

BRINGING WOMEN INTO COMPUTING MANAGEMENT

“All of us are indoctrinated about what men and women are like, what they can and cannot do, and what they should and should not do,” observed E. B. Schwartz and J. J. Rago, Jr. These cultural attitudes, as they are practiced in business, are now being questioned. U.S. law says there can be no discrimination in employment based on sex. But companies are finding it unpalatable to comply with this law in more than a token manner. The result has been a number of massive court-ordered settlements by companies that thought they were complying with the law—settlements of hundreds of thousands to millions of dollars. In this report we shall look at what computing management should know about sex discrimination in business, the equal employment opportunity laws and regulations, and what a company can do to avoid the hazards of only token compliance with these laws.

Southern California Edison Company (SCE) is a major electric utility with headquarters in Rosemead, California, just east of Los Angeles. SCE serves 2.8 million customers in the Southern California area, and has annual operating revenues of over \$1.7 billion. It has 13,000 employees, 300 of which are in the data processing division.

In 1972 the personnel and employee development department at SCE reviewed its entire personnel system to evaluate its effectiveness in light of the federal affirmative action program requirements and the equal employment opportunity laws. After study, the company decided that the equal employment awareness program and the management training programs that it was obtaining from outside sources could be done better and more economically by its own staff. The personnel and employment development department developed these programs, beginning first with the affirmative action awareness program that was to be given to all SCE employees. Since 1972, this course has been presented to all employees.

The intent of this program is to make SCE employees more aware of the company's affirmative action program. The program points out the benefits of working with people of different cultures who, in many cases, have different points of view. It emphasizes SCE's objective of offering equal employment opportunities to all, based upon each person's qualifications and abilities, not his or her race or sex.

This course is presented separately to management and non-management employees. The 4-hour management program is given first. It goes into some depth on criteria for selecting and promoting employees in a non-prejudicial and objective manner, so that managers will be better able to answer their subordinates' questions raised by the program. The non-management program lasts three hours. It emphasizes that now and in the future, ability and performance are what count, not race or sex, and that women and minorities can compete with others on an equal basis.

SCE's policy is to promote from within for all company positions above the entry level, unless

no one qualified can be found within the company. This practice, coupled with their positive recruitment policy, is a major way in which SCE is seeking to place more women and minorities into the higher positions of the company. SCE would normally not have to recruit new people; between 20,000 and 25,000 people a year apply for jobs at SCE on their own. But the majority of these applicants are white males. So to increase the likelihood of hiring minorities and women, SCE seeks them out. SCE recruits through women's organizations, through advertising in newspapers read by minorities and by women, and by using personnel and social agencies.

To encourage employees to develop more skills, all non-unit, non-supervisory openings in the company are advertised via SCE's job opportunity information system (JOIS), with a few exceptions. For each opening, a short job description together with the skills requirements are given. Any employee with six months of company service may apply for a job announced via JOIS, with or without approval of his/her supervisor. Position openings up to and including the supervisory level are advertised company-wide.

To discover which employees have the ability and willingness to move upward in the company, SCE has developed a professional appraisal form. At least once a year each supervisor and manager fills out an appraisal form for each subordinate stating whether this person is ready for promotion, what skills are needed to make this person promotable, and what work this person is best suited to do. Each employee is made aware of these points and is encouraged to gain needed training, either through the in-house courses or through the educational assistance program.

To develop the potentially promotable people, SCE has developed a series of three training programs that teach skills needed at different organizational levels. Department heads are notified when a class is being formed and are asked to recommend participants.

The first course is a consciousness raising program given to non-supervisory people. Supervisors are urged to include women and minorities in this course. It helps these employees identify the value of their skills and aptitudes to the company and to their supervisors. This course was originally designed only for women, but SCE found that men benefitted from it also.

The second course is a 5½ day supervisory effectiveness seminar. It is given one day a week for six weeks. It is open to supervisors and potential supervisors who are recommended by their managers. It teaches planning, organizing, leading, and controlling skills pertinent to the supervisory position.

The next course is a 10-day middle management effectiveness program. It is given one day a week for ten weeks. It is open to recommended managers of multi-level organizations, high level staff people and people within the executive development program; these people are identified as having high potential and are given accelerated management training. It concentrates on decision making, control of costs and performance, management of human resources, performance appraisal, labor relations, affirmative action goals and responsibilities, and organizational climate.

One of the most important ingredients in successfully moving women into management is a positive corporate environment. To this end, SCE has put into effect a number of positive corporate policies—positive recruitment, promotion from within, JOIS, professional appraisal forms, awareness programs, in-house management training, and educational assistance.

These company policies are aimed at identifying and developing potential managers. But not all employees want to advance. The personnel people at SCE have found that women, especially, often do not want to be promoted. Some prefer to remain executive secretaries. Some do not want to go for a college degree, which often is a prerequisite for a management position at SCE. And some prefer not to have to face the overtime demands and responsibilities of a management position. For these women who are content to remain secretaries, SCE offers a seminar entitled "Today's Career Secretary." This course emphasizes training to become more proficient in all secretarial skills, including how to be of greater assistance to one's managers.

SCE's equal employment opportunity efforts reflect what many companies are now doing to bring their personnel policies more into line with the equal employment opportunity (EEO) laws. To get an idea of why such efforts are necessary, we shall look at the underlying reasons for sex discrimination in employment.

Sex discrimination in employment

The business world reflects the culture in which we live. And the biggest obstacle to the equality of men and women in business is the traditional cultural attitudes that both men and women have toward masculine and feminine roles. Women are perceived to have different skills, different habits and different motivations. Men are viewed as being aggressive, independent and achievement-oriented. Women are viewed as dependent, non-assertive and people-oriented. The business world is viewed in masculine terms. Prather (Reference 2a) states that a career for a man is like motherhood for a woman. A family man is equivalent to being a good provider. He works for the sake of the family. A working woman, on the other hand, is seen as working at the expense of the family.

Bass (Reference 2b) has noted that these ingrained perceptions of male and female roles in society translate into differential hiring, assignment, training, and promotion practices for women. This differential treatment is now being considered discriminatory, because it results in lower pay, less responsibility, and fewer opportunities for women. The personnel practices that perpetuate this situation are often so subtle that employers are blind to their effect.

