

Workplace Inequality

– The Discrimination Women Has to Face

Jiayi Wu^{1,a,*}

¹Penn State University, 201 Old Main City University Park, State PA, United States

a. michellewujy820@gmail.com

*corresponding author

Abstract: This abstract delves into the pervasive issue of workplace gender discrimination, encompassing overt and covert manifestations within professional settings. Despite legislative and judicial efforts, bias persists, inhibiting gender parity. Direct discrimination, exemplified through differential treatment and remuneration, is visible. Covert bias, exemplified through seemingly neutral practices that disproportionately affect genders, is subtler. Organizations must embrace comprehensive strategies: providing family support, continuous diversity training, and addressing evaluation biases. By acknowledging, rectifying, and dismantling these biases, workplaces can foster inclusivity and empowerment, thereby ushering in a future where gender bias is eradicated and all individuals thrive unencumbered by discrimination.

Keywords: direct discrimination, indirect discrimination, gender discrimination, workplace discrimination

1. Introduction

Workplace gender discrimination remains an enduring and profoundly ingrained concern transcending geographical boundaries, exerting its influence on societies worldwide. This persistent issue serves as a formidable impediment to realizing authentic gender parity and poses intricate challenges for both individuals and establishments ardently advocating for impartiality and comprehensive inclusiveness. Gender-based discrimination within professional settings encompasses a multifaceted landscape of inequitable practices, prejudiced attitudes, and outright exclusion predicated on an individual's gender identity or expression. Such systemic imbalances engender an environment rife with disparities in opportunities, curtailed avenues for advancement, and notable differences in remuneration and overall work experiences.

Despite commendable strides towards rectification, the recognition and confrontation of gender-based disparities continue to necessitate heightened awareness and concerted efforts. The specter of workplace discrimination, particularly affecting women and marginalized gender identities, obstinately persists. Deep-seated stereotypes, ingrained biases, and societal norms remain potent influencers within decision-making processes, perpetuating a milieu of unequal treatment and engendering a milieu that stymies the organic progression of professional trajectories. Evidenced since 2022, the crusade for an egalitarian society has emerged as a paramount objective cutting across various realms of societal discourse. Manifestly, it has crystallized into an inescapable verity that

addressing these glaring injustices is indispensable to the holistic evolution of an equitable society. A pivotal inquiry arises in this context: How can the society methodically ameliorate the specter of gender discrimination within workplaces? What actionable steps can individuals undertake? How can corporate entities wield their influence in this arena? Moreover, what role can legislative frameworks play in expediting this transformative process?

2. The Problem

To understand the nuances underpinning workplace gender discrimination, it is imperative to dissect both overt and covert manifestations of this phenomenon. Direct discrimination is conspicuous, involving explicit differential treatment based solely on an individual's gender. This form extends beyond verbal or physical actions, encompassing institutional policies and decisions that knowingly and overtly marginalize individuals due to their gender orientation or expression. Instances of direct discrimination are discernible and readily identifiable. A salient exemplar lies in the derogatory labeling or prejudiced assessment of a woman rooted in her sexual orientation rather than an objective evaluation of her professional competence. Furthermore, direct discrimination manifests in remuneration, where women, despite possessing comparable skills and experience, earn payment lower than their male counterparts for analogous job roles. Additionally, promotion refusals, gender-biased recruitment processes, uneven access to training and developmental initiatives, and gender-based harassment or maltreatment further underscore the spectrum of direct discrimination.

Conversely, the covert facet of workplace gender discrimination, termed indirect discrimination, presents a subtler yet equally pernicious challenge. This manifestation pertains to ostensibly impartial policies, practices, or conventions that ostensibly maintain neutrality but, in reality, disproportionately impact specific genders or individuals. Concealed within the fabric of these practices often lie implicit biases or double meanings that inadvertently perpetuate gender-based prejudices and consolidate traditional gender roles, particularly detrimental to women. An illustration of this manifests in rigid or inelastic work schedules, which disproportionately disadvantage those with caregiving duties, predominantly women. Similarly, stipulating physical strength or endurance requisites for specific job profiles inadvertently marginalize women and individuals whose attributes deviate from conventional gender paradigms. While indirect discrimination operates with subtlety, its ramifications are far-reaching, contributing to the perpetuation of systemic gender inequalities and encumbering avenues for the progression of affected individuals.

