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Background

Reasons for the Gender Pay Gap

- equal opportunities?
- formal education
- vertical occupational segregation
- working interruptions and reductions
- horizontal occupational segregation
- allocative discrimination?
- evaluative discrimination?
Theoretical approach

- `Comparable Worth’ debate is interdisciplinary
  (e.g. Acker 1989; England 1992; Steinberg 1990)
- Based particular sociological and ergonomic arguments
- Political demand:
  - `equal pay for work of equal value’
- Legal foundation:
  - ILO labour standard since 1951
  - EU law (Article 157 TFUE)
Theoretical approach

- Central: `devaluation hypothesis` (e.g. England et al. 1988; Liebeskind 2004)
  - This hypothesis refers to `that portion of the wage gap between women and men [...] that is due to systematic undervaluation of women`s work` (Steinberg 1984: 16)
  - `The central proposition is that cultural processes of valuation are gendered; because women are devalued, social roles (including occupations) and skills that are associated with women are culturally devalued relative to those associated with men` (Kilbourne et al. 1994: 694)
Theoretical approach

- **Systematic undervaluation of women`s work** = evaluative discrimination
  - "The argument is that past and present discrimination by employers and male dominated trade unions resulted in sex-segregated jobs and wage rates for female-dominated jobs that are systematically lower than wage rates for jobs of similar complexity usually held by (.) men" (Acker 1989: 6)

- Evaluative discrimination as a result of gendered job evaluation
Theoretical approach

• Importance of job evaluation methods
• Results from work science:
  • Job evaluative methods may contain evaluative discrimination potential
  • Application of the methods can lead to evaluative discrimination
Theoretical approach

Main reasons for systematic undervaluation of women`s work as part of the job evaluation:

1. **The criteria for evaluation are more appropriate to evaluate aspects that usually occur in male-dominated jobs (such as physical demands)**
2. **Criteria are omitted which are relevant generally for female-dominated work (such as psycho-social demands)**
3. **The criteria for evaluation are not gender-neutral defined and not gender neutral designed in practice (for example, if responsibility is only equated with leadership responsibility)**
How is it possible, to identify gendered job evaluations by statistics?
How can jobs of equal value be identified?

Is there a Pay Gap between women and men, who do work of comparable worth?

Employment survey

Structure of earnings survey
Research concept

1. Knowledge
   1.1 Formal skills
   1.2 Subject related additional qualifications
   1.3 No subject related additional qualifications
   1.4 Practical experience
   1.5 Plan and organize
   1.6 Coping with work interruptions
   1.7 Continuous attention and concentration

2. Psycho-sozial aspects
   2.1 Communication skills
   2.2 Cooperation ability
   2.3 Empathy and persuasiveness
   2.4 Onerous psychosocial conditions

3. Responsibility
   3.1 Responsibility for monetary and material assets
   3.2 Responsibility for the physical and mental health and data security
   3.3 Management responsibility
   3.4 Responsibility for the environment

4. Physical aspects
   4.1 Requirements for physical strength
   4.2 Demands on the posture, movement and senses
   4.3 Stressful working time conditions
   4.4 Interfering ambient conditions
Conclusion: Research concept

- Most questions in the *couple comparison* can be answered by the employment survey
- *CW-Index* contains numerical values
  - *Jobs of equal value can be identified!*
- Through the comparison of jobs of equal value with the actual incomes, it is possible to identify underevaluations of women's work (**CW-Gap**)
First empirical results

- Comparison of **CW-Index** and current incomes in female versus male dominated jobs
- Viewing 118 occupations
  - 45 percent too low earnings in the female dominated occupations
  - 24 percent inadequate earnings in the male dominated occupations
  - 6 percent comparable earnings
First empirical results

Examples: Comparable **CW-Index**, but too low earnings in the female dominated occupations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation (ISCO 3-Steller)</th>
<th>CW-Index (Arithmetic mean)</th>
<th>Average gross hourly wages</th>
<th>Proportion of women in the occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Software and applications developers and analysts (251)</td>
<td>25,1</td>
<td>27,68 €</td>
<td>18 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical and pharmaceutical technicians (321)</td>
<td>24,9</td>
<td>15,65 €</td>
<td>91 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process control technicians (313)</td>
<td>26,0</td>
<td>18,75 €</td>
<td>4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal care workers in health services (532)</td>
<td>25,9</td>
<td>11,97 €</td>
<td>89 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales, marketing and development managers (122)</td>
<td>27,7</td>
<td>30,49 €</td>
<td>25 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing, mining, construction, and distribution managers (132)</td>
<td>27,8</td>
<td>23,33 €</td>
<td>16 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel and restaurant managers (141)</td>
<td>27,8</td>
<td>14,16</td>
<td>64 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next steps of the project

– Multivariate analysis for quantitative validation of the *CW-Index*

– Group discussions and participant observations for qualitative validation of the *CW-Index*

– Multivariate analysis for calculating the *CW-Gap*
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