders at the local level and in relatively marginal positions such as chairs of education committees (Melcher, Eichstedt, Eriksen, & Clawson, 1992). Thus, women are still underrepresented in influential positions where they could participate in collective bargaining negotiations.

Although our data do not allow us to test the above explanations, the historical evolution of unions and gender patterns in the men’s and boys’ shirts industry offers a fruitful illustration. The garment trades form a labor-intensive and highly competitive industry because of easy entry. Firms are usually in low-wage areas and use new technology that reduces the number of high-paying jobs. Low wages, piecework, and occupational segregation have always characterized this industry with a largely female labor force (Carpenter, 1972). During the period covered by our data, the three main unions in the garment industries were the craft-oriented United Garment Workers, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America (ACWA), which organized the men’s clothing branch of the industry, and the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, which organized the women’s garment industry. The ACWA finally merged with the Textile Workers Union of America, forming the Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Clothing Union in 1976. Partly because women were isolated from the predominantly male labor force, these trade unions remained ambivalent toward women (Acker, 1989). Union goals of higher wages, shorter hours, and better working conditions seem to have lost out for years in this industry (Carpenter, 1972).

In sum, industry gender composition and union characteristics help interpret our results: The women in mostly female establishments within mostly female industries do not benefit as much from union representation as women in more gender-balanced industries. But the effect of unions on the wage gap remains a complex issue.

FUTURE RESEARCH

Future research should explore other reasons for the different effect across industries. For example, detailed comparisons of union structures and bargaining power in different industries could be examined (Fiorito & Hendricks, 1987). Similarly, understanding the barriers to full integration of women into union offices might clarify and solve gender differences in union effects (Cornfield, 1993). Research could also explore the percentage of
women in a union, the existence of caucus or women’s groups within a union, and the proportion of women in positions of leadership.

Additional research is suggested by our study’s limitations. For one thing, the IWS lack data on some worker characteristics, such as education and seniority, both important variables linked to union and gender wage effects (Cornfield, 1987). However, our study compares men and women working in the same detailed occupations, where differences in terms of education or human capital are likely to be small (Levy & Murnane, 1992).

A second limitation is that our data are two decades old. Yet, we believe we can generalize our findings through the present for two reasons. First, we are not looking at changes over time in the union effect, nor are we studying the effects of changing unionization rates on wage inequality. Rather, we estimate the effects of unions on women’s wages where they are covered by collective bargaining. From this perspective, the role of unions continues to be relevant in reducing wage inequality. Second, recent research using aggregate data confirms that the overall union wage premium has been relatively stable between 1980 (approximately when our data were collected) and 1992 (Wunnava & Peled, 1999). Moreover, as Card (1998) affirmed, “Despite the shifts in union membership, the structure of union relative wage effects is about the same in the mid 1990s as in the mid 1970s” (p. 20). Wunnava and Peled (1999) also reported that the union premium across different demographic groups during the same period seems to have converged, reinforcing the applicability of our argument. The authors suggest that this convergence relates to the “equalization hypothesis,” that is, unions’ tendency to raise wages more for workers with lower measured skills, thus helping close gender and racial wage gaps. If the union premium has remained relatively stable despite the decline of overall unionization, our prediction that unions help reduce the wage gap should still hold.

A final limitation lies precisely in our static perspective. Several recent studies have examined the long-term effects on wage inequality of changing unionization rates among men and women. These studies looked at effects for men and women separately, but something similar could be done for the gender gap. For example, Card (1998) found that among women, union membership has declined among low-wage workers but risen for high-wage workers. When looked at separately within sectors and genders, the emerging pattern suggests that unions have strongly deterred increasing wage inequality among public sector workers for both men and women. Future research should consider whether this finding applies to the private sector as well.
CONCLUSION

Past research on the earnings gap between men and women has addressed individual-level variables (e.g., human capital), occupational gender composition, and industry and organizational characteristics. Our work extends previous organizational-level research by examining how unionization affects within-employer gender wage differences in nine manufacturing industries. Our most relevant finding is that unionization is associated with smaller gender gaps, especially in industries where women do not dominate the workforce. The implications of this finding are paramount because a large number of women still work in low-paying jobs in predominantly female industries (Milkman, 1987).

Our findings have implications for research on inequality as well as for union research and practice. First, collective bargaining structures must be considered in studies of the wage gap that tend to focus mostly on segregation: Unions’ impact on the gender gap remains even after controlling for establishment gender segregation. Second, important differences exist, even within manufacturing, on how unions affect the wage gap. These differences are sometimes overlooked when studies compare workers across economic sectors.

From a practical standpoint, if unions lower within-establishment sex gaps in pay, then holding constant how segregated men and women are between establishments, more unionization will lower the economy-wide gender gap in pay. This highlights the importance of continuing efforts at organizing sectors where unionization has declined. Service-sector unions, with their higher female membership bases, have actively negotiated women’s issues such as affirmative action, family policies, and pay equity (Hartmann, Spalter-Roth, & Collins, 1994). Success in these negotiations can affect the extent of later female labor activism (Cornfield, Cavalcanti, & Chun, 1990). What the service sector unions have done to understand and organize the female workforce could be applied to the blue-collar sector, because women appear to be at least as interested as men in joining unions, and very committed once they have joined (Crain, 1994).

Finally, our findings suggest that although unions help reduce the gender wage gap, they can do more to incorporate equity concerns in their agendas. As Cook (1991) affirmed,

While national unions and officers have given importance to integration of women and minorities, especially in view of the fact that they will be a majority
of members by next century, little has been done to impress on the rank and file that the problem of integration is a major one on which the vitality of the unions may well depend in the future. (p. 253)

With the erosion of affirmative action policies, women must assume leadership to ensure fair treatment that may no longer be enforced by government agencies (Kirton & Healy, 1999). This is particularly important in the private sector, where enforcement or attention to pay equity issues is less keen (Creese, 1995).

NOTES

1. The combination of establishment- and individual-level data is difficult to find in current data because the BLS discontinued the IWS in 1990.

2. We did not have access to the IWS for a few manufacturing industries: basic iron and steel, men’s and boys’ coats, women’s and misses’ dresses, footwear, and hosiery. Although we do not have the data, these industries’ products, union coverage, and gender composition are relatively similar to those in the industries already included in our study. For example, research on the garment industries suggests that the gender composition and union coverage for the men’s and boys’ shirts industry are similar to those for men’s and boys’ coats and women’s and misses’ dresses industries. Similarly, the gender composition of the nonferrous foundries industry in our sample likely resembles that of the iron and steel industry. We did have data on the fabricated structural steel industry, but we decided against including it in the study; only 0.6% of this industry’s workers are female, making it very difficult to conduct appropriate statistical analyses. In other words, although we do not have the complete industry set, our study encompasses more than two thirds of all industries surveyed between 1975 and 1985, before the gender variable was eliminated from the questionnaire, and it includes industries that vary widely in gender composition and union coverage.

