

ATTITUDES OF OKLAHOMA WOMEN IN ADVERTISING
CONCERNING EQUALITY IN THE WORKPLACE

By

BEVERLY SUZANNE BAILEY

Bachelor of Arts

University of Tulsa

Tulsa, Oklahoma

1982

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
July, 1985

Thesis
1985
BIEHa
cop 3



ATTITUDES OF OKLAHOMA WOMEN IN ADVERTISING
CONCERNING EQUALITY IN THE WORKPLACE

Thesis Approved:

Walter J. Wood

Thesis Adviser

William R. King

Philip E. Paulin

Norman N. Hudson

Dean of the Graduate College

PREFACE

This study attempted to analyze attitudes of women in the advertising industry towards equality in the workplace. The objective was to determine attitudes toward various aspects of equality in the specific place of employment, as well as in the industry in general. The study also sought to determine the relevance of several variables, including age, occupation, and income upon expressed attitudes.

Many people contributed to these efforts. Very special thanks is given to Dr. Walter J. Ward, director of Graduate Studies, Mass Communication, for his guidance and support throughout the graduate program.

Appreciation is also due to Dr. William R. Steng, Dr. Philip E. Paulin, and Mr. William C. Overstreet. Their counsel and assistance aided in development of this study.

A special gratitude is given to Sheila A. Wisherd for her guidance, patience, and assistance during the program.

Finally, a very sincere appreciation is extended to the author's parents, Robert B. and Marjorie A. Bailey, for the many years of love and encouragement provided. Their continuous support and confidence in my ability have made this effort possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	3
The Hypotheses	4
Issues of Study	5
Operational Definitions	5
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	10
Anti-discriminatory Regulations and Laws	10
Federal Laws and Regulations	10
Oklahoma Laws	14
Equal Pay	15
Job Opportunity and Advancement	20
Sexual Harassment	29
Childcare	33
Conclusion	34
III. METHODOLOGY	46
Selection Process	46
Method of Scoring	47
Pretesting	49
Validity	49
Design	50
IV. FINDINGS	52
Hierarchy of Opinion Items	54
Attitude Toward Equality in the Advertising Industry in General	58
Attitude Toward Equality in Subject's Specific Place of Employment	58
Analysis of Variance Among Variables	61
Age-by-Level of Workplace	62
Job-by-Level of Workplace	63
Job Level-by-Age	64
Summary	66
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	70
Summary	70
Conclusions	73

Chapter	Page
Recommendations	74
BIBLIOGRAPHY	76
APPENDIXES	79
APPENDIX A - COVER LETTER	80
APPENDIX B - ATTITUDE SURVEY	82

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Income Levels of Male and Female Respondents . . .	20
II. Number and Percentage of Respondents By Categories	53
III. Mean Attitude Scores of All Respondents on Equality in the Workplace: Across All Levels	55
IV. Mean Attitude Scores of All Respondents on Equality in the Workplace By Levels	59
V. Mean Attitude Scores of All Respondents on Equality in the Workplace By Levels	60
VI. Mean Attitudes Toward Equality in Two Levels of the Workplace: By Age	62
VII. Mean Attitudes Toward Equality: By Levels of Job and Workplace	64
VIII. Mean Attitudes Toward Equality: By Age and Job Level	65

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Only a decade ago, the idea that women had the basic right to work was radical and was considered against the norm.¹ Few women worked outside the home; and those who did, generally did so solely of necessity.²

Between 1950 and 1979, however, female workers in the labor force more than doubled, from 18.4 million to 43.4 million.³ At present, more than half of all women work and comprise 42 percent of all workers. It is estimated, moreover, that between now and 1990, an additional one million women will enter the labor force each year.⁴ Bardwick states that, by necessity, attitudes toward the prospect of young women working outside the home have changed considerably. She says, "When half the population does something, that behavior can no longer be considered deviant. It is treated as normal."⁵

