

writings, later works showed his attempts to go beyond Marx and distinguish his perspective from Marxian writers. We should view Cox as a prophet, attempting to address issues that were of great public concern and critical of American sociological thought.

Endnotes

1. This section relies heavily on Herbert M. Hunter's article "Oliver C. Cox: Marxist or Intellectual Radical?" which is a condensed work from his dissertation, "The Life and Work of Oliver C. Cox," Department of Sociology, Boston University, January, 1981.
2. Hunter notes that there was only one other criticism refuting at any length the caste idea in the 1940s: Maxwell R. Brooks, "American Class and Caste: An Appraisal," *Social Forces*, Vol. 25 (December, 1946), pp. 207-211. Hunter goes on to clarify that this article relies heavily on Cox's critique of caste.

References

- Cox, Oliver C. 1945. "An American Dilemma: A Mystical Approach to the Study of Race Relations." *Journal of Negro Education* 14: 132-148.
- Cox, Oliver C.. 1948. *Caste, Class, and Race*. First edition. New York: The Country Life Press.
- Cox, Oliver C.. 1950. "Max Weber On Social Stratification: A Critique." *American Sociological Review* 15:223-227.
- Cox, Oliver C.. 1961. "Letters to the Editor." *American Journal of Sociology* 66:510-511.
- Hunter, Herbert M.. 1983 "Oliver C. Cox: Marxist or Intellectual Radical?" *Journal of the History of Sociology* 5: 1-27.
- Hunter, Herbert M. and Sameer Y. Abraham. 1987. *Race, Class, and the World System: The Sociology of Oliver C. Cox*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Thompson, Richard H.. 1989. *Theories of Ethnicity*. New York: Greenwood Press Inc.

CHANGING WOMEN'S WORKPLACE STATUS: ALONE OR TOGETHER?

Shirley Harkess and Amy Hammer
University of Kansas

Mid-American Review of Sociology, 1994, Vol XVIII, No. 1 & 2: 93--100

This review essay concerns what employed women can do to change their situation in the world of paid work. Now a perennial issue for women as well as men--going it alone versus mobilizing co-workers, assessment of several recent studies (Hertz 1986; Milkman 1987; Blum 1991; Paules 1991; McIlwee and Robinson 1992) from this perspective, chosen for the variety of occupations they represent, present very different ideas on this topic. The solutions which researchers, or the women they studied, pursue may be structural, cultural, or individual. Although the basic problem is essentially the same in each study--the lack of equity for women, researchers also arrive at different explanations of the problem, likewise structural, cultural, or individual. The objectives of this review essay are to: (1) map the variety of explanations and solutions; (2) examine the extent to which an author's explanation and solution are analytically consistent, and then characterize the researcher's philosophical stance on a continuum from voluntarist to determinist; and (3) in conclusion, speculate as to the reasons for the obvious variation among these occupational case studies of employed women. The following table summarizes our analysis.

Each study investigates a particular workplace problem. Referring to a period in the recent past, Milkman examines gender segregation in the World War II work force, exposing myths of the time about women's work and explaining the differences between the electrical and automotive industries. In reverse status order of contemporary workers, Paules shows how waitresses find power and autonomy actively resisting workplace controls. Blum examines the intersection of two social movements, labor and women's, identifying the pitfalls and possibilities of comparable worth. Hertz deconstructs the glamorous dual-career corporate marriage to its precarious social base. McIlwee and Robinson discover a male culture of engineering that women engineers must negotiate in order to succeed.

Explanations and Solutions: Structural, Cultural, or Individual?

Factory Workers during and after World War II. While gender segregation in factory jobs existed throughout the war, Milkman concentrates on postwar labor struggles. In the automotive industry before the war women were hired only as upholsterers. Although they filled many men's jobs during the war, afterward management attempted to return to the prewar policy of exclusion (pp. 130-37).