3. The coefficient in a semilog regression multiplied by 100 approximates the percentage change in the dependent variable associated with a one-unit change in the independent variable. To be precise, one must take the exponentiated coefficient minus 1 and multiply it by 100. We use the simpler approximation to facilitate relating the text to the tables.
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In the academic world of labor history, industrial unionism trumps craft unionism every time. Those who know the literature know the drill: Industrial organizations such as the Wobblies (the Industrial Workers of the World [IWW]) are portrayed as progressive, inclusive, and far better suited to organizing the 20th century workforce than their allegedly corrupt and clannish craft rivals in the American Federation of Labor (AFL). In the practical world of work, however, the story took a different turn, for it was the AFL that survived and grew and the IWW that all but disappeared by 1920. Whether this apparent rejection of revolutionary—or at least left-wing—unionism reflected what Selig Perlman called job consciousness or what Marxists called false consciousness, most observers chalk up the AFL’s victory to the innate conservatism and middle-class aspirations of the American workforce.

But, as Howard Kimeldorf argues in *Battling for American Labor: Wobblies, Craft Workers, and the Making of the Union Movement*, these observers are wrong. In the first place, classic studies of proletarian conservatism, such as Gerald Grob’s (1961) *Workers and Utopia*, employed “psychologizing strategies”—not hard evidence—to shape what Kimeldorf calls “the master narrative of failed consciousness” (p. 9). And, in the second place, the workplace radicalism that Kimeldorf documents demonstrates that American unionists, whether craft or industrial, were hardly conservative when it came to shop floor issues. Drawing on an impressive variety of historical sources, including newspapers, union records, oral histories, and memoirs, *Battling for American Labor* gives voice to a wide range of militant unionists. Their willingness to use both craft and “situational” power, or direct action, to disrupt production not only undermines the dominant conservative stereotype but gives credence to Kimeldorf’s conclusion that if the IWW failed as an institution, it nevertheless had its finger “on the syndicalist pulse of the American working class” (p. 11).

Basically, *Battling for American Labor* comprises two case studies. The first follows the 13-year history of the IWW’s Marine and Transport Workers’ Local 8, a Philadelphia longshoremen’s union that organized Black and White workers, managed to achieve a measure of regional solidarity, won recognition from the U.S. Shipping Board during World War I, and then gave way to the AFL-affiliated International
Longshoremen’s Association in 1926. The second case study follows culinary workers in New York City. It begins with German waiters joining the Knights of Labor in the 1880s and the AFL’s Hotel and Restaurant Employees (HRE) by the early 20th century and then follows unskilled hotel, kitchen, and restaurant workers, who formed an independent union in 1911, joined forces with the IWW in a dramatic New Year’s Eve strike a year later, and then formed a series of IWW and independent unions before joining the HRE in 1936.

In the process of recounting these complex stories, Battling for American Labor also details the day-to-day drudgery of work on the docks, the incredibly poor working (and cooking!) conditions in New York’s finest hotels, and the violence that shaped labor struggles. At the same time, it illuminates the dynamics of local solidarity and union loyalty, the strategic differences between craft and industrial workers that undermined classwide solidarity, and the structural weakness of locally based direct action. Finally, the book demonstrates the practical value of job control to both IWW and AFL supporters, pointing out that even the most radical workers ultimately favored effective organizing strategies over revolutionary rhetoric. When a local IWW leader compared the AFL’s organizational stability to his union’s imminent demise, he put it this way: “Because the A.F.L. tries to protect the job, members stick to it; because the I.W.W. does not, members do not stick” (p. 66).

But, if Battling for American Labor makes a valiant effort to portray the IWW in all its complexity, the book relies on stereotypes when it comes to discussing the AFL, its affiliates, and its leaders. On one hand, it overestimates the AFL’s power over international and local unions, at one point describing AFL president Samuel Gompers as an international union president’s “boss” (p. 124). On the other hand, it underestimates the craft union’s flexibility, strength, and integrity, accepting as fact judgments offered in Solidarity, the IWW newspaper, and assuming that AFL supporters not only ignored the unskilled but needed the IWW to teach them about militancy. During the years covered by this book, though, these same workers were building aggressive, amalgamated, “craft-industrial” unions; the AFL was experimenting with federal labor unions and industrial departments; and Gompers was making it clear that “the organization of the workers . . . must be something plastic that will change as organization and industry change” (The Samuel Gompers Papers, Vol. 10, in press). Considered in this broader context, the cross-fertilization of the AFL, the IWW, and independent unions, and the underlying syndicalist spirit analyzed here, do not seem so surprising after all.

—Grace Palladino
University of Maryland
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What sorts of jobs will be available in postindustrial economies? Contradictory generalizations have abounded. Some observers predict a shift toward rewarding, creative work in less hierarchical organizations; some present a frightening future of invasive electronic monitoring and declining job security; others envision a growing divide between those reaping the rewards of technological and economic developments and those suffering the penalties. On the Front Line: Organization of Work in the Information Economy provides an empirical basis for assessing postindustrial possibilities by investigating the nature of work in the fastest growing industries of the service sector. It reports findings of an ambitious research project spanning three countries, nine companies, and several varieties of frontline service work.

Combining case studies of 14 “workflows” and a survey of more than 1,000 employees in high-performing companies primarily in the financial services industry, the authors generated and tested hypotheses about emerging systems of work organization for service, sales, and knowledge workers. The study also examined variation in the organization of similar types of work by contrasting the experiences of workers in Australia and the United States with those of workers in Japan. The basic analytic strategy was to generate ideal types of work organization for frontline jobs that differ in complexity—bureaucratic, entrepreneurial, and knowledge-intensive—and to use these as benchmarks for examining the actual experiences of workers in “mass customized service work,” sales work, and knowledge work.

To make comparisons among the workflows within and across each of these types of work, the authors systematically examined the main components of these jobs. Their careful elaboration of the elements of frontline work is a major strength of this study. In separate chapters, On the Front Line contrasted work relations (which essentially means job content), employment relations, control relations, coworker relations, and customer relations. The analysis demonstrated that the three types of work operate under distinct forms of work organization, resembling the ideal types in many respects but with elements that take hybrid forms.