Until the 1970's it may have been "normal" for women to have jobs but not careers, and it was acceptable for women to work only if there were no small children at home, or if their incomes were really necessary.⁶ With constrained job opportunities and limited conditions, most working women --particularly those who were married and had children--did

so to improve the economic level of their families. Work for women, thus, was an extension of their traditional supportive role. Women merely carried this role into the labor force. Consequently, until very recently women generally did not derive status or a sense of identity from working outside the home. The continuously increasing percentage of employed women does not represent a significant change in women's values or self-perceptions.⁷

Today, instead of holding the more traditional values of the past (women having only economically supportive jobs and not careers), a large number of women are seeking careers to develop their own potential. Furthermore, they are insisting that work is their right.⁸

The dramatic increase in female labor force participation also has been a major force in shaping the outcomes in the management of human resources. As Ralph E. Smith writes:

. . . as more women work outside the home, the fight for equal treatment in the job market and equal responsibilities for unpaid domestic work has (sic) intensified. Indeed, female-male relationships in every aspect of society are being questioned and are changing. The movement of women into the labor force is part of this larger social revolution, both as a cause and as an effect. The economic power provided by paid employment enhances the bargaining power of an individual in the marketplace, the political arena, and the home.⁹

It is becoming more apparent that increased participation of women in the labor force has had a strong effect upon the basic structure and ideals of the workplace and has raised a number of important issues concerning treatment women receive on the job.

As the percentage of women in the general business world increases, so does the percentage of women in the field of advertising. In 1971-1972, 35.5 percent of all bachelor's degrees in communications were awarded to women. In 1980, this percentage increased to 52.3 percent. In the advertising field, in 1979-1980, 1,163 out of 1,940 bachelor's degrees and 66 out of 118 master's degrees were conferred to women. In 1980, 41.8 percent of those employed as advertising agents were women.¹⁰ Not only are these women employed in advertising, they are moving slowly up the ranks into more advanced positions.¹¹ They are an important part of the female workforce, facing the same challenges and issues concerning equality in the workplace. Just as other women in business are helping to redefine ideals in the corporate structure, so are the women employed in the advertising industry.

Statement of the Problem

Much research has focused on the attitudes of women in the general workforce concerning equality in the workplace. A limited amount of research has even focused on women in various media occupations, such as journalism and broadcasting. Very little research, however, has focused on attitudes of women employed in advertising concerning equality in the workplace, and no research was found specifically covering attitudes of women employed in the advertising profession in Oklahoma. This study was an attempt to provide informa-

tion to fill this gap.

The study had the following objectives:

1. To determine the attitudes of women employed in the advertising industry in Oklahoma toward equality in the workplace.

2. To determine to what extent two factors--age and job level-- are related to attitudes of the subjects studied concerning equality in the workplace.

The Hypotheses

1. Women 35 years or older will perceive more discrimination in the workplace than women 34 years or younger.

2. Women who hold positions in account work or management will perceive more discrimination in the workplace than women employed in clerical, media, or creative positions.

The hypotheses were based upon the author's contention that women who are older may have more experience in industry and may have experienced discrimination for a longer period of time. Consequently, they may perceive more discrimination in the workplace. Women who hold "executive" positions may be in a supervisory role in which (as stated in the literature review) they may encounter more discrimination. As the literature review states, women have only recently become prominent in executive positions and they often may face more resistance because of this.¹²

Issues of Study

In reviewing literature, including that by Phyllis Wallace, Ralph E. Smith, Alice Yohalem, and Anne Harlan and Carol Weiss, several major issues concerning women in the workforce (including those in advertising) repeatedly are discussed. These include: anti-discrimination regulations and laws, equal pay, job opportunity sexual harassment in the workplace, and child care. These issues of equality were used as a basis for this study.

Operational Definitions

1. Attitude was defined as an organized predisposition to think, feel, perceive, and behave toward a referent or cognitive object.¹³

2. Advertising industry was defined as business concerning the paid form of nonpersonal presentation and promotion of ideas, goods or services by an identified sponsor.¹⁴

3. Anti-discriminatory laws were defined as those set forth in the United States Constitution, as well as those in the state of Oklahoma's Constitution designed to bring about equality in the workplace.

4. Equal Pay was defined as the sameness in treatment and opportunity given to males and females in monetary compensation for work.