Concurrent with this nuanced comprehension, a salient imperative emerges – elucidating the intricacies surrounding workplace gender discrimination. Invariably, three core questions beckon exploration: How does it differentiate from other forms of discrimination? What confers significance upon this particular strain of bias? And, more pertinently, how does contemporary workplace gender discrimination manifest?

Indeed, the discourse on workplace gender discrimination assumes paramount importance within the broader canvas of societal equity. It transcends the delineations of race, socio-economic strata, vocational trajectories, and affluence, encompassing the entirety of the human populace. Thus, it conveys a universally applicable concern that resonates across diverse demographics. The trajectory of the fight against gender discrimination traces its origins to the 19th century. Preceding even the watershed Civil Rights Act of 1964, the legal combat against gender bias commenced with precursors such as the Equal Pay Act of 1963 [1]. This particular statute was pivotal in laying the cornerstone for addressing workplace gender discrimination. As one of the pioneering legislative measures to confront discrimination, it echoes the historical salience of the subject. The Equal Pay Act's establishment reverberates through time, underscoring its enduring significance in engendering legal precedents and frameworks. The Act's inception was instrumental in creating a precedent upon which subsequent legal battles and enactments could be built. Evidently, within the historical context, direct

discrimination was an overt manifestation, prominently manifested before the advent of the Equal Pay Act. A conspicuous example surfaces in the pernicious denial of opportunities to women solely based on gender. This was often accompanied by demeaning appellations, instances of catcalling, or even dismissive disregard within professional spheres. Particularly egregious was the persistent scourge of unequal remuneration, where women were disproportionately compensated compared to their male counterparts, despite equal qualifications and competencies.

Notwithstanding the advocacy, protests, and organized movements, the needle of progress remains frustratingly limited in its direction. Despite the institution of federal statutes to counter gender-based disparities and discrimination, substantive headway remains elusive. Gender discrimination, it seems, surreptitiously infiltrates organizational precincts, maintaining an insidious grip on workplaces even in contemporary times.

While direct discrimination may have receded somewhat, it has surreptitiously metamorphosed into the more discreet guise of indirect discrimination. Foremost among these covert biases is the pervasive issue of disparate remuneration. Employing less overt methodologies, companies and male counterparts use subtle strategies to marginalize women, often unbeknownst to the affected individuals.

At the crux of this challenge is the vexing disparity in compensation. The vision of gender-equitable remuneration remains a distant mirage. Alarming statistics from 2020 underscore that women earned a mere 84% of their male counterparts' earnings for similar employment profiles, with a stark divergence for Black and Latina women, who garnered even lesser proportions [2]. The gender wage gap, despite temporal progression, demonstrates a sluggish 8-cent improvement over 25 years. A complex interplay of factors is at play, spanning discrimination, uneven educational access, and the "sticky floors" phenomenon rooted in deeply ingrained societal norms that nudge women towards lower-paying professions. At the same time, their male counterparts dominate high-paying sectors. Moreover, negotiating pay assumes a fraught disposition for women, compounded by the palpable fear of retribution. Astonishingly, recent data reveals that women are as likely as men to request pay raises, yet their success rate stands at a mere 15%, as opposed to the 20% achievement rate for men [2].

The managerial stratum serves as an illustrative prism reflecting the entrenched gender bias. A veritable "broken rung" is perceptible, with 86 women promoted to executive roles for every 100 men. This underrepresentation exacerbates as one ascends the echelons of leadership, with a paucity of women managers bottlenecking the funnel for advancement to higher echelons such as departmental heads, directors, and C-suite executives [3]. The conundrum of underrepresentation is unmistakable, with 62% of C-suite positions monopolized by white men, a paltry 20% held by white women, and a mere 4% embraced by women of color [3]. In an unfortunate feedback loop, managers rely on referrals from individuals who mirror their gender, ethnicity, or identity, thereby perpetuating the persistence of skewed representation.