The typifications of the three broad categories of work are based primarily on analyses of workers in three jobs: Most of the sales workers were home loan consultants, most of the knowledge workers were systems developers, and most of the service workers were customer service representatives (CSRs) in phone centers. The chapters on work relations and employment relations, which draw primarily on the qualitative case studies, provide the most vivid impressions of these jobs and of the stark differences in how they are organized. The highly regimented jobs of the CSRs, with omnipresent electronic controls, most closely conformed to the pessimistic view of the postindustrial workplace. The systems developers’ jobs came closest to the optimistic version of work in the information economy: collaborative, participatory, challenging. The jobs of the home loan consultants seemed little different from those of sales workers employed in other economic sectors. Their work, affected relatively little by
information technology, was individualistic, and their relations with superiors, co-workers, and customers alike were predominantly instrumental.

The research team drew on the qualitative case studies to develop hypotheses, which they tested using the survey data. Their examination of the relations between various elements of work organization and such outcomes as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, team cohesion, and stress produced some unexpected results. Contrary to celebratory evocations of new organizational structures, the knowledge workers did not appear to place higher value on the intrinsic features of their work than service or sales workers, they experienced greater stress, and their “socio-normative control systems” were fragile, susceptible to breaking down into confusing, anomic environments. On the other hand, despite the intensive monitoring of the CSRs, their imposed isolation from peers, and their relentless work pace, they had more satisfying relations with management, coworkers, and customers than might have been predicted. The CSRs developed “communities of coping” with coworkers (contrary to managerial intentions), they expressed empathy for customers despite the pressure to limit the scope of their interactions, and some felt that their development was facilitated by their supervisors’ monitoring.

The authors found that Japanese workflows, regardless of work complexity, were organized more bureaucratically than their counterparts in the United States and Australia. *On the Front Line* contradicts some accepted notions about the virtues of Japanese work structures. Generalizations about the superior performance orientation produced by Japanese employment relations, based largely on studies of male production workers, did not hold true for knowledge workers or for women, who are typically excluded from the career systems and welfare corporatist policies available to many male workers in Japan. Japanese service workers, largely women, were less committed to their organizations than their Western counterparts, although because the Japanese service workers were doing a different job than those in the comparison group, conclusions should be treated cautiously. Moreover, because Japanese organizations were more hierarchically structured than those in the United States and Australia, Japanese workers in all three types of workflows were less satisfied with their learning outcomes, and knowledge workers in Japan reported weaker group cohesion.

The authors explain in the preface that this research project was funded by Anderson Consulting, so it is worth considering whether the funding source might have affected the product. The analysis, although scrupulously objective, is by and large focused on issues amenable to managerial decision making and advising by consultants. The introduction relates changing work organizations to trends in societal inequality: the declining power of organized labor, the emergence of a stable core of privileged workers at the expense of a growing group of disposable workers, and restructuring processes aimed at lowering employment levels and increasing work effort. However, except for attention to gender inequality in Japan, broad issues of social inequality are not integrated into the substance of the book. The analysis of work organization does not address social policy or consider the ethical ramifications of corporate decision making.

A surprising gap in the book, given its frequent allusions to increasing customer “sovereignty,” is a lack of consideration of how satisfactory the varied actual and po-
tential forms of work organization are from customers’ points of view. Other limitations include a repetitive structure and some confusing editorial lapses. Overall, the authors emphasizeanalyticcomplexityoverrichdescription,withtheresultthatreadersgetsomewhatsketchyimpressionsofthedistinctworksettings. Thedesignationofworkflowsbybafflingacronyms,whichsometimesidentifythecountryandtypeof companyandsometimesdonot,makesitevenhardertokeepthemstraight.

Theauthorspredictconsiderablevariationinformsworkorganizationinthenearfuture.Ultimately,theyforeseeadegreeofconvergenceassalesandservice workdevelophybridformscombiningweakverticalrelationswithstronglateralrelations,asknowledgeworkhas. Theempiricalbasisforthesepredictionsisnotmade sufficientlyclear.But,by systematically laying out the various features of frontline work and investigating therelationsamongthem, this book provides a sturdy foundationforassessinghowchangingformsofworkorganizationwillaffectworkersand organizationalfunctioning. On the Front Line demonstrates persuasively that many of thecategoriestraditionallyusedtotalkaboutwork—bluecollarversuswhitecollar, skilledversussemiskilledorunskilled—areoflimiteduseinunderstandingknowledge-basedandfrontlinework. This book improves on them.

—Robin Leidner
University of Pennsylvania


Why do some firms within an industry operate with high-involvement (HI) practices (e.g., extensive training, skilled workers responsible for quality, job rotation, employee involvement in decision making) whereas others rely on Taylorist/Fordist principles? Thesix chapters in Employment Practices and Business Strategy, each focused on a different industry or cluster of industries, describe and attempt to explain this variation.

Over 250,000 jobs were lost in the U.S. steel industry in the 1980s, but minimills performed well. Despite similar sizes and technology, some minimills use what Jeffrey Arthur in chapter 1 calls control-type systems, and others use HI practices. Scrap rates are lower and productivity is higher in HI mills, but both strategies are profitable. Multivariate analysis demonstrated that mills that competed on the basis of being the lowest cost producer of standardized products were likely to use control-type systems. Mills that produced unique products or services were more likely to use HI practices.

The U.S. apparel industry lost nearly one half of its total employment (600,000 jobs) between 1970 and 1997. In chapter 2, Thomas Bailey and Carola Sandy describe a range of management strategies ranging from labor cost reduction and automation to the use of teams of workers who rotate jobs and are responsible for quality. How-
ever, most of the industry continues to rely on time study, specialized jobs, and semi-skilled workers with little discretion. Only 13% of the firms studied used an HI approach. Firms producing varieties of apparel styles were no more likely than those making standardized garments to adopt an HI system. However, firms that had recently increased their varieties of products tended to adopt HI practices. Firm size was the factor most closely related to the use of HI practices.

In chapter 3, Frits Pil and John Paul MacDuffie maintain that there is one best way to produce cars, that is, a set of technical and HI practices known as lean production. They cite New United Motor Manufacturing, Inc. (NUMMI; a Toyota–General Motors assembly plant in California) as proof of the superiority of lean production, ignoring alternative explanations such as Toyota’s excellence in ease of assembly and the insecurity of NUMMI workers who had lost their jobs in a previous shutdown of the plant. Indeed, there are factories that are very efficient (e.g., those in Canada) despite the absence of the bundle of practices that allegedly ensure superior performance. There is considerable variation of work practices among auto assembly plants in the United States and around the world. A number of factors are linked to the use of HI systems: long-tenured management teams, a lack of union resistance, dissatisfaction with existing procedures, region, and culture.