5. Equality was defined as sameness in treatment and opportunities given to males and females in the workplace.

6. Job opportunity and advancement were defined as the

chance given to males and females to hold certain jobs and to advance in their professions.

7. Sexual harassment was defined as unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors and other verbal or work performance to create a hostile or offensive work environment.¹⁵

8. Child care was defined as the care and supervision of the children of parents who are working outside of the home.

9. Workplace was defined as the physical and social environment in which one is employed.

10. Age of respondents was divided into those 20-24, 25-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, 65 and over.

11. Occupational position was divided into: clerical, media, creative, account work, and management.

12. Number of years employed in the advertising industry was divided into 1-5, 6-10, 11-15, 16-20, and 21 and above.

13. For this study, older women were classified as those 35 and older. Women who are younger are classified as those 20-34.

14. For this study, job level was classified as executive (account work and management) and non-executive (clerical, media and creative).

15. Agencies whose gross billing exceeded 2.5 million dollars per year were considered large agencies. Agencies with less than 2.5 million dollars per year were regarded as small agencies.

16. For this study, industry level was divided into subject's specific workplace and the advertising industry in general.

ENDNOTES

¹Judith M. Bardwick, In Transition, (Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1979), pp. 40-41.

²Ibid., p. 41.

³Phyllis A. Wallace, Women in the Workplace, (Boston: Auburn House Publishing Company, 1982), p. 1.

⁴Ralph E. Smith, The Subtle Revolution, (Washington, D.C., The Urban Institute, 1979), p. ix.

⁵Bardwick, p. 41.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Ibid.

⁸Daniel Yankelovich, "Angry Workers, Happy Grads," Psychology Today, December 1974, pp. 81-87.

⁹Smith, p. 1.

¹⁰Manpower Data Resource Service, Professional Women and Minorities, (Scientific Manpower Commission, 1982), p. 44.

¹¹"Women Get Their Chance in Media," Media Decisions, Vol. XIII, No. 8, August 1978, p. 64.

¹²Susan Fraker, "Why Women Aren't Getting to the Top," Fortune, Vol. CIX, No. 8, April 16, 1984, p. 40.

¹³Fred N. Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioral Research, (Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973), p. 495.

¹⁴Maurice I. Mandell, Advertising, (Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1980), p. 6.

¹⁵Guidelines on Sexual Harassment (Guidelines on
Discrimination Because of Sex), 29 Congressional Federal
Record, Nov. 10, 1980, Chapter XIV, Sec. 1604.11.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Anti-Discriminatory Regulations and Laws

Federal Laws and Regulations

Concomitant with changes in the labor supply of women, changes on the demand side of the market associated with the implementation of employment discrimination regulations and laws have improved job opportunities for women.¹ While outdated stereotypes regarding women's long-range commitment to work and traditional views about "women's place" in the job market are changing rather slowly, the legislation governing women's employment has changed radically since the early 1960s.²

The first sex discrimination legislation enacted was the Equal Pay Act of 1963.³ It requires equal pay for equal work, regardless of sex. This act was passed as an amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938⁴ and required employers to pay members of both sexes the same wages for equivalent work except when the differential was based on one of the following exceptions: (1) seniority system, (2) merit system, (3) a system that measures earnings by quantity or quality of production, (4) a differential based

on any factor other than sex. Equal work was defined as jobs in the same establishment, the performance of which was done under similar working conditions.⁵

In as much as it did not require non-discrimination in hiring, promotion, or work assignments, however, the Equal Pay Act did not mandate equal employment opportunity. Some say the motivation of the Equal Pay Act actually was to increase employment security for men who feared competition from women who would do their jobs for lower wages.⁶ Nonetheless, this piece of legislation represented a watershed, a turning away from a legal system that facilitated and sanctioned discrimination against women to a legal environment that prohibits sex discrimination in employment.⁷