In summation, the discourse on workplace gender discrimination, while rife with complexities, encapsulates a fundamental crux within the broader endeavor of achieving societal parity. It oscillates between overt and covert expressions, which demand rigorous redressal. The ramifications of gender-based discrimination, whether overt or covert, are not confined to organizational precincts but resonate within the societal fabric, impeding holistic progress. Consequently, the narrative underscores the imperative for sustained vigilance, collective effort, and transformative initiatives to unravel the tangled skeins of gender discrimination and foster workplaces where meritocracy prevails above all.

3. What Are the Government and Companies Currently Doing?

The issue of direct workplace discrimination has been the subject of comprehensive legislative and judicial interventions within the United States. These legal frameworks are in place to safeguard individuals from unjust treatment rooted in gender bias. Notably, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is a prominent example [4], serving as a formidable deterrent against sex-based employment discrimination [5]. This pivotal statute engenders a prohibition against any form of discrimination predicated upon gender, enveloping a spectrum of employment facets, including recruitment, career progression, remuneration, and the broader range of terms and conditions underpinning employment relationships.

An additional landmark legislative enactment, the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act of 2009, attests to the legal milieu's commitment to combating direct discrimination, particularly concerning wage disparities [6]. The commission serves as an amendment to the Civil Rights Act of 1964, thereby instituting a mechanism through which aggrieved individuals are empowered to assert pay discrimination claims within a stipulated temporal window after receipt of a discriminatory paycheck. This laudable legal instrument effectively addresses scenarios wherein gender-based wage discrepancies, although entrenched, may not have been readily discernible at the outset.

The role of jurisprudential precedent is integral to the shaping of interpretation and the subsequent enforcement of these anti-discrimination statutes. In *Price Waterhouse v. Hopkins* (1989) [6], the Supreme Court's pronouncement had far-reaching ramifications. The decision, predicated on the premise that gender stereotyping could function as evidentiary corroboration of sex-based discrimination according to Title VII [7], emanated from a case wherein a female employee's denial of partnership stemmed from her non-conformance with prevailing gender stereotypes. The outcome of this case extended the protective imprimatur of the law against gender-driven bias, affirming that individuals should be exempt from adverse employment actions on the grounds of non-adherence to stereotypical gender expectations.

Similarly, the case of *Young v. United Parcel Service, Inc.* (2015) assumed prominence, explicitly concerning the treatment of pregnant workers [8]. In this instance, the Supreme Court's elucidation accentuated the potential obligation upon employers to afford reasonable accommodations to pregnant employees, mirroring concessions granted to colleagues navigating analogous vocational constraints [9]. The pivotal import of this ruling rests in its assertion that discriminatory policies disadvantaging pregnant workers can contravene statutory tenets of unlawful bias.

The amalgamation of these legislative edifices and jurisprudential milestones illustrates the sustained endeavor to counteract direct gender-based discrimination within the United States' professional sphere. [10] These constructs arm affected individuals with potent legal recourses while accentuating the paramount significance of parity within the workspace. Notwithstanding these substantive strides, it remains imperative to perpetuate awareness campaigns, facilitates stringent enforcement mechanisms, and fervently champion gender egalitarianism to promulgate an environment that espouses fairness and inclusivity for all strata of the workforce.

However, rectifying gender-driven workplace bias necessitates a nuanced, multi-pronged approach that transcends the confines of mere legal frameworks and precedents. It mandates the proactive impetus of organizations, punctuated by a gamut of measures to foster inclusivity. These measures encompass but are not limited to, the amelioration of organizational policies, the implementation of equitable recruitment and advancement practices, and the establishment of support systems that foster career development sans the encumbrance of gender bias.

This holistic blueprint also embraces the propagation of public awareness campaigns that collectively underscore the deleterious impact of gender discrimination while concurrently fostering

attitudinal shifts within society. Such campaigns act as the crucible through which the latent biases ingrained within societal constructs are confronted and dismantled.