CHANGING WOMEN'S WORKPLACE STATUS

Study (occupation)	Expln. ¹	Solution	Stance	
			Voluntarism . . .	Determinism
Milkman (factory wkr.)	S	S		X
Paules (waitress)	<u>C</u> , ² S	I	X	
Blum (clerical or recreation wkr., librarian)	<u>S</u> , C	<u>S</u> , C		X
Hertz (manager)	S, C, I	I, S	X	
McIlwee/Robinson (engineer)	<u>C</u> , <u>S</u>	I, C, S	X	

S = structural
 C = cultural
 I = individual
 Underscore = emphasis

Milkman views this as a feature of automotive industrial structure. As capital-but not labor-intensive, the industry could afford to pay high wages to workers in order to control its labor force. Management also had a preference for male workers. We can see this preference either in cultural terms, as a function of patriarchal society, or in structural terms, as an example of gender identification overriding class identification.

Women auto workers were only able to make gains by appealing collectively to the union to protect their seniority rights (p. 140). This structural solution netted automotive women much less, however, than women gained in the electrical industry.

In this branch of manufacturing, women were employed in relatively large numbers in lighter production. The electrical industry is labor-intensive, prompting management to cheapen labor wherever possible. During the war, women moved into higher paid men's jobs. Management's policy toward women after the war was to demote them to traditional lower paid women's jobs. Milkman attributes this problem to the dual-wage system (p. 144). Women, numerous and relatively powerful in the United Electrical Workers, were able to

fight for comparable worth (a structural solution) and win some concessions from management with the help of male union members who feared female substitution under the dual-wage system (p. 148).

Milkman concludes that comparable worth may be more successful than affirmative action, a more individual solution, to the key problem of women's low wages (p. 159).

Waitresses. Paules' explanation of waitresses' problems is primarily cultural. She describes the "symbolism of service" waitresses must combat in order to achieve autonomy. This symbolism is a cultural phenomenon that allows customers to define waitresses as non-human servants who do not deserve or receive common courtesy (p. 132-40). The structural issue is a distinct lack of opportunity for advancement. While waitresses can, if they wish, become local-level managers, this may involve an actual cut in take-home pay and much more aggravation. Because of the interstate restaurant chain's centralized nature, waitresses do not have an opportunity to move beyond the single restaurant in which they work (p. 112-28).

The solutions Paules observes and endorses are individual. Route waitresses resist by occasionally blowing up at customers or walking off the job. Paules suggests that because of the individualistic ethos of restaurant work, waitresses are uninterested in unionization (p. 174-5). The code of non-interference she describes and waitresses' view of themselves as private entrepreneurs may also contribute to the lack of interest in unions.

Clerical or Recreation Workers. Librarians. Blum analyzes the struggle for comparable worth of these public employees in San Jose and Contra Costa County. Comparable worth is a solution to the causes of women's low wages in the cultural devaluing of women's work, its consequent low market value, and an occupational structure of short promotion ladders and dead-end jobs (p. 57-8). The cause is partially cultural if we feel that women and men enjoy different kinds of work because they operate in different gender cultures. Librarians in San Jose, for example, who had invested considerable time and money in their education, enjoyed what they did and did not want to have to leave the occupation in order to make more money (p. 64-7). The solution is cultural as well as structural. In San Jose, where the union was victorious, comparable worth brought actual wage hikes and financial returns (p. 85-91). In completing a job study as part of the struggle, women also came to value their work more (p. 77).

Managers. The problem as Hertz sees it is that male managers are "more equal" than female managers in supposedly egalitarian dual-career marriages. The causes are multiple. Culturally, women tend to marry older men with more power; the women Hertz studied did not originally intend to have careers at all (p. 42-54), and thus their marriages began on an unequal footing. The individual effects of socialization also play a role in successful managerial wives' contradictory profession of ignorance when it comes to their checkbooks (p. 106-7). Structurally, women are penalized financially in the workplace and may be penalized again at home when children arrive to make their marriages more

traditional (p. 137-8). Another structural explanation is that the ability of women and men to have a dual-career marriage depends on the existence of a class of oppressed workers to replace the wife's labor in the home. These workers do not enjoy the benefits, including the high income, of partners in a dual-career marriage. So progress for managerial women is not progress for all women, a fact Hertz sometimes fails to recognize fully.