Since women workers are concentrated heavily in occupations segregated by sex, provisions of the Equal Pay Act dealing with equal work performed under similar working conditions may have limited impact.⁸ A confusing definitional issue also arose over whether equal pay for equal work should be replaced by equal work of comparable worth--jobs that require comparable (not identical) skills, responsibility, and effort. However, United States Representative Charles E. Goodell, a sponsor of the Equal Pay Bill, had substituted the term "equal work" for "comparable work," an approach that had been used by the War Labor Board during World War II. Goodell had stated:

Last year when the House changed the word 'comparable' to 'equal' the clear intention was to narrow the whole concept. We went from 'comparable' to 'equal' meaning that jobs involved should be virtually identical. . .⁹

Though there has been some confusion over the Equal Pay Act, the legislative history of the Act and its judicial interpretations indicate that the concept of equality embraces job content as well as the standards of skill, effort, responsibility, and working conditions.¹⁰

In general, anti-discrimination laws enacted during the mid 1960's included women as well as minorities as protected groups. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Executive Order 11246 established the guidelines for anti-discrimination practices and procedures.¹¹

Initially, there was a strong conflict between Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and state protective laws. These special laws restricted the maximum number of hours worked, limited the amount of weight to be lifted, and prohibited night work.¹² For several years after Title VII's passage, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) treated the protective laws as bonafide occupational qualification (BFOQ) exceptions to Title VII - that is, sex discrimination in employment could be permitted where it was reasonably necessary to normal operation of a business.¹³

In August 1969, however, the EEOC revoked a portion of its Guidelines on Discrimination Because of Sex and inserted a new selection stipulating that such (protective) laws and regulations conflict with, and are superseded by, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The 1969 Guidelines stated that since such protective laws did not take into account capacities, preferences, and abilities of individual females,

they tended to discriminate rather than protect.¹⁴

Beneficial provisions of state labor laws, such as minimum wage, overtime pay, or rest periods, were not invalidated, but in accordance with the 1972 Guidelines, had to be extended to cover men in order not to violate Title VII.¹⁵

The EEOC was (and still is) considered to lack effective enforcement powers, and is overburdened by a heavy caseload, but its guidelines have clarified important legal issues. For instance, the guidelines have made it illegal for firms to attribute characteristics to individuals based on the attributes of a group.¹⁶

The Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972 revised Title VII. Title VII as amended by this Act forbids discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin, religion or sex in any term, condition or privilege of employment, including sexual harassment by unions, employment agencies, and employers.¹⁷ The law was amended in 1972 to cover all public and private educational institutions, as well as state and local governments. It applies to all employers, public or private, whether or not they receive any federal funds. Title VII covers all private employers of 15 or more persons.¹⁸

Shortly after the amendment of Title VII in 1972, a stringent set of guidelines on sex discrimination was issued by the EEOC, expanding and clarifying the scope of the Equal Employment Opportunity Act, with sections including height and weight requirements (BFOQ exceptions, seniority systems,

equal pay, retirement benefits, and pregnancy). In 1980, sections on sexual harassment were added to the guidelines. The interpretations of the guidelines on sex discrimination and the implementation of the provisions of the anti-discrimination laws and regulations that are gender-related have produced significant changes in the nature of the labor force participation of women. They not only have shaped the work environment of women but of all workers.¹⁹

Oklahoma Laws

Oklahoma Statute 25:1302 states it is a discriminatory practice for an employer to:

1. Fail or refuse to hire, to discharge, or otherwise to discriminate against an individual with respect to compensation or the terms, conditions, privileges or responsibilities of employment, because of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, or handicap unless such action is related to a bona fide occupational qualification reasonably necessary to the normal operation of the employer's business or enterprise; or

2. Limit, segregate or classify an employee in a way which would deprive or tend to deprive an individual of employment opportunities or otherwise adversely affect the status of an employee, because of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, or handicap unless such action is related to a bona fide occupational qualification reasonably necessary to the normal operation of the employer's business

or enterprise.²⁰

Oklahoma Statute .25:1311 states that:

Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, it shall not be an unlawful employment practice because of sex to differentiate in employment, compensation, terms, conditions or privileges of employment between male and female employees if such differences are otherwise required or permitted by the laws of this state, or by the provisions of Section 703 of the Federal Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, or by the provisions of Section 6(d) of the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended; nor shall it be an unlawful employment practice because of sex for an employer, pursuant to a plan, to provide differences in annuity, death and survivors' benefits between widows and widowers of employees.²¹