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), which is charged with enforcing compliance with the federal equal employment opportunity laws, states that since the passage of these laws in the mid 1960's, *overt* discrimination by individuals against individuals has declined (Reference 3). Today, a person is not so likely to consciously discriminate against another person. However, *systematic* discrimination is still occurring in employment practices. Systematic discrimination results from the seemingly neutral employment practices that unintentionally perpetuate discrimination. The identification and elimination of systematic discrimination are the major focus of EEOC's efforts today. To this end, the courts have ruled that it is the *consequences* of employment practices, not the *intent*, which determine whether discrimination requiring remedial action exists. Even if a practice or policy is neutral in intent, if it freezes the status quo of prior discriminatory practices, then it constitutes unlawful discrimination.

The beginning of changing systematic discrimination in personnel policies is the identification

of the cultural attitudes that were the basis for them in the first place. Since most of these are feelings that are traditional, and thus taken for granted, we shall begin by enumerating a number of them. Most come in the form of myths about working women. These myths represent a two-edged sword. Not only do they manifest themselves in business practices, but they also cause certain self-discriminatory reactions from women. To eliminate systematic discrimination, both the employment practices and the women's attitudes must be changed.

The following discussion is based mainly on papers in Reference 2, and facts and figures from the Women's Bureau of the U.S. Department of Labor, Reference 16.

Myths about working women

According to Bass (Reference 4), a woman is downgraded in business because of four myths: (1) she lacks career orientation, (2) she lacks supervisory potential, (3) she lacks dependability, and (4) she lacks emotional stability. These are the very areas in which most stereotypes and myths inhibit working women. So we shall discuss cultural attitudes in this context. What are the myths? How do they manifest themselves in business practices? How do women react to these practices? Do the myths contradict reality?

Career orientation

Myths—Women do not really want a career, they would prefer to stay at home and raise a family. They work only to make "pin money" for family extras. A woman's primary obligation is to her family, not to her career.

In employment practices these myths manifest themselves through employers having a greater concern for the careers of men than for the careers of women. In the first place, employers rarely recruit women for career-oriented positions. Instead, they put them into dead-end "women's jobs." Also, as Prather points out (Reference 2a), women are generally excluded from informal situations—golf courses, lunches, bars, bull sessions—where her male co-workers are making important decisions. In addition, employers pay women less than men for doing the same job.

It is not categorically true that women do not want a career. Bass (Reference 2b) points out that

the homemaker/mother role is much less rewarding today than it used to be, because women now have many labor-saving appliances, they have access to educational opportunities, they marry younger, and they have their children earlier. A woman's apparent attitude of not aspiring to a career is actually a reaction to the employer's unwillingness to support her—via financial aid for education, job opportunities, training programs, and career planning. Employer support and encouragement are crucial to most women's career success. Left to themselves, most women will go into occupations that society deems are appropriate for them.

Since women learn that employers will not encourage them to have a career, they take training that will give them higher paying dead-end jobs, such as programming, rather than start low in, say, sales where the eventual goal is to be a manager or executive. Hacker (Reference 5) points out that women will not prepare for certain vocations (such as engineering) because they know they will have to be much better than men to succeed in them, and they know they will be given less of a chance, because employers think they have no dedication and commitment. Also, since they know that their education probably will not mean as much to an employer, fewer women than men go for advanced degrees. Thus, since few women prepare for a meaningful career, they are not placing themselves in a competitive position with men.

Employers do not encourage careers for women because they think that women do not have the ability to balance both work and family demands. Employers want the job to come first, which is something women supposedly can't (or won't) do. Hacker notes that the lower level of women's aspirations, which is often caused by their being torn between home and work, justifies and reinforces employers' discriminatory attitudes.

In reality, women are paid less than either white men or black men. The Department of Labor reported in 1973 (Reference 16) that the median income for a full time, year-round worker was \$10,918 for a white male, \$7,373 for a black male, \$6,172 for a white female, and \$5,280 for a black female. Women's salaries are 60% of men's salaries—the same ratio that existed 20 years ago.

The average woman college graduate who works full time all year ends up with about the same income as the average male high school dropout (Reference 17).

In data processing the picture appears to be quite a bit better. Gilchrist and Weber (Reference 6) reported on salary levels for keypunch operators, computer operators, business programmers, and business system analysts. In the three different grade levels within each of these job types, women were paid no less than 79% of the corresponding men's salaries. This lowest figure was for keypunch operators. Women's salaries in the other three jobs were in the 94-97% range—near parity with men.

Employers give several reasons for a salary differential based on sex. One is that women do not have to support a family the way men do. This is not necessarily true. According to Department of Labor figures, as of March 1973, over half of the 34 million working women worked because of economic need. Either they were the sole support of themselves or their families, or their husbands earned less than \$7,000. Bass reports that a woman's decision to work is influenced most heavily by the attitudes of her family. Thus, employers should not be concerned with *why* a woman works.

Myth—The employment of mothers leads to juvenile delinquency. This myth is seen in business in employers' reluctance to hire mothers for jobs with upward mobility potential. Yet one-third of the women in the labor force have children under 18 years of age, and employer discrimination here means they are ignoring a lot of potential talent. The Labor Department reports that of the many factors that lead to juvenile delinquency, whether or not a mother is employed does not appear to be a determining factor. It is the quality of her care that counts, not the quantity of time spent on care. Bass (Reference 4) reports that research conducted in the United States, Great Britain and France has repeatedly shown that children whose mothers work generally perform better in school than those with mothers who are restricted to the home.

Supervisory potential

Myths—Women do not want responsibility, promotion or job changes that add to their workload,

and they inately lack the ability to supervise. In business this translates into employers not even offering women jobs that require overtime, travel, or a permanent move—the characteristics of many supervisory and management jobs. Women are systematically excluded from consideration because employers make assumptions about a woman's personal desires that they would never make regarding a man's. The Department of Labor reported in 1973 that only 5% of the women in the workforce were in supervisory or management positions. This compared with 14% for men. Stead (Reference 1b) remarks that companies that employ female college students as secretaries highlight their obvious discrimination and under-utilization of talent.