The only solutions these dual-career partners are willing to accept are individual ones. In order to preserve the appearance of independence, they prefer not to rely on collective means (p. 194-95). Hertz' reference to employers as "silent partners" shows she believes they have some responsibility to help solve the workplace problems of dual-career couples, but she does not think they will do so voluntarily or that managerial employees will organize collectively to demand it (p. 210-11). However, if employers were to act, structural change might ensue.

Engineers. In engineering school and two West coast firms especially, McIlwee and Robinson discover a male culture characterized by competitiveness, aggression, and bragging (p. 116). This atmosphere makes the women engineers, who in the authors' words are not "gender role rebels" (p. 23), very uncomfortable. Although this discovery would suggest that the authors see the cause of women engineers' workplace problems as cultural, McIlwee and Robinson root the varying manifestations of this culture in the different structures of the two firms: a small high-tech company where engineers are very powerful and promotions are dependent on peer review and a large aerospace company dependent on federal contracts requiring affirmative action, where engineers compete for power with other employees. The male culture of engineering is a bigger problem at the first firm because the male engineers have the power to enforce their will. At the federal contractor in contrast, where a close eye is kept on promotions and the hierarchy is clear, male engineers are unable to influence promotions and workplace environment to their benefit. Thus, McIlwee and Robinson's explanation, which they call a conflict-structural perspective (p. 111-31), is both structural and cultural.

The sociologist team offers several solutions. In high school girls should take math, and college women should study engineering. In the workplace they recommend the individual remedy of affirmative action. More generally, they suggest cultural changes in work-family relations that would make it easier for women and men to participate fully in both work and family life. For these changes to occur, structural change--great demand for engineers in the U.S. or a re-energized women's movement--will be necessary.

Taken together, the all of the explanations and all but one of the solutions researchers devise for the problems they discern in this range of occupations have at least some structural component. Only Milkman and Blum, however, propose solutions that are predominantly structural and, importantly, at least in this group of cases, relatively more successful. Structural solutions are the most difficult to effect, requiring organization to achieve power; in the workplace they often imply collective action. Women engineers and women managers have

overcome many of the obstacles the average woman faces in the workplace, but they benefit from the women's movement rather than contribute to it, as the two studies report. These successful entrants in prestigious male-dominated occupations identify with their class, not their gender. It was by identifying with their gender, though, that Milkman's factory workers and Blum's white-collar public employees were able to organize collectively and effect change.

Paules and Hertz suggest that their subjects even *insist* on individual solutions to their workplace problems. Paules recommends that the waitresses she studied see themselves as soldiers and entrepreneurs to get as much as they can out of the job of waitressing. We have no doubt this is true; however, this need not have prevented either author from proposing a more collective solution. It is true that neither waitresses nor managers have a history of mobilization like factory labor does. But neither did clerical workers, who obviously benefited greatly from unionization. Both Paules and Hertz seem to value the independence of their subjects as if it were independent of social structure. Yet we need to ask how the traditional "independence" of waitresses and managers was created and how it is maintained. What training or signals, for example, do these employees get from management that lead to such maladaptive "independence"? Paules' waitresses can only control how they *feel* about their situation, but emotional control is not control over wages or the size of their tips. The only way they can increase their income is by a self-inflicted speed-up.

Consistency and Stance: Voluntarist or Determinist?

In considering the five studies' explanations and solutions jointly and identifying the author's stance as voluntarist or determinist in the table, the contradiction in three of the five cases (Paules, Hertz, and McIlwee and Robinson) is apparent. Consistently and only structural, Milkman falls closest to determinism. *Gender at Work* is not about individuals or individual choices; it is about how historical forces shape women's work experiences and how collective action can be effective. Milkman describes social allegiances, such as the gender allegiance of male management to male workers, similar to that originally noted by Hartmann (1976) in the struggle over the family wage. Comparable worth is a solution in keeping with Milkman's structural explanation. A representative of voluntarism might suggest that since women choose what field to go into and what jobs to apply for and take, the results--women's lower wages--are not the fault of employers but of individual women. A determinist like Milkman would counter that while it may appear that women are making choices, the fact that they are making the same one suggests that working in low-paying women's jobs may not be a choice at all. Achieving comparable worth, then, can undo some of the damage done by socialization, and address inequity now.