Oklahoma Statute 40:198.1 states that:

It shall be unlawful for any employer within the state of Oklahoma to willfully pay wages to women employees at a rate less than the rate at which he pays any employee of the opposite sex for comparable work on jobs which have comparable requirements relating to skill, effort and responsibility, except where such payment is made pursuant to a seniority system; a merit system; a system which measures earnings by quantity or quality of production; or a differential based on any factor other than sex.²²

Equal Pay

At the beginning of the 1980s, the earnings of full-time women workers averaged about 62 percent of those of men. Although there was some variation by occupation, the overall ratio has widened slightly during the period of the most significant increases in the labor force participation of women.²³ There is considerable debate over how much of the sustained wage differential is attributable to productivity characteristics, and how much to sex discrimination.²⁴ Lloyd and Niemi have reviewed 21 important studies that

decompose the male-female earnings gap by controlling for variables such as age, hours of work, marital status, work experience, continuity of work experience, education, turnover, absenteeism, and geographic region. In three-fourths of the studies, the variables that might affect productivity explain less than half of the earnings differential.²⁵

Much of the unexplained residual has been attributed to wage discrimination.²⁶ Wage discrimination against women may be said to exist when the ratio of male to female wages is greater than the ratio that would result in the absence of discrimination.²⁷

In a study of 226 professional women (all 1963 graduates of Columbia University) by Alice Yohalem, salary was cited most frequently as a source of discrimination (cited by 74 percent of respondents).²⁸ Differences associated with the size of current earnings were slight. Thirty-seven percent of all women who had full-time earnings of \$30,000 or more in 1974 claimed to have experienced salary discrimination compared with 44 percent in the lowest earnings range (under \$15,000).²⁹

Inequity in salary was noted more frequently by women who had received unequal treatment in fields in which females were underrepresented or well-represented than in occupations in which females had larger representation. Workers in occupations with male majorities tended to earn more than women in predominantly female fields, yet they apparently were more aggrieved about their relative earning

status. It is possible their grievances referred to past salary discrimination that later had been rectified, but one also may speculate that, since women in male-dominated occupations had the most career continuity, they possibly had anticipated higher rewards. While their earnings were greater than those of women in occupations with higher proportions of females, they may have been lower than those of male co-workers of similar background.³⁰

Unlike other groups, a smaller proportion of workers in female-dominated occupations mentioned discrimination in earnings than in promotion. In many predominantly female fields, there may have been few men, if any, with whom to compare earnings, so salary discrimination would be more difficult to assert than inequity in advancement.³¹ That these women's earnings tended to be lower than those of other respondents partially reflects the general earnings distribution in female occupations. The other women had higher earnings but they had plenty of males whose salaries could be used as points of reference and, having done so, they apparently believed they relatively had been deprived.³²

Reasons for gaps between the theory of equal pay for equal work and actual practice of this principle are varied. One reason this gap exists still can be attributed to the common belief that working women need only extra "pin money," especially when they are married and their husbands work.³³ In interviews conducted by the American Corporation for Public Broadcasters, in a survey of the salaries of women

broadcasters, a male executive vice president stated:

We have underpaid women in producer roles because we know that perhaps it has been a second job and their husbands have other jobs. With the job market as it is today, perhaps we can pay these persons a little less because we want to save as much as we can in terms of budget.³⁴

When males and females of equal qualification are up for pay raises and related wage increases, many supervisors still will award the raise to the male because he "has a family to take care of." Supervisors often seem to assume women have lesser financial needs, and have fewer financial responsibilities than their male cohorts.³⁵

Another possible reason for this earning gap is the perception that women are temporary participants in the work force.³⁶ Labor force participation and continuity of experience obviously help shape the life-cycle earnings of women. One explanation why men's age-earnings tend to rise while women's are relatively flat is that men are more likely to invest early in education and training that pay off later in higher earnings.³⁷