When an employer does offer a management job to a woman, he requires her to have more education and/or more work experience than he would require of man. She is usually given an unequally small voice in decision making. The employer wants her to be a "Queen Bee." A "Queen Bee," as was explained to us, is a woman with traditional ideas about a woman's place in society who has moved up through company channels by playing the traditional woman's role, i.e. she lets the men still make the decisions. Queen Bees enjoy their stature in a company and will probably not be very helpful to aspiring young women. Most women in management in the past have been Queen Bees. But we gather that most women aspiring to be managers today do not want to be Queen Bees.

Since employers hold women back, Tinker (Reference 2c) suggests that the Peter Principle appears to apply mainly to men—women *do* remain within their level of competence for most of their careers.

On the question of women categorically not wanting promotions and increased responsibilities, Koff and Handlon (Reference 7) did a six-year study of 1,775 women in business to discover their upward motivational attitudes. They found that 30% of the women they studied were motivated to move upward in business. The other 70% were more prone to stay put. In general, the level of the women's intelligence, their marital status, and their number of children did not affect this desire. However, young women who had gone to college were more likely to want to move upward than young women who had not.

Of the 30% upward mobile group, Koff and Handlon identified three subgroups. The group most motivated were those women who were strong risk-takers, were high achievers, were very self-confident, and who would pursue goals despite lack of employer support. The second group would move upward only if they had a positive company climate (coming from a high company level) that helped them develop their self-confidence on a regular basis. Once this type of woman had achieved her goal, she was often content to stay there. The women in the third group would move upward in a company only if they had even more "hand-holding." They were very security-conscious and needed constant reassurance of approval from their families and from their immediate supervisors.

The stay-put group shunned increased responsibility and challenges. They feared going against "traditional" female roles. They feared becoming disloyal to their peer group. And they feared entering a new social status associated with a higher position. Only 12% of these women would even consider being given increased job opportunities from their employers.

Do women have the abilities to manage people? Reif, *et. al.* (Reference 8) reports on a study conducted at the Johnson O'Connor Research Foundation by J. J. Durkin between 1922 and 1971 to discover the aptitude differences between men and women. They found that in 14 of the aptitudes, there were no differences between men and women. In 2 aptitudes—grip and structural visualization—men excelled. In six aptitudes women excelled—finger dexterity, graphoria (accounting ability), ideaphoria (rate of flow of ideas when talking), observation, silograms (ability to form associations between words), and abstract visualizations. Durkin noted that the aptitudes which seem to underlie successful management are: objective personality, abstract visualization and high English vocabulary. Since women excel in one of these traits, he concluded that upon this basis there ought to be more women in management than men. Reif reports on other findings that suggest that the assumption that women managers are basically different (meaning inferior) is not supported by the facts. What is true is that management skills are learned, and that men and women are more alike than different as far as these skills are concerned.

Myth—Men do not like to work for a woman. This myth translates into employers not offering women supervisory positions in predominantly male departments. One basis for this feeling is traditional social norms, which do not sanction women in dominant positions. Bass states that social norms also govern the way both men and women view their stereotyped roles in public competition, arguments and decision-making. Heinen, McGlauchlin, Legeros, and Freeman (Reference 9b) state that women naturally slip into supportive roles and suppress their own achievement needs when men are around. Both men and women are ingrained with these attitudes and accept them. These attitudes must change for discrimination to disappear.

Another reason for men saying they do not want to work for women is their fear of a new and different kind of competition. Schwartz and Rago (Reference 1a) report that for many executives, the prospect of competing with women requires a substantial change in the way these men view themselves. A man can no longer stress being a man's man—that is, only a “real” man can do his job. Resolving this male-female threat is a definite problem that companies must cope with when they implement an equal employment opportunity program.

Bass reported on a study of 174 male managers and their feelings toward women workers. Men who did not work with women at all had a more positive regard for them than men who worked with women as supervisors, peers or subordinates. Bass felt that this was because the first group viewed women in stereotypes and probably tried to give “socially desirable” answers. The second group dealt more with reality—they had experienced disappointments from women as well as from men. Interestingly, the managers who had the lowest regard for women as workers worked with women subordinates. Managers who worked with women peers had a higher regard for them. Bass, combining this finding with conclusions from other studies, concluded that in order for there to be a reduction in prejudice against women workers, interaction has to be on an equal basis. If men only view women from a position of authority, they will continue to view them in an unfavorable light. This change in attitude is enhanced if the contact is sanctioned by custom or law.

Wood (Reference 10) recently did a study of 100 male and female managers in 14 Los Angeles companies. What she discovered substantiates Bass' conclusions. She concluded that by the time qualified women make their way to higher management positions, the worst of the struggle is over. Once there, the men and women in her study agreed that the tensions, the feelings of threat, and the apprehensions had disappeared.

Wood also found that neither the male nor the female managers felt that they had to make significant personal or organizational adjustments in order to fit women into the male management hierarchy. The novelty of women in management apparently had been easier to adapt to than some of the managers had anticipated. The initial feelings of threat had eased and the status-role conflicts were slowly being resolved. The respondents noted that the major problems were *not* in adjusting man-woman roles and relationships but rather in finding and motivating qualified women to seek advancement and in gaining more general resocialization throughout the companies.

Dependability

Myth—Women do not work as long or as regularly as men. This myth translates into employers not offering women as much opportunity for training programs or career counselling, but rather giving them dead-end jobs. Employers assume that working is just a short-term venture for women so why waste time and money training them? As we mentioned, women react to this practice by taking outside training for higher paying dead-end jobs rather than training for a career.

In reality, most women do experience some breaks in employment during their child-bearing and child-rearing years. But of those who do leave, most return after their children are in school. The U.S. Department of Labor reports that there were 4.8 million working mothers in 1973 who had children under 6 years of age—although labor force participation is highest among women aged 18 to 24 and 35 to 54. Even with this break in employment, the average woman worker has a worklife expectancy of 25 years, as compared with 43 years for the average male worker and 45 years for the single woman worker. Studies on turnover show little difference be-

tween men and women. These rates are more job-related than sex-related. Women and men seem to quit jobs just as readily.