In the postderegulation era, competitive pressures led telecommunications companies to downsize all categories of employees, contract out customer service operations, provide customized packages of multimedia products to specific market segments, convert full-time jobs into part-time jobs, automate service functions, and consolidate customer service bureaus. In chapter 4, Rosemary Batt and Jeffrey Keefe reveal that employment practices vary mainly within rather than between firms, according to the market served. Employees dealing with residential customers were the target of a labor cost reduction strategy. A typical residential call center now handles between 500 and 1,000 customers per day at a call cycle time of about 3 to 5 minutes, conversations are taken from a scripted text, and there is pervasive electronic monitoring (including timing restroom breaks). In contrast, companies hire college-educated people to deal with large business and institutional accounts. Despite deregulation, the telecommunications industry remains oligopolistic, and the employment practices of the Bell system continue to dominate the industry. However, union density has fallen from over 50% of the workforce in 1983 to 29% in 1996 as a result of antiunion new entrants, downsizing, and the reclassification of employees as managerial in unionized firms, HI practices are rare. Nevertheless, “the telecommunications industry with high rates of productivity growth, rapid advanced technological diffusion, and decades of high and sustainable levels of performance improvement has distinguished itself as a high performance industry” (p. 148).

Between 1940 and the early 1980s, employees of retail banks had specialized but secure jobs. Regulatory and technological changes led to substantial restructuring—including process redesign, mergers, and consolidation of operations—and considerable job loss. The trend is toward good jobs for college-educated employees responsible for customers considered valuable by the banks and routine, poorly paid jobs for employees who handle nonvaluable transactions. Over 50% of the surveyed banks
had quality control circles, total quality management projects, or work teams for the high-end employees. In chapter 5, Larry Hunter argues that upgrading the routine positions is undermined by market and technological forces that drive down wages and full-time jobs, decrease training, and replace rather than empower workers.

In chapter 6, Geoff Mason examines U.S. and European cookie, precision metal working, and high-speed machinery and vehicle components factories. Automated U.S. and British plants employ workers with low skill levels and discretion because of their production of standardized products. In Dutch, German, and French plants, workers were better trained and more skilled because of the plants’ small-batch production of various types of upscale cookies. Most U.S. metal working firms use Taylorist systems. Some U.S. and many European plants assign workers inspection tasks and the rearrangement of machines so that teams of workers who rotate jobs now handle all the operations on a component, from rough casting to the finished product. U.S. machinery and vehicle components plants were less likely than their British and German counterparts to have adopted work teams. Because of intense competition, there are now widespread efforts in the United States, Great Britain, and Germany to involve production workers in problem solving and to relax supervisory controls. In general, Mason concludes that HI practices are apt to be implemented where there is a mismatch between product market requirements and existing Taylorist modes of work organization.

In The Machine That Changed the World, Womack, Jones, and Roos (1991) maintained that lean production is the best way to produce anything and that it will become the standard global production system of the 21st century. The research reported in this informative book not only indicates that their prediction is wrong on both counts but also goes some way toward explaining why this is so.

—James Rinehart
University of Western Ontario
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Because the apparel industry remains one of the largest employers in advanced industrial societies, it is surprising that so little is written about it in comparison, say,
with automobiles. This is even more surprising given that most of us spend time buying clothes and have a rudimentary grasp of fashion, read newspapers that chronicle the persistence of sweatshops, and see television reports of job losses and factory closings in this industry. The more inquisitive consumer might wonder why the local department store constantly has sales (therefore, why pay full price for an item?). Most people, however, remain blithely ignorant of what lies behind the industry’s glamorous facade. In detailing the current state of the apparel industry in Los Angeles and providing a snapshot of working life in this industry, Bonacich and Appelbaum’s book rectifies these deficiencies.

Because apparel production is labor intensive with low barriers to entry, it is a highly competitive industry that continues to attract new entrants, whether as immigrant entrepreneurs with access to small amounts of capital or as low- or semiskilled immigrant workers searching for a foothold on the employment ladder. Because the technological potential for labor-displacing automation is limited, much of the competitive advantage that accrues to firms comes from getting their workers to work more efficiently than their competitors’ workers. With labor the principal variable cost, it is not surprising that productivity-enhancing schemes will go hand in hand with wage-depressing tactics. Added to this is the truly global nature of apparel production, in which many manufacturers look for low-cost, overseas sites for production. Although U.S. manufacturers cannot match the prevailing wage rates of less than 50 cents an hour that predominate in many regions of Asia, they are nevertheless under intense pressure to keep their labor costs as low as possible. In turn, this can and does, as the authors document, lead to workplace abuses and the reemergence of sweatshops in certain sectors of the industry.

This book covers events in the apparel industry of Los Angeles during the 1990s. Whereas other regions of the country have lost jobs in apparel manufacturing, Southern California has been one of the few regions to see job growth in this sector. Because much of apparel production in Los Angeles is women’s wear, where fashion changes result in market volatility, there is a demand for fast turnaround of new products that cannot easily be met by low-cost production overseas. Capitalizing on the existence of a large pool of “surplus,” often immigrant, labor in Southern California, many manufacturers in this area have been able to assemble goods quickly and cheaply, meeting the demands of increasingly powerful retailers who market the final product. In other industries, assembly jobs have gone overseas in search of lower wage labor solutions. In the case of apparel, as the authors unambiguously argue, de facto Third World labor markets have been recreated in the United States. The problems that have occurred as a result of this trend are discussed in depth.

The book details the events that have led manufacturers, retailers, and contractors to look for ways to continue to lower their production costs. It then examines the plight of workers working in what are often sweatshop conditions. Illegal overtime practices, child labor violations, minimum wage abuses, and a climate of fear among workers whose redress is sharply circumscribed are all detailed. Government efforts to regulate the industry are shown to be often ineffective, partly because many of the workers lack trust in big institutions and partly because other arms of government are doing their utmost to help the industry remain in the region. Unionization remains vir-
tually nonexistent, and anecdotal evidence of the intimidation of workers (and one of the authors) who challenge the status quo is sufficient to silence the most ardent advocate of change.