With the emphasis on structure in her explanation and solution, Blum's stance is similarly determinist. The title of her first chapter, "Justice You Can Bank On," is illustrative. Blum does not think women freely choose to take lower paying jobs, but rather a variety of social factors have pushed them to do so. Thus, changes in education and new socialization patterns are very well and good for the next generation--if they happen, but what today's women need is justice they can take to the bank.

In almost total contrast, emphasizing the sources of autonomy available to waitresses despite a very restrictive work environment, Paules' stance is voluntarist. She does not discuss the social pressures that cause women to become waitresses. Instead, she concentrates on the options waitresses have and can exercise for their own benefit (p. 77-114). What Paules sees as waitresses' success in achieving autonomy is sometimes simply a change in attitude; i.e., they see themselves differently, they have not changed their circumstances.

As represented in the table, the other two studies fall on the continuum between these two extremes. Hertz is more voluntarist than determinist. She feels that the degree of choice exercised by these dual-career corporate manager couples is a factor in their financial success, which not everyone can achieve (p. 214). With their cultural-structural explanation and multi-faceted solution, McIlwee and Robinson are in the middle of the continuum between voluntarism and determinism. Notice, for example, that they do not recommend that women in sales at the high-tech firm explore comparable worth. At the same time, they clearly believe there is social pressure, as their examples of women's parents' restricting their entry into engineering (p. 42).

Conclusion: Why the Difference?

From the table, Paules is the exception. This is perplexing at first as waitresses in a dead-end unit of a very hierarchical national chain are arguably the most oppressed among all the women workers studied. Yet Paules finds evidence of resistance on their part and endorses their strategies. Her tone, however, is defensive. One purpose of her research is to counter what she sees as the dominant characterization of women workers in the research literature (feminist and other) as passive victims of sex discrimination. She is part of a revisionist wave of feminist researchers trying to show that subordinated women have exercised power to whatever extent possible in their patriarchal circumstances. Her study becomes more understandable, then, not just as that of the only non-sociologist (Paules is an anthropologist), but as a reactive attempt to alter the pendulum. In our view, while it is important to reveal that even the most oppressed are not passive victims, it seems equally important to keep in mind the larger picture of the occupation: its sources of recruitment, for example, and, in this particular case, the local labor market for waitresses which was uncharacteristically tight.

Further, on the basis of the other studies in this group, it is evident that there is a more balanced consideration of the play between agency and structure than Paules thinks. Even Milkman, the most determinist of the five, sees at least some of her factory workers recognizing their situation and making an effort to combat and alter it. It is additionally significant, as she notes, that these women were wartime workers entering male domains before a resurgent women's movement gave them even a little public affirmation and rhetoric. The appeal to "patriotism" was unable to prevent new forms of gender segregation during and after the war.

The other fault line in researchers' stances is primarily the status of the occupation studied, really the social class its workers represent, and secondarily its gender composition and label. Hertz's managers and McIlwee and Robinson's engineers are white-collar workers at the top of the prestige hierarchy and have little experience or inclination to "go public" with their gripes and eventually act collectively. Given this history, it is perhaps not surprising that the researchers of these occupations would be in the middle, recognizing structural, cultural, and individual factors in their explanations or solutions. However, in neither case do their solutions seem adequate to the structural issues they have identified. Hertz empathizes with her subjects' fierce sense of autonomy while McIlwee and Robinson's endorsement of affirmative action seems a weak tool to restructure the established organization of work, especially at the high-tech firm. In comparison, Blum and Milkman deal with lower-status workers who are also in large organizations (e.g., Ford, Westinghouse, the California civil service). The scope of their image of themselves as individuals on the job is likely much reduced, so the focus is on how they band together to create a larger impact. In the end it was their understanding of their status as women that enabled them to try to do so.