Because men view their careers in long-term perspective, they allegedly are willing to forego short-term earnings opportunities and to undertake costly education and training with a view toward a later payoff. Conversely, many women are said to invest less in education and training because they expect to have fewer years of labor force activity in which to benefit from education and training.³⁸

Another explanation is employers tend to provide superior training opportunities for men in the expectation that

men will stay with the firm longer than will most women. Training decisions usually are made early in a worker's career, before he or she has had opportunity to establish a work history. To the extent that employers hold traditional attitudes regarding the* intermittency or unreliability of women employees, even women who never leave the firm will have received fewer training opportunities than will similarly qualified men.³⁹

While these attitudes and occurrences account for some degree of wage discrepancy, it is believed by far the greatest reason for discrepancy in wages is occupational segregation in the job market.⁴⁰

In simple, straightforward terms (occupational segregation is discussed in detail in the portion of this review covering job opportunity and advancement), this phenomenon occurs when women on one hand are denied access to some occupations and are "crowded" into a limited number of occupations where pay, then, is lower and unemployment higher.⁴¹ Jobs are divided into "male" and "female," with jobs given to females offering less compensation. Although discrimination laws may prevent more rigid forms of occupational segregation, they can do little to attack the more widespread, more subtle cases.⁴²

The Oklahoma City chapter of Women in Communications, Inc. developed a 1983 job/salary survey involving workers in communications-related fields in the Oklahoma City metropolitan area. Their findings are summarized as follows:

TABLE I
INCOME LEVELS OF MALE AND FEMALE RESPONDENTS

	-\$14,000	\$15,000- \$19,999 *	\$20,000- \$29,999	\$30,000- \$39,999	\$40,000+
Male	4.8%	6.3%	38.1%	31.7%	19.0%
Female	16.8%	26.7%	45.1%	14.5%	6.9%

The study states:

In looking at this table, it is obvious that the men responding to the survey were more likely to earn a higher salary than women respondents. There are several variables that might account for this difference.

For instance, the men responding to this survey tended to have a higher education level and greater experience levels in the field of communication than did the women respondents, possibly accounting for higher reported salaries by the male respondents.⁴³

Because of strict equal pay legislation, blatant examples of wage discrimination now are harder to locate. The more subtle forms, such as occupational segregation, now seem to be the main culprit. The issue of equal pay for equal work now has become intertwined strongly with the issue of equal access to work.⁴⁴

Job Opportunity and Advancement

Between 1970 and 1975, the increase in all areas of business in the number of women holding managerial positions

amounted to some 202,000 individuals. According to the Conference Board (1978), this figure represented an increase from 13 percent in 1970 to 17 percent in 1975.⁴⁵ Women are moving slowly into the management sector of business.

Even with this influx of women into management, problems still exist. Management remains heavily male-dominated, with women comprising 15 percent of entry-level managers but only 5 percent of middle-management and 1 percent of top management. The proportion of women in middle- and top-management has remained relatively constant from preceding decades.⁴⁶ In Yohalem's study of professional women, 61 percent of the participants reported experiencing sex discrimination in promotion.⁴⁷

The critical problem women in the labor force face today, and will continue to face, is occupational segregation.⁴⁸ The majority of women in the labor force are in positions considered to be "women's work." It is unlikely this pattern of segregation will have ended by 1990. Its causes are complex and varied, relating in part to employer discrimination, but also to the attitudes and preparation of the female workers themselves. The key issue is how to absorb more women into the labor market in such a way that integration will occur.⁴⁹

Occupational segregation occurs when traditional concepts of women's work, derived from societal sex roles and sex-based division of labor at home, characterize the jobs women do in the paid labor force.⁵⁰

Several traits characterize jobs typically held by women. First, women rarely are put into positions of authority. Assignment of male supervisors to a predominantly female work force limits women's upward mobility even in female-dominated occupations.⁵¹

Both white-collar and blue-collar jobs that women hold are stereotyped according to certain attributes commonly perceived as feminine. Jobs that require caring for others and nurturing are viewed as appropriately feminine, since these are tasks to which females are exposed from childhood.⁵²