Unfortunately, the authors do such an excellent job of depicting the logic of inevitability about events and conditions that it is hard to take seriously their final chapters on worker empowerment and the antisweatshop movement. Commendable as they are in terms of advocacy, they belie the fundamental problem of inequality that is the book’s subtheme.

The real villains in this book are a loosely knit “power elite” comprising large retailers and manufacturers, fashion designers, and those who service the high end of the industry. But, if one examines the structure of the industry, as the authors do, one can see that the issue is not so simple. Increasingly, concentrated retailers have struggled with high interest payments following mergers or acquisitions and put pressure on manufacturers, who in turn have sought cost savings from contractors, who in turn resort to wage-depressing tactics among their workers. A few in the industry become rich, but that is not so different from other manufacturing sectors in which income disparities exist. Not every manufacturing site is a sweatshop, although the authors imply that this is increasingly the norm. Although the crucial issue here remains the (in)digestibility of labor, one cannot help but wonder about the culpability of consumers. Because most of us do not appear willing to pay substantially more for the clothes that we wear, should consumer responsibility be added to the agenda for discussion and analysis?

—Ian M. Taplin
Wake Forest University


The relationship between work and health is a topic of great importance, but sociologists (and industrialists and policy makers, for that matter) have largely ignored the subject. Work is one of the primary determinants of physical and mental health, yet most physicians in the United States have no training in occupational medicine. Every year, more than 6,700 workers in the United States die from on-the-job injuries, and between 6 and 13 million suffer from work-related illnesses. Worldwide, there are approximately 120 million workplace accidents and 200,000 work-related deaths annually. The productivity lost in health-related absences from jobs in the United States and the United Kingdom alone cost businesses billions of dollars.

Daykin and Doyal’s groundbreaking book, Health and Work: Critical Perspectives, is among the best research on occupational health published in years. Overcoming the limitations of traditional monodisciplinary approaches, they assemble an
impressive, interdisciplinary array of scholars representing sociology, epidemiology, policy studies, medicine, biology, and women’s studies, to name only a few. The topics covered range from research on the hazards of domestic labor and sex work to postmodern theoretical models of occupational risk.

The contributors to this volume collectively develop new theoretical approaches to the study of work and health. Recognizing the recent growth in small businesses, self-employment, the global sex work industry, child labor, piecework, and sweatshop labor—all of which are highly problematic for the health of working people—the authors broaden the concept of work itself beyond formal labor market employment to the informal economy and unpaid occupations. This orientation serves as a fundamental challenge to the occupational health research canon, which is largely based on formal employment in large firms. Furthermore, building on foundational research by Karasek and Theorell (1990) and others, the writers examine “new” occupational health factors such as psychosocial stress, mental health, and qualitative indicators of worker well-being. That is, as service jobs and “knowledge work” have become more statistically prominent in the world’s industrialized economies, many of the traditional physical occupational hazards are less common, whereas psychosocial stress and its attendant physical health outcomes have become more salient. For example, rising rates of contingent, temporary, and contract work—all part of the trend toward “flexible production”—have been linked to higher rates of psychosocial strain, stress, and cardiovascular disease.

Social inequality plays a major role throughout the book. Race, class, gender, disability, and geography are presented as factors that are highly correlated with a range of occupational health risks. For example, the authors do an admirable job of laying bare the gender biases in traditional approaches to occupational health. The critiques reveal that among scholars, policy makers, and industry leaders, conventional knowledge of work and health is predicated on a perspective rooted in the average male occupational experience. However, women and men work in largely gender-segregated occupations with very different labor processes and different occupational health risks. In fact, contrary to popular (and most scholarly) perceptions, women’s work is often much more dangerous than men’s work, yet few research models or health programs recognize these differences.

The authors provide evidence that many new occupational health disorders are slow to receive attention because of these deeply rooted biases. For instance, chemical-induced illnesses in microelectronics plants are often viewed by managers as nothing more than the result of “female hormones acting up” or “women’s hysteria.” In the case of repetitive strain injuries, which were first studied in Australia, many workers suffering from such injuries were initially subjected to racist degradations that served to dismiss the validity of their claims with slurs about “Greek back” or “Lebanese wrist.”

The geographic reach of the essays in this volume is refreshing. The reader becomes familiar with historical and contemporary research on occupational health and safety in the United Kingdom, the United States, Sweden, Italy, Zimbabwe, Quebec, and Latin America. One unfortunate finding is that when jobs are discovered to be hazardous in the Global North, instead of improving their occupational health record,
firms often simply export the jobs to the Global South. Thus, geography plays as strong a role in exposure to occupational hazards as any other factor.

Collectively, the contributors also make a solid contribution to methodological approaches to work and health studies. From survey research and other quantitative methods to qualitative ethnographic and participant observation techniques, the authors underscore the value of multimethodological strategies for addressing any number of research questions. To my delight, they also pay serious attention to participatory research methods: those that involve the “expert” and informant collaborating as peers in the knowledge production process. Participatory research is based on the observation that research participants and informants (in this case workers) possess a great deal of expertise about the subject matter and can offer crucial insights into research questions, study design, and data interpretation.

Although the contributors to this excellent volume present new theoretical perspectives on the relationship between work and health, they deliberately eschew any attempt to produce a unified, general model of this relationship, nor do they offer grand policy prescriptions. For this, they are to be commended. The most powerful observation that one must take away from Health and Work is that so much of the illness, injury, suffering, and death (or, conversely, recovery and well-being) observed among working people is the result of politics. For instance, when antilabor crusaders Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan took power in the United Kingdom and the United States respectively, occupational health outcomes quickly took a turn for the worse for the working populations in both nations. And, when unions have been present in these same workplaces, the average health outcomes for workers have improved dramatically. The message from the authors is clear: Social movements and policy making must be oriented toward a worker-based, community-based standard of health rather than a standard that bureaucrats and industrialists might promulgate. Health and Work is a must read for medical sociologists, environmental sociologists, and anyone interested in developing a fuller understanding of the impact of the labor process on the minds and bodies of workers in the global economy.

—David N. Pellow
University of Colorado at Boulder
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Emotions in the Workplace: Research, Theory, and Practice, edited by Neal M. Ashkanasy, Charmine E. J. Hartel, and Wilfred J. Zerbe. Westport, CT: Quorum, 2000, 309 pp. $75.00 (cloth).
Over 15 years have passed since Arlie Hochschild (1983) first introduced the concept of emotional labor into the discipline of sociology. Since then, sociologists have grappled with the questions of what constitutes emotional labor, who is most likely to do it, and what are the consequences for those who are forced to do it as a part of their job descriptions. With a few notable exceptions, the bulk of sociological research dealing with workplace emotions has been composed of richly detailed ethnographies that document the experiences of service workers who exist at the middle and lower ends of the occupational status hierarchy and perform emotional labor for their bosses and clients. Emotion itself has been usually conceived as something socially constructed and relatively open to manipulation; very little attention has been paid to emotion for emotion’s sake.