Myth—Women have higher rates of sickness and absenteeism than men. In reality, the U.S. Department of Labor reports, age, occupation and salary make more difference than sex in absentee rate. A recent average figure given was that men lose 5.2 days per year while women lose 5.6 days per year—hardly a significant difference. Women over 45 are out substantially less than men of their age. Also, women are less likely to break rules—including crime, alcoholism and gambling—which have a detrimental effect on one's job performance.

Emotional stability

Myths—Women are too emotional in business. They are likely to cry because they take criticism too personally. These myths, as the others, manifest themselves in employers not promoting women into supervisory and decision making jobs where men must “cope” with them.

It is true that women are trained to *act* more emotional. They generally are more willing than men to admit that they need help. But just as men act differently in a business environment than at home, so do women. When women are successful and confident, they won't cry. Reif (Reference 8) reports that a recent study concluded that women will not take a sex-role related strategy in a competitive situation—that is, they will act competitively, not emotionally, when the situation calls for it.

This myth, however, can come very close to the truth for some women. Because of this possibility, it is important that women going into management obtain training to help them take criticism constructively and to learn how to compete and cooperate with men on the job.

Wood (Reference 10) reports some of the good effects women in management can have on the business environment. In her study, male managers reported that the women tend to remain calm under pressure, often more calm than their male counterparts. This has helped, they said, to keep discussions more objective and less emotional. Women have also been more rational and more able to cope with the pressures of short turnaround and crisis situations. In addition, the women have softened the management image.

This has helped to put a damper on the intense competition often found in these higher company positions.

Is there discrimination in data processing?

You might ask how much of these kinds of discrimination exists in data processing. There seems to be mixed reports on this. Statistics show that few women are in data processing management, but, at the same time, some women in the field report having felt no discrimination.

We asked this question of Dr. Marion Wood, Assistant Professor at the University of Southern California, who has been involved in training women for management for many years. She stated that, for one thing, the data processing field is unique. It is not historically a male-dominated profession, as is dentistry, law and engineering. In those fields there is access discrimination, in that women have not been encouraged (often not allowed) to enter the fields. In addition, there is treatment discrimination in those fields, in that women are confronted with discrimination once they obtain a job. Women going into those fields must make a lot of “noise” to get these traditional barriers removed.

Data processing is also not a traditionally female profession, as is teaching and nursing. In those fields there is no access discrimination in the lower levels, and thus women are more likely to work through the system to break down treatment barriers.

The computing field has always been open to men and women. And because entry-level jobs are accessible to women, they do not feel the need to be “noisy” about the need for change. In fact, they may not even be aware of discrimination. But just because they say they see no discrimination, that does not mean there is none.

Levitan (Reference 2d) reported on the discrepancy between working women's perceptions of sex discrimination and objective discrimination that actually exists. She reported that in a national study of 539 working women, only 7.9% of them reported having been discriminated against in *any* way on their job because they were women. In actuality, there was evidence of discrimination against 95% of these women. Levitan surmised that the reasons for this discrepancy were many. Possibly the women rationalized an unpleasant situation, or maybe they compared themselves to

other women rather than to men. Maybe they felt that men *should* receive more occupational rewards, or maybe they thought only of overt discrimination rather than systematic discrimination. Whatever the reasons, Levitan concluded that objective discrimination was unrelated to perceived discrimination.

Although we mentioned that there appears to be little salary discrimination against women in the computer field, we conclude that there *is* systematic discrimination. There are few women in the higher positions in computing, and as we have shown, this is based on company personnel procedures as well as cultural attitudes. With this in mind, we shall now look at the U.S. federal governmental efforts to change this systematic discrimination. We suspect that similar programs are or soon will be underway in other countries.

Sex discrimination can be expensive

In 1973 American Telephone and Telegraph Company found that it could be very costly to have court-ordered remedies to one's systematic discriminatory practices. After more than two years of litigation, AT&T signed an agreement with EEOC and the U.S. Department of Labor that cost them over \$50 million. This settlement is by far the largest in the history of EEOC, and it serves as a warning and a guide to other employers of the enormous costs of EEO Act non-compliance.

Some of the provisions of the AT&T settlement (as outlined in Reference 11) are as follows: AT&T had to make a one-time payment of \$15 million to 15,000 minority and women employees as back payment for discrimination suffered from past discriminatory practices. The company had to make a \$23 million per year payment, for at least two years, to minorities and women due to new promotions and wage policies based on this agreement. Another requirement was to make retroactive adjustments for up to two years to 3000 females in craft jobs. Other requirements included lump sum payments of \$100 to \$400 to approximately 10,000 women and minorities who switched from non-craft to craft jobs; assess the promotability of women college graduates in management jobs, and give each woman eligible a \$100 a month raise; and create a special training program to prepare women for higher level positions. Further, AT&T had to: (1) develop training and promotion target goals for all job clas-

sifications; (2) make judgements of women's and minority's promotability to management positions based on their basic qualifications and their company seniority; (3) pay promoted employees based on their length of service; and (4) inform all employees of job vacancies and promotions. All in all, it was a huge settlement, especially for a company that had been proud of its labor policies.

In another smaller and somewhat more typical case, Household Finance Company agreed in 1972 to pay over \$125,000 to white-collar female workers who charged they were denied promotion because of sex. HFC agreed to hire 20% females for branch representatives openings until a 20% representation was attained. It also agreed to hire 20% from specified minority groups for clerical, credit and branch representative jobs, until this group represented 65% of the population in the labor area. HFC also agreed to train female and minority employees to help them qualify for better jobs where they were under-represented.

These two cases are not alone. In the year ending June 30, 1974, the EEOC had 39,289 sex-bias complaints filed with it. A number of these will undoubtedly lead to court-ordered remedial affirmative action programs, such as described in the AT&T and HFC cases. The teeth behind these suits are a few major laws and executive orders passed in the 1960's and early 1970's. We shall briefly review these. Our discussion is based on EEOC's 1974 publication, *Affirmative Action and Equal Employment: A guidebook for Employers* (Reference 3).