Another characteristic of women's work assignment is that women are allowed only vicarious rather than direct assignments. Women often are placed into roles as assistants, even when qualified for supervisory positions. Society has long encouraged women to accept vicarious satisfactions, and this acceptance is expected in the workplace.⁵³

Sex differences in job assignments can take the form of allotting men and women different qualitative tasks. In business concerns, for instance, personnel officers routinely may seek women for secretarial positions and men as management trainees. Some professions, such as nursing or teaching small children, socially are stereotyped as "women's work," while other jobs, like airline pilot and police officer, are considered "men's work." In most cases, jobs perceived as "women's work" pay less than do "men's" jobs requiring comparable levels of skill and effort.⁵⁵

A related mechanism that perpetuates a wage gap and

segregation between men and women is the assignment of men to jobs needing specialized skills and training that can be learned only on the job, or to supervisory positions with extra responsibility. In practice, differences in upward mobility for men and women interact with the practice of giving men and women qualitatively different job assignments. Career-ladder jobs often are restricted to male turf, while women's jobs offer fewer opportunities for advancement. The male management trainee, for instance, will receive specialized training and will be assigned to positions of ever-increasing responsibility with, of course, higher pay. The secretary, meanwhile, often finds herself in a dead-end job, with much smaller increases in pay than those the male executive receives, even if she spends years in the company.⁵⁶

The male buddy system also operates. In more blatant forms, in many work environments where teamwork is essential for effective completion of jobs, some men refuse to cooperate with the woman who is "invading their territory."⁵⁷ This appears in a more subtle form as the male "club." Edith M. Lynch states that the higher one gets, the more apparent it is that top executive levels constitute a club. She states that many of these men grant women considerable ability but feel very uncomfortable about having them around on equal terms in the "club."⁵⁸

Many people still believe women's participation in paid labor market activities is incidental to their major life's work as wives and mothers. This view has been made obsolete

by decisions many women have made to participate in the labor force in circumstances that a generation ago would have kept them out; in particular, the presence of young children is not nearly so great a barrier.⁵⁹

Nancy Barrett says when people persist in holding the preconceptions about women that contribute to occupational segregation, it seriously can affect their evaluation of women as workers or potential workers. Young women who do not expect to be in the labor force for long are unlikely to acquire the education and training that will prepare them for good jobs. Similarly, their parents, teachers, and counselors are unlikely to provide good vocational guidance if they do not expect the young women to stay in the labor force for long. Employers hesitate to hire women for jobs that require considerable training if they do not expect the trained employees to stay on the job.⁶⁰

Ralph Smith states that as long as women who work outside the home earn much less than men, they will continue to be viewed as "secondary workers."⁶¹ This second-class designation not only affects women's positions within the job market, but also influences women's decisions about whether it is worthwhile for them to enter or remain in the labor force. This secondary-worker designation also affects how women are viewed by society in general and by their families in particular.⁶²

In our society, a person's status often is defined in terms of the work a person does. If the wife's job pays less

than her husband's and offers less opportunity for advancement, it is clear which job will take precedence when a child needs to be taken to the doctor or when the husband has an opportunity for promotion by moving to another city. Women's acquiescence in treatment as secondary workers, in turn, perpetuates the view that women's home responsibilities make them less valuable workers outside the home.⁶³

Nancy Barrett states that as long as sex roles within the family presuppose male dominance and female submission, occupational segregation in the marketplace will be hard to overcome. Women and men have trouble adjusting to different sex-role patterns at home and in the office. She states that a man accustomed to a submissive wife may have trouble taking orders from a woman at work, while a female executive with a position of authority in the office may find it hard to accept a dominant husband at home.⁶⁴

According to a 1980 UNESCO report on the status of women in the media, occupational segregation is also a part of the communications industry. This general discrimination is reflected in the traditional division of all jobs into two categories: jobs for men and jobs for women.⁶⁵ In media-related fields, few women were found in managerial and administrative positions. Women were moving into some middle management areas but very few reached upper-level positions. In creative and professional areas, women often were used as assistants but rarely as directors or producers. Technical jobs were performed almost exclusively by men. The majority

of women had clerical positions.⁶⁶

This is not to say that all women, particularly those in the communications field, are limited only to clerical/secretarial positions. Women are moving slowly into management ranks. In advertising,⁶ some women are moving into areas such as sales and have ad directorships. The process just had been much slower than many think justified.⁶⁷