The confluence of these measures, interwoven with legal safeguards, fosters the cultivation of a professional sphere that stands as an exemplar of impartiality, bereft of direct or indirect prejudice. This amalgamated approach, propelled by legal underpinnings and holistic initiatives, endeavors to engender workplaces that are emblematic of gender-neutral parity, engendering a vista wherein opportunities are dispensed solely based on competence and merit rather than predilections stemming from gender.

Moreover, rectifying gender-based wage disparities and pay discrimination has galvanized significant legislative endeavors and judicial adjudications within the United States. These legal constructs are explicitly crafted to engendering pay parity and obliterate the gender-anchored wage chasm.

The epochal enactment of the Equal Pay Act of 1963 is emblematic of this commitment. A legal bedrock, this statute effectively proscribes wage discrimination contingent upon gender, mandating equal compensation for commensurate labor, regardless of gender considerations. The law requires that employers extend equitable remuneration to employees whose responsibilities bear substantial semblance concerning skill, effort, and commitment [11]. Ineluctably, this statutory intervention obliterates the discriminatory practice of recompensing women at a rate lower than their male counterparts, notwithstanding the equivalence of qualifications and experience attributed to identical roles.

In summation, the trajectory of addressing direct workplace discrimination anchored in gender within the United States epitomizes a layered and multifaceted effort. Emboldened by legal frameworks buttressed by pivotal judicial pronouncements, eradicating such discrimination demands a concerted synergy of organizational proactiveness, societal consciousness-raising, and comprehensive attitudinal shifts. Through the harmonious amalgamation of these tenets, the ultimate aspiration of establishing workplaces characterized by equitable prospects and impartiality, unfettered by direct or indirect biases, is progressively realized. The concerted symbiosis of legal measures and comprehensive endeavors thus emerges as the quintessential *modus operandi* for societies to actualize workplaces that are veritable bastions of gender-neutral equity.

4. What Needs to Be Done?

To mitigate gender bias within the workplace, organizational leaders must cultivate a heightened awareness and commitment towards elevating the professional status of women, aiming for parity or a proximate approximation thereof. Several strategic recommendations can be advanced to guide corporations toward this objective. Central among these is the imperative to extend provisions for childcare facilities and institute paid family leave policies. By alleviating the unique burdens women face, stemming from responsibilities often unequally distributed between genders, companies can tangibly contribute to equitable opportunities. The pivotal decision confronting working women, frequently entailing a trade-off between familial duties and professional obligations, can be ameliorated by fostering an environment that offers robust support for parents and caregivers. This could encompass an array of initiatives, ranging from augmenting access to paid sick days, family leave, and comprehensive medical leave to offering comprehensive childcare services. Such policies not only function as a propitious recourse to attenuate undue job attrition among women but also underpin a broader economic security framework, benefiting not solely women, who predominantly shoulder caregiving responsibilities within society, but also extending their advantages to the entirety of the workforce.

Furthermore, an efficacious avenue towards abating gender inequality within the corporate realm is providing continuous training in diversity, inclusion, and equity. It is incumbent upon organizations

to internalize the notion that deeply ingrained biases, particularly those targeting women in business and employment, are impervious to swift eradication. To counter these engrained stereotypes effectively, a proactive stance necessitates a sustained commitment to engendering a transformative cultural shift. This is best effectuated by dedicating resources towards an ongoing pedagogy aimed at bolstering the educational acumen of employees. It is incumbent upon companies to recognize that the amelioration of entrenched biases necessitates a regimen of consistent, reinforced messages, thereby perpetuating a collective consciousness regarding the nuanced manifestations of gender bias in the professional milieu. This iterative approach is optimally designed to facilitate the indelible retention of knowledge disseminated during these educational sessions, ensuring that the erudition disseminated therein is seamlessly woven into the cognitive fabric of the workforce.

Moreover, operationalizing inclusivity principles through tangible actions is paramount. By way of illustration, companies can proactively sensitize managers to the potential influence of bias on employee evaluations, particularly when drafting annual reviews. For women, this represents a potent tool, offering a mechanism through which they can address the often-tacit instances of injustice encountered. By substantively acknowledging these biases and their implications, companies empower women to articulately vocalize and navigate the multifarious forms of discrimination they face. This mechanism is consequential in engendering improved outcomes for women and other marginalized groups within the professional sphere, fostering a context wherein their contributions and potential are optimally harnessed.