Approaching a similar set of issues, albeit from a different perspective, Ashkanasy, Hartel, and Zerbe’s *Emotions in the Workplace* is a collection of conference papers. Unlike sociologists, who tend to approach workplace emotions from a constructionist perspective, these management researchers approach emotions more positivistically, or as things rather than constructs. Indeed, Ashkanasy et al. warn up front that the contributing authors have more functionalist than interactionist views of emotion. As a result, *Emotions in the Workplace* has the potential to provide sociologists with a very different view of workplace emotion.

The purpose of the study of emotion, as it appears in the management literature, is to maximize the occurrence of positive emotions and minimize the occurrence of negative emotions, and this goal tends to be presented from the managers’ perspectives as opposed to those of the workers. Because of the underlying assumption that emotions are things, management researchers are not as tied to ethnographic work as are most sociologists. Indeed, as the title suggests, the authors use a number of methodologies, including archival research, survey research, and experimental research, in addition to ethnography and interviewing.

The introduction sets the stage for the following chapters by reviewing the existing theory on emotion (Ashkanasy et al.), tracing the historical origins of emotion and display rules from the 14th century to the present (Willem Mastenbroek), documenting the types of emotions that are likely to be found in the workplace and linking them to their precipitating events (John Basch and Cynthia Fisher), and illustrating how theories of emotional evocation can help explain employees’ reactions to procedural and jurisdictional justice (Russell Cropanzano, Howard Weiss, Kathleen Suckow, and Alicia Grandey). Later sections address more specific topics, including the role of emotions as structuring forces within organizations and in understanding organizational dynamics, the outcomes of emotions in the workplace, and, not surprisingly, emerging research agendas.

One of the strengths of this collection of articles is the multifaceted approach used by the authors, both methodologically and theoretically. In particular, a number of authors use theoretical perspectives not typically used by sociologists. Drawing heavily from psychology and social psychology, several studies incorporate discussions of cognition, attribution, and identity. The authors’ focus on more cognitive processes allows for a deeper understanding of what may have been only implicit in ethnographic studies of similar phenomena. In fact, Larissa Tiedens’s experimental study, which re-
veals “the vicious cycle” of powerful emotions and status, coupled with Marjukka Ollilainen’s ethnography of self-managing teams, results in a very compelling explanation and illustration of the gendering of emotions and the reification of gender hierarchy in mixed-gender groups.

Furthermore, the consideration of cognition and identity as inextricably linked to emotion prompts some authors to study emotions not as outcomes but as moderators. Michael Pratt and Jane Dutton, for example, argue that emotion and identity are crucial in determining whether or not organizational actors will “own” particular social issues. Using a combination of surveys and interviews, Pratt and Dutton are able to illustrate the degree to which social issues elicit certain emotions from organizational actors and map onto their professional, present, and perfect (or ideal) identities affects whether or not they will own, and subsequently act on, a particular issue. Similarly, Lonna Anderson and Robert Jones discuss emotion as a moderator between feedback valence and feedback acceptance among employees, and Anat Rafaeli and Avi Kluger cite emotion as a moderator between “servicescapes” and customer satisfaction. Although none of these studies focus on emotion per se, each stresses the importance of emotion in understanding the relationship between other more observable constructs.

The section of this volume that most clearly resembles the work done by sociologists deals with the outcomes of emotions in the workplace. In these three studies, Jeffrey Karabanow identifies the culture of organizations, as opposed to the structure, as determining feeling and display norms, while Susan Kruml and Deanna Geddes as well as Wilfred Zerbe make concerted attempts to reconceptualize emotional labor and to address the question of whether or not emotional labor is truly related to physical and emotional well-being. Despite what the authors refer to as the intuitive appeal for the idea that emotional labor has deleterious effects on workers, the results of their statistical analyses do not support it.

And finally, the last section serves to introduce three broad research agendas that deal specifically with the issues of “transformational leadership” as emotion management (Neal Ashkanasy and Barry Tse); emotional intelligence, job characteristics, and emotional display (Ronald Humphrey); and shame in the workplace and its possible relationship to workplace violence (Christian Poulson II). Unlike the previous four, this section is strictly theoretical and, as the editors so astutely point out, is broad enough to spawn research in this area for years to come.

The amount of overlap between the management scholars and those in sociology is surprising. It is especially surprising given the relatively few sociologists cited in the references. Their ideas are there, but their names are not; for instance, several authors’ work incorporates insights that have been published previously by such sociologists as Theodore Kemper, Peggy Thoits, Robin Leidner, Karen Pugliesi, Allen Smith, and Sherryl Kleinman, to name just a few. What this suggests is not that management theorists do not value sociologists’ insights in this area of study, but they may simply be unaware of them. Given the similar number of management studies typically cited by sociologists, the failure to consider one another’s endeavors appears to go both ways.

Despite the fact that sociologists have been grappling with the issue of emotion in the workplace for over 15 years, they are still struggling to define the most fundamen-
tal concepts, to measure the most basic occurrences, and to find or construct a theoretical framework that will allow them to move ahead in their quest for answers. Organizational management researchers appear to be very much in the same place. Given this state of affairs, it seems, at least to one sociologist, that collaboration between these two fields would move us all ahead far more effectively and efficiently than we will be able to move separately.

—Kathryn J. Lively
Indiana University
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Within seven chapters, Alan Jenkins introduces the “not very well understood French model” of employment relations to the Anglo-American world by discussing French exceptionalism, participative management, organizational change, automation at Peugeot, process redesign, collective bargaining, restructuring, new flexibilities, and reform in work and society. In brief, the French model is based on four elements: a powerful bureaucracy, an omnipotent state, respect for hierarchy, and low-trust union-management relations. The origins of a powerful state bureaucracy dating back to Napoleonic times have resulted in a strong influence over labor relations. With 70% of all firms represented by the Conseil National du Patronat Français, small organizations are covered by the Confédération Générale des Petites et Moyennes Enterprises. On the trade union side, politically fragmented federations are divided into the progressive Confédération Générale du Travail (CGT) and its splinter group Force Ouvrière (FO), the Catholic Confédération Française des Travailleurs Chrétiens, the “worker self-management”–oriented Confédération Française Démocratique du Travail (CFDT), and the union of lower and middle managers known as Confédération Française de l’Encadrement–Confédération Générale des Cadres. Having outlined the main players, Jenkins uses the subsequent chapters to describe in detail French labor relations.