Together these five studies reveal not just the range of women's occupational experiences, which is wider than it was even 20 years ago (see Harkess 1985), but also, at least to us, the merits of situating the experiences of individual women in particular occupations in the larger historical and social structures of which they are a part.

References

- Blum, Linda M. 1991. *Between Feminism and Labor: The Significance of the Comparable Worth Movement*. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press.
- Harkess, Shirley. 1985. "Women's Occupational Experiences in the 1970s: Sociology and Economics." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 10:495-516.
- Hartmann, Heidi I. 1976. "Capitalism, Patriarchy and Job Segregation by Sex." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 1:137-69.

- Hertz, Rosanna. 1986. *More Equal than Others: Women and Men in Dual-Career Marriages*. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press.
- McIlwee, Judith S. and J. Gregg Robinson. 1992. *Women in Engineering: Gender, Power, and Workplace Culture*. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press.
- Milkman, Ruth. 1987. *Gender at Work: The Dynamics of Job Segregation by Sex during World War II*. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press.
- Paules, Greta Foff. 1991. *Dishing It Out: Power & Resistance among Waitresses in a New Jersey Restaurant*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

BOOK REVIEWS

Provisional Irish Republicans. An Oral and Interpretive History, by Robert W. White. (1993) Greenwood Press, Westport, Connecticut. 206pp.

Beneath the statue in Dublin of the late 19th century Irish parliamentarian James Stewart Parnell are inscribed the words, "no (one) has the right to fix a boundary to the march of a nation". No book, that I know of, proves the prophetic merit of that statement more definitively than Robert W. White's **Provisional Irish Republicans**. This book is essentially a case study of the various organizations that are the gatekeepers of Irish Nationalism. The major emphasis is on the Provisional Irish Republican Army and its political arm, Sinn Fein. It is important to sociologists for two reasons. One, it provides information about group conflict that challenges dominant social science theories of such violence. These theories include social breakdown due to rapid social change, an expectant-achievement gap, discrimination that promotes prolonged deprivation, and the inability to bear up under social stresses and strains. Secondly, it brings a social structural approach to its examination of the Irish Nationalist group formation and cohesion, where other studies take either a psychological or criminological viewpoint.

The author is an Assistant Professor of Sociology at Indiana University in Indianapolis who specializes in matters of contemporary group violence. Over a period of several years, covering the greater part of the 1980's, he made a number of trips to Ireland and interviewed Nationalist activists across a broad spectrum of time and geography. For example, respondents included 100-year-old Tom Maguire, the oldest living Republican of the 1920's, and the last surviving member of the only All-Ireland constituted Dail (Parliament) of 1921. Other interviews covered prominent women nationalists (a segment of the population generally overlooked in writings of this sort), lifelong members, two English-born converts to Irish Nationalism, one of whom became IRA Chief of Staff, and the most recent converts to the cause. As to geography, the author included respondents from each of Ireland's contested six northern counties, and thirteen of her remaining twenty-six counties. Additionally, interviews covered nationalist activists of every generation from the Easter uprising of 1916 to the present time.

The book begins with a sociological discussion of traditional theories and policies dealing with small group violence in contemporary societies and a historical examination of the irrepressible phenomenon known widely as the IRA. Chapter 2 sets forth the reasons for the author's choice of the IRA and Irish Nationalism as a prime example of a small-group political mobilization heuristic. He further builds on the historical narrative in the opening chapter with a general examination of the resistance to British occupation until a reinvigorated Irish Republican Movement was jolted from its slumbers by state generated terrorism such as the "Battle of the Bogside" and "Bloody Sunday", in the late 1960's and early 1970's.

Chapters 3,4 and 5 continue the historical approach with personal oral histories from Irish Republicans to provide an understanding of why, what, when