The Equal Pay Act of 1963 requires that the same pay be given to men and women doing equal work, and requiring equal skill, effort and responsibility under similar working conditions within the same establishment. This applies not only to one's paycheck but also to fringe benefits. This is enforced by the Labor Department's Wage and Hour Division. The courts have defined "equal" to mean "substantially equal" not "identical." In 1972 this Act was extended to executive, administrative and professional employees, and in 1974 it was further extended to most federal, state and local government employees.

In 1965 President Johnson signed *Executive Order 11246*. This order was amended in 1968 to include sex discrimination by Executive Order 11375. Executive Order 11246 requires that all firms seeking or having federal contracts over

\$50,000 and having 50 or more employees must develop and implement a written affirmative action program (AAP). AAP's are administered by the Office of Federal Contract Compliance (OFCC) of the U.S. Department of Labor, and requirements for an AAP are spelled out in OFCC's *Revised Order #4*. Non-compliance may result in termination or cancellation of contracts or barring from future contracts.

Briefly, an AAP must identify areas of minority and female "under-utilization" and "concentration," not only company-wide but also within departments and within major job classifications. The U.S. Department of Labor has developed "packets" of local work force statistics so that companies can determine whether their corporate labor forces correspond to their relevant labor market (which is defined as a company's area of reasonable recruitment). An AAP must include numerical hiring and promotion targets and other actions to increase minority and female employment. These can range from immediate actions, such as adjusting salaries and benefits to classes of employees, to long range goals, such as yearly targets for hiring, training, transferring, and promoting under-utilized groups within the company.

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits discrimination because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin, in all employment practices. The U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) was created in 1964 to administer individual's complaints under Title VII.

In 1972 the *Equal Employment Opportunity Act* expanded the jurisdiction of the EEOC. Now Title VII covers all private employers of 15 or more persons, all educational institutions, state and local governments, public and private employment agencies, labor unions with 15 or more members, and joint labor-management committees for apprenticeship and training. The 1972 Act also gave EEOC the power to go directly to court to enforce the law if conciliation fails. Because of this added power, EEOC's legal actions on behalf of individuals against employers are increasing.

Court interpretation of Title VII requirements are similar to the requirements under OFCC's *Revised Order #4*, thus making these requirements applicable to a much wider group than just government contractors.

Based upon these laws and regulations, the courts have identified employment discrimination as class-wide discrimination. And Title VII provides that where it is found to *exist*, action to eliminate it must apply to all members of the "affected class." This has been very broadly interpreted by the courts, as evidenced in the AT&T and HFC cases described earlier. The remedies must not only open the doors of equal employment to all but also must "make whole" those affected by past discrimination.

The EEOC receives and investigates job discrimination complaints. When it finds reasonable cause that the charges are justified, it attempts to reach an agreement with the employer on how to eliminate *all aspects of discrimination that it has uncovered* during its investigation. This EEOC review gives the employer a preliminary assessment of corporate liability for "making workers whole," according to criteria used in past court decisions. If the company decides to voluntarily restore the rightful economic status of the affected class, then they save large litigation costs. It is the focus of the EEOC's efforts to identify and eliminate systematic discriminatory practices without going to court. If, however, the employer balks and refuses to admit that such discrimination exists in the company, then *the burden of proof is on the employer's shoulders* to show that the inequities in the company workforce are not the result of discrimination.

Systematic discrimination can occur during recruitment, selection, placement, testing, fringe benefits, lines of progression, promotion, seniority, salary structure, layoffs, etc.

The EEOC provides guidelines to employers in Reference 3 for effecting meaningful policy changes once discriminatory practices in these areas are found. They do not, however, have a cure-all model remedy program. All programs must be tailor-made. We shall briefly give examples of discriminatory practices in some of the areas listed above. We shall also give some structural changes that the EEOC recommends implementing. Our discussion is based mainly on Reference 3.

In *recruitment* discrimination can occur when a company only recruits by word-of-mouth or by walk-ins. These practices tend to perpetuate the present composition of the workforce in various job categories. The EEOC recommends positive re-

cruitment practices, much like the ones taken by Southern California Edison Company, described earlier.

The EEOC has found that the *selection* process is probably responsible for more discrimination than any other area of employment practices. Non-job related selection criteria that disproportionately screen out certain groups is discriminatory. One such criteria is age. The Age Discrimination Employment Act of 1967 protects people between the ages of 45 and 60 from age discrimination. Another example is a policy of not hiring mothers of pre-school children unless they are putting their husbands through college. The EEOC says that this policy is acceptable if the company also does not hire fathers of pre-school children unless they are putting their wives through college.

In the area of *employee benefits*, one concern of women is maternity leave privileges. The EEOC guidelines suggest that pregnancy, miscarriages, abortion, childbirth, and subsequent recovery be treated (for job-related purposes) as "temporary disabilities." The length of leave must be determined on an individual basis. Thus, all company policies concerning temporarily disabled employees must be consistent with each other.

In the *job progression* area, if an employer has certain jobs covered by a bargaining agreement which are not open to certain employees, then this is discrimination. The courts disallow such bargaining agreement provisions.

On *promotions* the EEOC recommends instituting a merit promotion system in place of a seniority promotion system. The question of whether or not seniority is a discriminatory practice has been ruled by the courts to be discriminatory if it perpetuates the effect of past discriminations. The EEOC advises that if a seniority system is used, then female and minority workers should be allowed to use their full company seniority for promotion and layoff purposes.

Many subtle kinds of discrimination occur within promotion practices. Wood pointed out some to us. From her recent study, indications are that companies will promote a man every 12-15 months, while they will promote a woman every 15-18 months. This difference may not seem great, but it means that a woman will have to get three promotions to equal two for a man. In addition, the titles and associated responsibilities and

salaries given to men and women, who start out equal at the entry level, tend to become unequal with promotions. This is subtle systematic discrimination.

The area of discrimination in *layoffs, discharges and recalls* is one in which the EEOC has not issued definite guidelines for employers. If layoffs are based solely on seniority, there is likely to be a disproportionate reduction in women and minority workers, since they have only recently been allowed and encouraged to enter certain job categories. Two interesting discussions on this point occurred recently—one by Lund, et al (Reference 12a) and one by Pogrebin (Reference 13).

