

1. Record Nr.	UNINA9910814949603321
Autore	Nelson Robert L. <1952->
Titolo	Legalizing gender inequality : courts, markets, and unequal pay for women in America / / Robert L. Nelson, William P. Bridges
Pubbl/distr/stampa	Cambridge [England] ; ; New York, : Cambridge University Press, 1999
ISBN	0-511-08781-0 1-107-11482-9 0-511-01960-2 1-280-43220-9 0-511-17303-2 0-511-15198-5 0-511-32328-X 0-511-49934-5 0-511-05041-0
Edizione	[1st ed.]
Descrizione fisica	1 online resource (xvi, 393 pages) : digital, PDF file(s)
Collana	Structural analysis in the social sciences ; ; 16
Altri autori (Persone)	BridgesWilliam P
Disciplina	331.2/153/0973
Soggetti	Pay equity - Law and legislation - United States Pay equity - United States
Lingua di pubblicazione	Inglese
Formato	Materiale a stampa
Livello bibliografico	Monografia
Note generali	Title from publisher's bibliographic system (viewed on 05 Oct 2015).
Nota di bibliografia	Includes bibliographical references (p. 371-384) and index.
Nota di contenuto	Law, markets, and the institutional construction of gender inequality in pay -- pt. 1. Theory and method. Legal theories of sex-based pay discrimination. Toward an organizational theory of gender inequality in pay. Methodological approach: law cases, case studies, and critical empiricism -- pt. 2a. The case studies: public sector organizations. Paternalism and politics in a university pay system: Christensen v. State of Iowa. Bureaucratic politics and gender inequality in a state pay system: AFSCME v. State of Washington -- pt. 2b. The case studies: private sector organizations. Corporate politics, rationalization, and managerial discretion: EEOC v. Sears, Roebuck & Co. The financial institution as a male, profit-making club: Glass v. Coastal Bank -- pt. 3. Conclusion: legalizing gender inequality. Rethinking the relationship between law, markets, and gender inequality in organizations --

Sommario/riassunto

Legalizing Gender Inequality challenges existing theories of gender inequality within economic, sociological, and legal organizations. The book argues that male-female earnings differentials cannot be explained adequately by market forces, principles of efficiency, or society-wide sexism. Rather it suggests that employing organizations tend to disadvantage holders of predominantly female jobs by denying them power in organizational politics and by reproducing male cultural advantages. These findings contradict major legal precedents which have argued that labor markets and not employers are the source of inequality. The authors further argue that comparable worth is an inappropriate remedy, as such an approach misdiagnoses the causes of gender inequality and often falls prey to the same organizational processes that initially generated this differential. The book argues that the courts have, by uncritically accepting the market explanation for male-female wage disparity, tended to legitimate and to legalize a crucial dimension of gender inequality in American society.

---