The initial section, on the reform of work, starts with the May 1968 revolution, when “social relations in the firm moved at the top of the political and economic priorities,” ending with the Auroux legislative reforms in the early 1980s, which “presaged the unfolding of industrial democracy in the French workplace” (p. 36). The 1980s were also the decade of technological modernization and the negotiation of organiza-
tional change, when computerization in production and service formed two experiences. State regulation influenced this process, and patterns of technological change emerged from branch- and firm-level negotiations. Although Jenkins’s case study of automation by the car manufacturer Peugeot exemplifies union participation during the introduction of automation, the Toyota production system commonly known as lean production affected more than just car making. Even though state support led to changes in management, it also “generated working conditions of great severity.” But, Jenkins concludes, “there is not really conclusive evidence that lean production has ushered in a new regime of employee subordination” (p. 105). In his chapter on decentralized bargaining, Jenkins shows that functional, not numerical, flexibility has been the biggest stimulus leading to individualization. Overall, “nonstandard contracts do not at all enjoy significant legitimacy in the eyes of the French working population” (p.182).

With the recession of 1991, employment saw “crisis, restructuring and downsizing,” in which methods of “institutional downsizing regulation” were predominant under state-assisted social plans that built and nurtured active dialogue. Such “new flexibilities” also affected working time and contracts, but most significant has been the Aubry Loi sur les 35 heures Law of June 1998, which “encouraged all companies to begin negotiating working time reductions and flexibilities in exchange for state help in offsetting the costs involved” (p. 167). Between June 1998 and September 1999, 15,831 agreements were negotiated, moving working time significantly below the 40-hour week. According to a survey conducted by the Guardian Weekly (May 31, 2001, p. 14), 80% of all French citizens saw the 35-hour week as positive or very positive, whereas 60% of company directors “believed the law has helped to increase productivity” (p. 14). In France, the 35-hour week does not appear to have had a negative impact on last year’s 500,000 new jobs or the International Monetary Fund’s 2.6% economic growth for this and next year.

The final chapter discusses the protest of 1995, when “new modes of mobilization and new group solidarities emerged spontaneously with huge marches in major cities such as Nantes, Lyon, and Marseille” (pp. 190-191). Four developments contributed to the protests: (a) a powerful national consensus that rejects social exclusion; (b) rising economic expectations based on improvements of education in many subpopulations; (c) incompetence by the elite (and management), who are “considered incapable of reforming themselves”; and (d) a significant and prolonged economic recession. These developments led to the protests of 1995, when “6 million worker-days were lost in strikes compared to an average 1.1 million per year between 1982 and 1994” (p. 189). In sharp contrast to organizations such as the AFL-CIO with highly bureaucratic administrations, membership registers, rules, and regulations, French workers prefer spontaneous protest. In fact, Jenkins describes social protest as an important element of French political culture. On the whole,

both the Socialist government of Lionel Jospin and the main unions CFDT, CGT, and FO were shaken by the movement—not only the success of its unorthodox methods, but also the widespread public support that was clearly behind its demands. (p. 194)
Jenkins also stresses that “generally, labor relations problems and issues of collective rights pushed the terms of recent HR management (essentially individualistic) off center stage, both inside and outside organizations” (p. 192). Jenkins concludes that in contemporary Europe—where the politics of the Third Way as a path between Soviet socialism and U.S. capitalism are popular, where Germany’s social-democratic Gerhard Schröder and Britain’s Labor leader, Tony Blair, are powerful players—French labor relations “play a dynamic role in influencing economic and social policy” (p. 208) beyond France.

—Thomas Klikauer
University of Western Sydney


In recent years, popular and scholarly analysts have argued that the United States is a meritocratic society where serious racial discrimination is a phenomenon of the past. They point to the existence of civil rights laws and the presence of visible tokens—professionals and other white-collar employees of color in a variety of workplaces.

Yet, as Philip Moss and Chris Tilly show, data on U.S. workplaces contradict this view. Discrimination targeting Black, Latino, and Asian Americans remains prevalent. These researchers use data from surveys and face-to-face interviews with employers in major cities to examine types of jobs offered by employers, skills needed, and screening and hiring practices. This is the sixth in a series of books out of the Multi-City Study of Urban Inequality, a project jointly sponsored by the Russell Sage Foundation and the Ford Foundation.

A key analysis here examines stereotypes in employment. How employers view the merit of a class of employees, such as African Americans, shapes their willingness to employ them. If workers of color are thought not to have certain skills, even before they are known, they will be excluded from consideration. In interviews, employers indicated that hiring decisions involved stereotypes about the personality traits, attitudes, and behaviors of workers of color. Employers often had a mindset that Black and Latino workers were best fit for lower paying, menial jobs regardless of their skills, and such workers, not surprisingly, were often not considered for more skilled positions.

“Soft skills,” the skills of communication and social interaction, are increasingly sought by employers. Applicants of color are thought by many employers to be less likely to have such skills. In face-to-face interviews, some 46% of the employers “criticized blacks’ hard or soft skills, with black workers’ motivation a particularly frequent target” (p. 153). A smaller group of employers were similarly critical of Latino workers’ hard and soft skills. The increased accent on soft skills in the workplace in-
creases the possibility of prejudice and stereotyping entering into the hiring and promotion processes.

Moss and Tilly find that in the multicity survey of employees, higher percentages of college-educated African Americans reported discrimination in pay or promotion than did less well-educated African Americans, a counterintuitive finding yet consistent with other research. For example, in interviews with several hundred middle-class African Americans, my colleagues and I have found that most of these economically successful Americans report significant racial discrimination in their lives, including in their workplaces (see Feagin & Sikes, 1994).

Another finding presented by Moss and Tilly is that some employers seem to seek to match racial backgrounds or preferences of clients and customers (“customer ethnocentrism”) with the racial characteristics of employees. Racial matching restricts job opportunities. Moss and Tilly also discovered, yet again, that the movement of jobs from central cities to suburban areas by companies has had a serious impact on the employment of workers of color in cities. This is a common finding, yet this analysis documents the important point that racial motivations are intertwined in this type of metropolitan restructuring. Some employers intentionally choose workplace locations inaccessible to Black workers. Some employer surveys have found that employers were more likely to express a desire to move away from neighborhoods with increasing numbers of Black families than from other neighborhoods. The spatial mismatch of jobs in many cities is often linked to an intentional movement away from Black populations by White employers.