Lund discusses the pros and cons of inverse seniority. Inverse seniority, as the name implies, inverts the order in which people are laid off. Under this system, the most senior eligible employee is allowed to elect temporary, compensated layoff, while retaining his right to return to his previous job. Pogrebin discusses several proposed alternatives to the seniority basis for layoffs, such as proportional layoffs, fictional seniority (giving previously discriminated groups more seniority than they have actually accumulated), and ignoring seniority altogether. She also lists some solutions proposed as alternatives to layoffs—(1) modifying unemployment insurance laws, (2) corporate reduction of work hours, and (3) employee's voluntary reduction of work time, compensation, fringe benefits, and privileges.

Since the government has not recommended alternative, non-discriminatory layoff policies, the solutions are now being determined in the courts.

Having reviewed the myths and practices that discriminate against women in employment, we shall list some steps that employers can take to go beyond token compliance with these laws. These suggestions are based upon our interviews and study of the subject. We make these suggestions because the problem exists and the penalties for non-compliance can be high.

Eliminating sex discrimination in employment

Many authors have commented that changing the laws is not enough to effect equal employment opportunities for women. Other, more intrinsic changes must occur within the organization structure and with employee attitudes, in

order for a successful equal employment opportunity program to exist. These changes must occur on three corporate levels. They are:

- Create a positive corporate environment
- Resocialize men's attitudes
- Train women for management.

As an aside, we have found that a whole new industry has grown up around the EEO laws. Services to help employers implement the various programs are now readily available. One source of information on some of these services is the *1976 Buyer's Guide to Women's Programs and Services* (Reference 14).

Create a positive corporate environment

Based on our studies, we found that the single most important ingredient for creating a positive corporate environment is top management's genuine commitment to EEO. Without this, even the most receptive EEO officer and middle manager will have no luck promoting women, and they will probably get themselves into trouble besides. Once the commitment is there, top management must make sure that there is continued commitment down the line. This is no easy task, because middle management is where many subtle discriminatory decisions are made. So management must implement a program to monitor the actual compliance by managers.

The next step is the appointment of a top company executive as an EEO officer. It is his/her duty to perform a perspective audit which analyzes the company's current personnel policies and practices with an eye toward sex and race discrimination. Boyle (Reference 12b) recommends that this corporate duty be assisted by several types of people: a woman in the personnel department to co-ordinate the effort, outside consultants to help develop the AAP and create management awareness seminars, and possibly a task force of top company officials to review the progress of the program quarterly.

The next step is the development of a company-wide affirmative action program, following the guidelines in OFCC's Revised Order No. 4 (found in Reference 3). This includes familiarizing line management with the EEO laws, teaching them the hazards of EEO non-compliance and the effects of tokenism, and defining the new personnel procedures needed to achieve EEO.

The corporate EEO officer must also study the

organizational attitudes, looking at the corporate environment and identifying unarticulated patterns of discrimination. Munson (Reference 15) says one such attitude is a company's lack of concern for women once they are hired. A company that hires a woman without assigning her to an appropriate manager, without putting her into a management training course, and without making her feel part of the team is subtly yet deliberately anticipating her failure. Wood (Reference 9A) points out that every successful woman has had a supportive male influence her at every level of her career. Putting a woman under such a manager does a lot to make her promotable.

What are the traits of a supportive manager? Munson says that such a manager: criticizes constructively, supports a woman when others make anti-female remarks, does not exclude her from lunch with the men, encourages her new ideas, does not joke about her appearance, coaches her on corporate structure, and does not make anti-female remarks himself.

Implementing positive corporate policies and monitoring them are ingredients for successfully bringing women into management, computing and otherwise.

Resocialize men's attitudes

Wood stated to us that she does not feel that a male manager with traditional sex-role beliefs can work successfully with a woman peer until he has been resocialized. By resocialization she means that he has to learn to adapt to the way things are now. People's attitudes are based on their value system, which is what they learned from their parents. One's value system may never change, but one's attitudes can be changed. One's attitudes, in turn, dictate one's behavior. Behavior is the easiest of these three to change, and that is what the EEOC laws and regulations are trying to do—change individual and corporate behavior toward specific groups of people. When a specific behavior becomes acceptable and proved, then one's attitudes will change also. But this takes time.

To change a person's attitudes directly, it is necessary to get the person to see and understand the basis for these attitudes. This is basically what awareness training for managers is all about—resocializing men's attitudes. Awareness training sensitizes line managers to their traditional atti-

tudes that form subtle barriers to EEO. This is not to say that only men form these barriers; women managers also have attitudes which prevent them from making objective decisions about women subordinates. But male managers seem to be less aware of these preconceived generalizations than women.

Wood feels that awareness training sessions conducted by a qualified man-woman team are the most effective way of resocializing managers. But it is not necessary to bring in such a team to get managers more attuned to their attitudes. One product we have seen is a self-administered course for small groups of managers entitled PROFAIR (Reference 4) developed by Bass. First, a test on attitudes toward working women is administered. Then a decision on hiring a specific woman or man for a position is asked. Next, a role-playing session is organized which presents facts about working women in such a way to combat the stereotypes so often felt by managers. Finally, the initial test is regiven to see which feelings about working women have changed. This type of course is an initial step to resocializing managers.

Once typical stereotypes are reviewed, the next step is to educate the managers on the needs, rights and responsibilities of women workers. If she is a peer, is she being excluded from some social or recreational activities with co-workers because she is a woman (such as after-work-hours golf matches)? What special support should a manager provide for a woman when she makes a decision contested by others? How should he deal with her personal dilemmas?

Finally, a manager needs to be helped in working with women. Various organizations hold workshops that get men and women cooperating with each other in simulated work situations. Making sure that women are put into corporate management training courses can also achieve this interaction. Needless to say, without strong top management support (and directives) of "women and men workshops," many line managers might choose to send their secretaries rather than go themselves.

What should a company do about a white male backlash to an EEO program? First of all, expect it. Wood says that there is no way to avoid it, there are only ways to cope with it, and these may not be too successful. The most equitable way to deal with it is to give male employees a method of ex-

pressing their grievances. They should be allowed to complain if they feel an unqualified female or minority employee has been promoted over them. Another method of coping with backlash is to minimize male-female conflicts involving unreceptive men. By putting aspiring women under supporting and receptive managers, some such conflicts may be avoided. Dealing with unreceptive managers is the main objective of awareness programs.

