

# UC Santa Barbara

## UC Santa Barbara Previously Published Works

### Title

Job Queues, Gender Queues: Explaining Women's Inroads Into Male Occupations. Barbara F. Reskin , Patricia A. Roos

### Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3615q343>

### Journal

American Journal of Sociology, 98(4)

### ISSN

0002-9602

### Author

Bielby, Denise D

### Publication Date

1993

### DOI

10.1086/230103

Peer reviewed

of nationalism among the Afrikaans population. And, in the midst of the racial politics of the 1970s, and in spite of continuing harassment, “colored” and black women in the canning industry forged a consciously cross-race trade union organization.

Although she emphasizes the features specific to South African society, Berger frames her study in the context of theoretical issues in the historiography of working-class women in other countries. In particular she asks what brings women to be active in class-based organizations, especially in trade unions. She argues that the evidence from the South African case supports the view that women become active in organizations that address their concerns not only with regard to work, but also those that bear on their lives outside the workplace.

A decided strength of the book lies in Berger’s clear exposition of why focusing on women changes how we understand labor history. She argues, for example, that in South Africa, women and men had different paths of proletarianization which in turn suggests that theories about the development of capitalism based solely on men’s experiences are inadequate.

Along with the many virtues of this book are some problems with Berger’s analytical framework. On the one hand Berger sees social and economic structures as constraining—setting limits and creating interests. On the other, she sees women workers making choices and actively shaping their own lives, sometimes reacting against those constraints. Thus she maintains a strict dichotomy between structure and agency. Berger is quite explicit in not wanting to view the women who are the subjects of the book as “victims,” insisting that by making choices, their behavior was not the consequence of blind structural forces over which they had no control. Yet, we are told relatively little about how and why people made the choices that they did, and we do not see directly how the choices that they made contributed to emerging structural arrangements. Also, there are points in the book where Berger seems to assume that peoples’ interests stem automatically from their racial, gender, and class identities, and so she does not fully investigate how those interests and identities were shaped and made politically relevant. These are, however, relatively minor concerns about what is generally an impressive piece of scholarship.

*Job Queues, Gender Queues: Explaining Women’s Inroads into Male Occupations.* By Barbara F. Reskin and Patricia A. Roos. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1990. Pp. xii + 388. \$39.95.

Denise D. Bielby  
*University of California, Santa Barbara*

Despite radical transformations in the industrial and occupational structure in the post–World War II era, changes in the composition of the labor force during the same period, the feminist movement, and antidis-

crimination regulations of the 1960s and 1970s, the notable gains women made in a few occupations previously dominated by men have not reversed the persistence of occupational sex segregation. Reskin and Roos seek to explain this enduring pattern and to account for the handful of customarily male or mixed-sex occupations that underwent a disproportionate increase in women in the 1970s. Their study relies upon census data and 14 case studies from among the 33 occupations in all occupational strata that exhibited disproportionate change. Their investigation examines: (1) whether technological, organizational, and work conditions precipitated change in occupational sex segregation; (2) whether shifts in human capital requirements and labor supply generated change in occupational sex composition; and (3) whether institutions such as unions, regulatory agencies, and the courts facilitated women's entry into male-dominated fields. In addition, they explore the consequences of occupational sex desegregation, particularly with respect to pay equity for women who moved into male-dominated occupations.

They have two major findings. First, sex integration of jobs typically did not accompany occupational-level desegregation. Women and men were segregated into different jobs in each of the occupations they studied, even as women's representation increased in those occupations. Vacancies for women occurred when structural transformations precipitated change in earnings, benefits, prestige, job security, autonomy, or chances for advancement in a specific occupation, thereby lowering men's preferences for those occupations over others. Generally, those vacancies were attractive to women because they offered improvements over other options available. Vacancies also occurred when growth of an occupation created a demand for employees that exceeded the supply. Regardless of the reason for vacancies, women entrants worked in different subspecialties than men, served different clients within firms, worked in different industrial sectors, and were employed at different ranks. In short, women were "ghettoized" within feminizing occupations. Men who stayed retained the more desirable jobs, while women were relegated to lower-status specialties, less desirable work settings, lower-paying industries, and part-time rather than full-time work.

The consequences of ghettoization account for the second major finding of this project: women's earnings in feminizing occupations improved relative to men's only because men's earnings eroded in those occupations. That erosion was indicative of a declining occupation that offers limited career prospects, regardless of gender.

The authors rely upon queuing theory (rather than human capital theory, gender stereotyping, or other accounts emphasizing individual action) to provide a structural explanation for the remarkably enduring pattern and bleak consequences of occupational sex segregation. According to queuing theory, employers' construct a queue that ranks potential employees from most to least desirable. However, individual differences are taken into account only within groups defined by gender and race. Simultaneously, workers maintain job queues, ranking jobs in

terms of attractiveness. When employers' ordering, the relative supply of groups in that ordering, and rankers' (both employers' and workers') preferences overlap, occupational sex segregation is stable. When those preferences diverge due to structural, institutional, or human capital requirements, occupational sex integration occurs. Males' continuously privileged ranking over females in the labor queue facilitates their movement out of occupations losing status and their successful search for alternatives, thus perpetuating the pattern of segregation and relative pay inequity. Queuing theory improves upon other structural explanations of occupational sex segregation (such as models of statistical discrimination) for two reasons. First, it allows for change over time in gender composition of occupations and jobs. Second, it explains the re-segregation that almost invariably follows gender integration. The authors do not, however, fully consider the limitations of studying only those occupations that rapidly desegregated within a 10-year period. Different mechanisms and dynamics may operate within occupations that experience more gradual shifts in gender composition. Presumably more measured integration, if that does indeed ever happen, would be explained by a mix of both structural and individual level mechanisms. I hope that Reskin and Roos's plans to statistically model the determinants of occupational sex composition across all occupations will unlock the conundrum so carefully investigated in their case studies.

Reskin and Roos have provided an important contribution to explaining segregation in the work force. Unlike most other structuralist accounts, theirs attends to preferences and choices of both employers and employees and explains change over time in patterns of gender segregation, integration, and re-segregation.

*Gender Inequality: A Comparative Study of Discrimination and Participation.* By Mino Vianello and Renata Siemienka. Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1990. Pp. xxii + 360. \$47.50.

Julie Elworth and Szonja Szelényi  
*Stanford University*

This is an ambitious study of gender inequality in four countries—two from the democratic West (Canada, Italy) and two representing socialist regimes (Poland, Romania). The authors collected their own survey data with the expectation that this would ensure comparability across nations and extend their inquiry into “different areas of social life: values, family, work, and public affairs” (p. 1).

Vianello and Siemienka have three objectives in mind: uncover the forces that hinder women's access to political power, examine the extent of women's participation in public life, and compare their status across socialist and nonsocialist societies (p. xi). The first chapter sets the stage for the analyses. In a compact set of eight pages, the authors describe