Moss and Tilly speak of the useful idea of “mental maps”:

For a substantial minority of employers, these mental maps contain a negative image of the inner city that is tied to race, class, and a variety of perceived urban ills such as crime, family breakdown, welfare dependency, and inadequate education. . . . Employer comments are laced with stereotypes, and other employers based in such communities criticize these views as overblown. (p. 207)

Moss and Tilly successfully combine qualitative and quantitative research methods to provide a clear portrait of how employers contribute to the persistence of systemic racism in the workplace.

Moss and Tilly note that only 45% of the employers reported that affirmative action programs or equal employment opportunity laws had played a role in their job hiring. Moreover, affirmative action outreach efforts, such as using public schools, state employment agencies, and community agencies, were made for only 8% of the people finally hired.

In their conclusion, Moss and Tilly discuss affirmative action and related strategies for dealing with discrimination in the workplace. One solution stems from the finding that the more formal and less subjective the hiring process is, the better Black workers do. So, more programs such as affirmative action, as well as aggressive enforcement of antidiscrimination laws in employment, seem necessary for real change. Because the majority of employers today do not make use of affirmative action programs in hiring, and because this is a society with much racial discrimination, there is
much political and organization work to be done if U.S. society is ever to live up to the standard of “liberty and justice for all.”

—Joe R. Feagin
University of Florida
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*Gender and Community Policing: Walking the Talk*, by Susan L. Miller. Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1999, 269 pp. $50.00 (cloth), $20.00 (paper).

Susan L. Miller’s groundbreaking book *Gender and Community Policing: Walking the Talk* is the first attempt to construct a feminist conceptual framework of community policing. In particular, Miller offers an illuminating analysis of how policing has been transformed to honor the “feminine” values associated with community policing within the traditions of a paramilitary, masculine organization. Relying on detailed qualitative data collected during extensive fieldwork with police officers in one Midwestern city where community policing has been practiced for over a decade, Miller successfully answers a host of questions about the negotiation of gender by neighborhood police officers. This book is clearly an important piece of scholarship because it extends the largely atheoretical community policing literature by “examining the development and interactive process of gender dynamics within the community policing context” (p. 71).

In chapter 1, Miller provides relevant background information related to community policing in general and, more specifically, an overview of community policing in Jackson City. The Jackson City neighborhood policing program was initially unpopular, largely because of the “feminine” traits and values associated with community policing philosophies and practices. Officers who initially sought out neighborhood officer assignments were typically female and/or members of a racial minority, and they faced stigmatization, ostracism, and a lack of support from traditional patrol officers. In later years, as the number of male neighborhood officers increased, and as they were promoted to supervise newer neighborhood officers, the community policing program began to be viewed as more legitimate. In the author’s words, “in order for community policing to be accepted by rank and file, the feminine traits involved in community policing needed to be appropriated as masculine ones and reshaped to appear powerful and desirable” (p. 5).
In chapter 2, Miller presents an exceptional piece of ethnographic research that documents the daily work activities of six neighborhood police officers. The six profiles are presented near the beginning of the book for three reasons. For one, the profiles illustrate the three very different kinds of neighborhoods (i.e., criminally active, program development, and maintenance) that exist in Jackson City. Second, the profiles reveal the various policing styles of the six neighborhood police officers. Finally, the profiles begin to illuminate “how gender, sexual orientation, and race play direct or indirect roles in various decisions: desire to become a neighborhood police officer, selection of neighborhood, and activity planning and goal setting for the work conducted in the neighborhood” (p. 26).

Miller shifts her focus in chapter 3 from analyzing the research data to an overview of the theoretical and historical framework in which she grounds her analysis of community policing in Jackson City. Here, Miller accomplishes several important objectives. First, she reveals “the gendered nature of policing and the ways in which this masculinist culture manifests itself in the everyday reality of police work” (p. 65). Next, she describes the historical background of women’s entrance into policing, which provides a framework for understanding the development of distinct male and female roles in policing and the tendency to dichotomize certain traits, skills, and activities as either feminine or masculine. Finally, Miller reveals how the stereotypical feminine traits, skills, and activities (e.g., empathy, communication, crime prevention) once consistent with those of policewomen in the late 19th and early 20th centuries have “been resurrected and elevated to the pinnacle of community policing agendas and practices” (p. 65).

In chapter 4, Miller uses her research data to reveal the struggles, confusion, and pressures that many officers experience as they transition from patrol to neighborhood police work. Relying on feminist research methods, Miller allows both male and female officers’ voices to be heard, which provides a unique glimpse into the conflicts officers experience as they struggle to coordinate the dual image of the neighborhood police officer as crime fighter and social worker. Male officers in particular describes coming to terms with the fact that community policing does not reflect “real/masculine” crime fighting but rather has a less aggressive, prosocial emphasis that has not traditionally been considered “real” police work.

At this point, Miller poses the question, Do men and women “do” community policing differently? She maintains that many of the apparent differences between men and women were based on a combination of gender role expectations and socialization experiences. Even residents were found to project certain competencies and expectations onto neighborhood police officers that were based on gender and had nothing to do with the officers’ actual skills or abilities. In fact, in chapter 5, Miller investigates the interactions between neighborhood police officers and citizens, revealing the situational ambiguities related to such encounters. Within this chapter, she also explores why officers sought out neighborhood policing positions and how officers’ policing styles and interests influence the types of neighborhoods they chose as places to work. From here, Miller proceeds to examine how an officer’s gender, race, and ethnicity influence his or her perceptions, behaviors, and actual police work. Throughout chapters 4 and 5, Miller clearly demonstrates that differences in behavior
and style cannot be easily reduced to any single factor, such as an officer’s gender, because men and women are clearly not monolithic groups, and that “untangling the effects of gender, race, and sexual orientation on neighborhood policing is a complex task” (p. 151).

In chapter 6, Miller attempts to capture the perceptions and experiences of patrol officers assigned to squad cars in the community policing neighborhoods. She also examines the different ways in which patrol officers versus neighborhood officers handle a social problem such as domestic violence. The finding that neighborhood officers were better able to handle domestic violence situations in a more informal manner, different from traditional policing models, led Miller to advance numerous important policy recommendations, which she presents in chapter 7. One of the strongest policy messages related to gender and neighborhood policing is that “given traditional gender-role expectations, in many community policing situations, women do not get any or enough credit and men get too much” (p. 220).

—Robin N. Haarr
Arizona State University West
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