Instituting resocialization programs for middle male managers is an important ingredient for successfully bringing women into management. Further, it is one approach that we believe few companies are doing much about.

Train women for management

Many authors feel that in business a woman's worst enemy may be herself. If she has little confidence in herself and her abilities, if she has no ambition to pursue a career, and if she is fearful of success, then this is probably true. Thus, to get more women into supervisory and management positions, a company needs to encourage its female employees to take training to: (1) improve their self-image, (2) learn self-motivation, and (3) develop management skills. In this area, as in the other EEO areas, there are consultants, seminars, films and university courses available to help employers implement these programs.

The following discussion on women's training needs is based on Wood (Reference 9a) and Heinen and McGlauchlin (Reference 9b) plus interviews with the authors.

Improve women's self-image. Many women have a problem breaking loose from the secretary image—the pretty, dependent servant. If they want to move into management, they must learn to feel that they are equals to men. This means developing self-confidence—improving one's self-image. Women must believe in themselves before they can convince men to have confidence in them. This is often called assertiveness training, and it ties in with women learning self-motivation.

Learn self-motivation. Wood has said that a passive woman does not have a chance of getting ahead. If she waits around for someone to tell her what to do, they will give her something uninteresting. This is also true of men, but through social conditioning men are more likely to have been

trained to be aggressive. Women must learn to be aggressive. Wood calls this "aggressiveness disguised as self-initiative." Unfortunately, women do not have female managers whom they can model themselves after in most companies, and it is not appropriate to model themselves on male managers. Women's training courses often fill this void.

Seeking achievement in a man's world will inevitably cause conflicts within a woman, state Heinen and McGlauchlin, because it is not sanctioned by custom. Thus, women must be given assistance to cope constructively with these feelings.

Women must also work out a strategy, set goals, and make a plan, as men do, on how they would like to move up the company ladder. This means learning to become career-minded and convincing others of this. It also means developing one's own career plan—to work through the system, not to fight it. Women must realize that they have to be good to make it into management; capability and performance *are* important. And Wood feels this is justified, because these women are in the spotlight and they should not perform poorly and make it difficult for those who come later.

Develop management skills. Besides having to learn the skills that any manager must know, women must also learn to cope with problems unique to women managers. For one thing, women must learn to deal constructively with hostility and negative attitudes. Heinen and McGlauchlin state that cultural conditioning tends to cause women to hide negative feelings, such as anger. They often turn away from such feelings between people. Because of this, managing conflict is particularly difficult for women. It is a managerial skill that they, more than men, need to learn.

Women also need to learn how to compete with men, as well as with other women. Many women fear this. They would prefer to become subordinate rather than confront a man head on. Negotiation skills are needed here. Women also must learn teamwork, and how to collaborate to accomplish group goals—something many women missed in school.

Besides reorienting these learned behaviors, women must learn to make the most of their unique female talents. One such characteristic is their sensitivity to the feelings of others. This inter-personal skill is important to a manager who must motivate people. Counseling and developing subordinates are other skills which are not only vital to effective management but which conform with the traditional female self-concept.

An example of a course given to women to develop their managerial skills is a seminar given by Heinen, McGlauchlin and Freeman under the auspices of the University of Minnesota. It is a three-day residential course in which panel discussions, role playing, case analyses, lectures and films are combined. The course deals with: group decision making and analysis, managerial styles, dealing with conflict, principles of teamwork, favorable organizational climate, and career planning.

The instructors feel that in this all-female setting, women can learn to differentiate between the obstacles which challenge all managers from the ones unique to women. It also allows women to assume leadership positions in role playing activities—something they would be less likely to do if men were present. They feel this is a first step to developing effective female managerial talent.

Conclusion

In the area of equal employment opportunity, McGlauchlin says that the next 10 to 15 years will be painful, because of the social change that must take place. Corporate structural systems and cultural attitudes are the basis for sex discrimination, and these are not easy to change. Management on all levels must take the approach that will be to the company's benefit. This approach involves attacking the problem from three sides—create a positive corporate environment, resocialize men's attitudes, and train women for management.

Putting qualified women into management positions is not only an obligation, it is a positive action that will become an asset to any company.