5. Conclusion

In conclusion, the task of rectifying gender bias within corporate settings is a complex and multifaceted endeavor that demands a comprehensive and sustained commitment. Achieving true gender equity in the professional sphere, whether it be parity or a substantial approximation thereof, requires a multifaceted approach that systematically addresses both overt and subtle forms of discrimination.

First and foremost, policy reform must be at the forefront of any strategy aimed at eliminating gender bias. Companies must adopt and enforce stringent anti-discrimination policies and protocols, ensuring that they are not only in place but actively adhered to. Leadership teams need to set the tone from the top by fostering a culture of inclusion and diversity and holding themselves accountable for progress. However, policies alone are not sufficient. Continuous education is essential in sensitizing employees at all levels to the nuances of gender bias and its impact on individuals and the organization. This education should encompass not only awareness but also practical strategies for recognizing and addressing bias in everyday workplace situations. This learning should be ongoing, adapting to evolving societal norms and understanding. Moreover, the practical implementation of inclusive ideals is pivotal. This involves taking proactive steps to increase the representation of women in leadership positions and diverse teams, as well as eliminating barriers that hinder their advancement. This may entail reevaluating recruitment and promotion practices, offering mentorship and sponsorship programs, and establishing flexible work arrangements that accommodate the diverse needs of employees.

By embracing these measures in concert, organizations can effectively contribute to the cultivation of an equitable, diverse, and genuinely inclusive work environment. In such an environment, gender bias becomes an artifact of the past, and the full potential of everyone, regardless of gender, is unleashed. It's a future where not only women but everyone can thrive, and the collective strength of diverse perspectives can drive innovation and success in the corporate world. In the end, the journey to gender equity is not just a moral imperative but also a strategic imperative that can lead to better business outcomes and a more just society.

References

- [1] “The Equal Pay Act of 1963.” US EEOC, www.eeoc.gov/statutes/equal-pay-act-1963. Accessed 5 Aug. 2023.
- [2] Bohm Law Group. “Gender Discrimination in the Workplace: Bohm Law Group Employment Lawyers.” Bohm Law Group, Inc, 22 Oct. 2019, bohmlaw.com/areas/gender-discrimination/.
- [3] Brown Kwon & Lam. “What Is the Difference Between Direct and Indirect Discrimination?” Brown Kwon & Lam LLP, 24 Sept. 2021, www.bkllawyers.com/blog/2021/september/what-is-the-difference-between-direct-and-indire/.
- [4] “Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.” US EEOC, www.eeoc.gov/statutes/title-vii-civil-rights-act-1964. Accessed 5 Aug. 2023.
- [5] “Gender Discrimination in the Workplace.” Embroker, 16 Aug. 2022, www.embroker.com/blog/gender-discrimination-in-the-workplace/.
- [6] “Ledbetter v. Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company.” Oyez, www.oyez.org/cases/2006/05-1074. Accessed 5 Aug. 2023.
- [7] “Price Waterhouse v. Hopkins.” Oyez, www.oyez.org/cases/1988/87-1167. Accessed 5 Aug. 2023.
- [8] Parker, Kim, and Cary Funk. “Gender Discrimination Comes in Many Forms for Today’s Working Women.” Pew Research Center, 14 Dec. 2017, www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2017/12/14/gender-discrimination-comes-in-many-forms-for-todays-working-women/.
- [9] Young v. United Parcel Service, Inc.” Oyez, www.oyez.org/cases/2014/12-1226. Accessed 5 Aug. 2023.
- [10] Unknown. “Gender Bias in the Workplace: Bridging the Gap for Women in Business.” Gender Bias in the Workplace: Bridging the Gap, 10 Feb. 2022, www.stkate.edu/academics/women-in-leadership-degrees/blog/gender-bias-in-the-workplace.
- [11] “What Is Employment Discrimination?” US EEOC, www.eeoc.gov/youth/what-employment-discrimination. It was accessed 21 July 2023.