REFERENCES

1. *Business Horizons* (Graduate School of Business, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana 47401), price \$2.
 - a. Schwartz, E. B. and J. J. Rago, Jr., "Beyond tokenism: Women as true corporate peers," December 1973, p. 69-76.
 - b. Stead, B. A., "The semantics of sex discrimination," October 1975, p. 21-25.
2. Lindell, L. S. and J. DeLameter (Eds), *Women in the Professions: What's all the fuss about?* Sage Publications (275 S. Beverly Dr., Beverly Hills, Calif. 90212), 1971, price \$3.95.
 - a. Prather, J., "Why can't women be more like men?" p. 14-24.
 - b. Bass, B. M., J. Krusell, and R. A. Alexander, "Male managers' attitudes toward working women," p. 63-78.
 - c. Tinker, I., "Nonacademic professional political scientists," p. 48-54.
 - d. Levitin, T., R. P. Quinn, and G. L. Staines, "Sex discrimination against the American working woman," p. 79-96.
3. *Affirmative Action and Equal Employment: A Guidebook for Employers* (2 volumes), U.S. Equal Employment Opportunities Commission (Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402), January 1974, price \$2.45.
4. Bass, B. M. *PROFAIR: A program about working with women*, Transnational Programs Corporation (54 Main St., Scottsville, N.Y., 14546), 1971.
5. Hacker, H. M., "Women as a minority group—20 years later," *Who Discriminates Against Women?* Sage Publications (address above), 1974, p. 124-134, price \$3.95.
6. Gilchrist, B. and R. Weber, "Discrimination in the employment of women in the computer industry," *Communications of the ACM* (ACM, 1133 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y. 10036), July 1975, p. 416-418, price \$5 prepaid.
7. Koff, L. A. and J. H. Handlon, "Women in management: Keys to success or failure," *The Personnel Administrator* (American Society for Personnel Administration, 19 Church St., Berea, Ohio 44017), April 1975.
8. Reif, W. E., J. W. Newstron, and R. M. Monczka, "Exploding some myths about women managers," *California Management Review* (Graduate School of Business Administration, University of California, Berkeley, Calif. 94720), Summer 1975, p. 72-79.
9. *Personnel Journal* (100 Park Ave., Swarthmore, Penna. 19081).
 - a. Wood, M. M., "What does it take for a woman to make it in management?" January 1975, p. 38-41.
 - b. Heinen, J. S., D. McGlauchlin, C. Legeros, and J. Freeman, "Developing the woman manager," May 1975, p. 282-287.
10. Wood, M. M., "Women in management: how is it working out?" *S.A.M. Advanced Management Journal* (Society for the Advancement of Management, 135 W. 50th St., New York, NY 10020), Winter 1975, p. 22-30; price \$4.
11. Walsh, E. B., "Sex discrimination and the impact of Title VII," *Labor Law Journal* (Commerce Clearing House, 4025 W. Peterson Ave., Chicago, IL 60646), March 1974, p. 150-154; price \$3.
12. *Harvard Business Review* (Harvard Business School, Soldiers Field, Boston, Mass. 02163), price \$3.50.
 - a. Lund, R. T., D. C. Bumstead, and S. Friedman, "Inverse seniority: Timely answer to the layoff dilemma," Sept./Oct. 1975, p. 65-72.
 - b. Boyle, B., "Equal opportunity for women is smart business," May/June 1973, p. 85-95.
13. Pogrebin, B. P., "Who shall work," *Ms. Magazine* (370 Lexington Ave., New York, N.Y. 10017), December 1975, p. 67-72; price \$1.50.
14. Kimmel, K. (ed.), *1976 Buyer's Guide to Women's Programs and Services*, Women's Training and Resources Corporation (142 High St., Suite 512, Portland, Maine 04101), price \$35.
15. Munson, M. L. "Women in management: Less complaining more training," *Industry Week* (Penton Publishing Company, Penton Bldg., Cleveland, Ohio 44113), February 15, 1975, p. 56-59; price \$2.
16. "The Myth and the reality" and "Women workers today," Women's Bureau of the U.S. Department of Labor (Washington, D.C. 20402), 1974.
17. Bergmann, B. R. and I. Adelman, "The 1973 Report of the President's Council of Economic Advisors: The economic role of women," *The American Economic Review* (American Economic Association, Nashville, Tenn. 37202) September 1973, p. 509-514.

EDP ANALYZER published monthly and Copyright© 1976 by Canning Publications, Inc., 925 Anza Avenue, Vista, Calif. 92083. All rights reserved. While the contents of each report are based on the best information available to us, we cannot guarantee them. This report may not be reproduced in whole or in part, including photocopy reproduction, without the

written permission of the publisher. Richard G. Canning, Editor and Publisher. Subscription rates and back issue prices on last page. Please report non-receipt of an issue within one month of normal receiving date. Missing issues requested after this time will be supplied at regular rate.

SUBJECTS COVERED BY EDP ANALYZER IN PRIOR YEARS

1973 (Volume 11)

Number

1. The Emerging Computer Networks
2. Distributed Intelligence in Data Communications
3. Developments in Data Transmission
4. Computer Progress in Japan
5. A Structure for EDP Projects
6. The Cautious Path to a Data Base
7. Long Term Data Retention
8. In Your Future: Distributed Systems?
9. Computer Fraud and Embezzlement
10. The Psychology of Mixed Installations
11. The Effects of Charge-Back Policies
12. Protecting Valuable Data—Part 1

1975 (Volume 13)

Number

1. Progress Toward International Data Networks
2. Soon: Public Packet Switched Networks
3. The Internal Auditor and the Computer
4. Improvements in Man/Machine Interfacing
5. "Are We Doing the Right Things?"
6. "Are We Doing Things Right?"
7. "Do We Have the Right Resources?"
8. The Benefits of Standard Practices
9. Progress Toward Easier Programming
10. The New Interactive Search Systems
11. The Debate on Information Privacy: Part 1
12. The Debate on Information Privacy: Part 2

1974 (Volume 12)

Number

1. Protecting Valuable Data—Part 2
2. The Current Status of Data Management
3. Problem Areas in Data Management
4. Issues in Programming Management
5. The Search for Software Reliability
6. The Advent of Structured Programming
7. Charging for Computer Services
8. Structures for Future Systems
9. The Upgrading of Computer Operators
10. What's Happening with CODASYL-type DBMS?
11. The Data Dictionary/Directory Function
12. Improve the System Building Process

1976 (Volume 14)

Number

1. Planning for Multi-national Data Processing
2. Staff Training on the Multi-national Scene
3. Professionalism: Coming or Not?
4. Integrity and Security of Personal Data
5. APL and Decision Support Systems
6. Distributed Data Systems
7. Network Structures for Distributed Systems
8. Bringing Women into Computing Management

(List of subjects prior to 1973 sent upon request)

PRICE SCHEDULE

The annual subscription price for EDP ANALYZER is \$48. The two year price is \$88 and the three year price is \$120; postpaid surface delivery to the U.S., Canada, and Mexico. (Optional air mail delivery to Canada and Mexico available at extra cost.)

Subscriptions to other countries are: One year \$60, two years, \$112, and three years \$156. These prices include AIR MAIL postage. All prices in U.S. dollars.

Attractive binders for holding 12 issues of EDP ANALYZER are available at \$4.75. Californians please add 29¢ sales tax.

Because of the continuing demand for back issues, all previous reports are available. Price: \$6 each (for U.S., Canada, and Mexico), and \$7 elsewhere; includes air mail postage.

Reduced rates are in effect for multiple subscriptions and for multiple copies of back issues. Please write for rates.

Subscription agency orders limited to single copy, one-, two-, and three-year subscriptions only.

Send your order and check to:

EDP ANALYZER
Subscription Office
925 Anza Avenue
Vista, California 92083
Phone: (714) 724-3233

Send editorial correspondence to:

EDP ANALYZER
Editorial Office
925 Anza Avenue
Vista, California 92083
Phone: (714) 724-5900

Name _____

Company _____

Address _____

City, State, ZIP Code _____