The difference in the promotional status of men and women in the communications industry is evident in a trend analysis conducted by Diane Sears-Bugeja. In this study, Sears-Bugeja compared promotional publicity listings in Editor and Publisher for the 1960s and 1970s. Using percentages and the Pearson correlation coefficient, Sears-Bugeja sought to determine if promotional job publicity has shifted in a more favorable direction for women.⁶⁸

The study indicated that women received only a small percentage of the promotional publicity in the journal. In addition, the situation had not improved in the two decades of listings studied. Women generated only nine percent of the promotional job publicity during each decade. Men had 88 percent of the publicity in the 1960's and 90 percent in the 1970's. The remaining percentages were represented by an Either-type category.⁶⁹ In the field of advertising, women generated only six percent of the promotional job publicity in the 1960's. This dropped to 4.7 percent in the 1970's. Men generated 90 percent of the publicity in the 1960's and 95 percent in the 1970's. The remaining percentages were

represented by the Either-type category. As in the communications industry in general, women in advertising generated a very small percentage of job publicity and the situation did not improve in the two decades studied.⁷⁰

In conclusion, Sears-Bugeja states that the women's movement and recent legislation have done little to influence markedly the promotional status for women in the communication field. She states that women's gain in employment statistics does not mean they will be given job promotional publicity at the rate men are bestowed with it.⁷¹ She states that this factor is important in that promotion and publicity are factors that affect salary considerations and enhance clipbooks or portfolios. Sears Bugeja states that unless women receive equal treatment in this area, employers can favor men in their decisions about job salary and promotions, because on paper men will appear more highly regarded than their female counterparts.⁷²

Women who once were locked permanently into low-paying jobs in agency media departments are not sitting by passively anymore as their male colleagues move into bigger and better paying positions. Some women are seeking and getting a bigger portion of these positions.⁷³

Very few women, however, ever make it into senior managerial positions. As of 1982, there were but five women who had the title of chairman, president or managing partner in the top 100 agencies in recent years.⁷⁴ One thing disturbing about this is, while women have entered many industries

only recently, they have been prevalent in media for years.⁷⁵

One reason given for women not being given top positions in ad agencies is client reaction. It sometimes is believed that clients are reluctant to accept women in top positions. Yet, when the situation is studied, this does not seem to be the case. Clients are becoming more and more open to accepting women in ad agency management roles.⁷⁶

One distinct disadvantage to being a woman in advertising is said to be (as discussed earlier) the "club." Women on both sides of the desk say they have encountered the subtle attitudes, the camaraderie which exists among men which benefits them in business. The relationship between the client and account management becomes a social situation - the club, the golf course, after work hours, weekends. The business then is conducted in social situation in which women are excluded.⁷⁷

The trend in advertising agencies seems to parallel that of industry in general.⁷⁸ Despite impressive progress at the entry level and in middle management, women are having trouble breaking into senior management.⁷⁹ Only one company on Fortune's "top 500" list of the largest U.S. industrial corporations has a woman chief executive. That woman, Katherine Graham of the Washington Post Co. (No. 342), readily admits she got the job because her family owns a controlling share of the corporation.⁸⁰

It is believed that, with government and industry support, women, through their increasing commitment to the

labor force, can improve their position there.⁸¹ What women need most, experts say, are loud, clear, continuous statements of support from senior management. With this support, perhaps more women will join the ranks of upper-level management, and the problems of occupational segregation and discrimination in advancement can be alleviated.⁸²

Sexual Harassment

Sexual harassment is perceived to be a widespread problem in the workplace.⁸³ In a Working Women United Institute survey of women in upstate New York, 70 percent thought it was a serious problem.⁸⁴ Redbook magazine surveyed 9,000 women of whom 88 percent had been harassed and 92 percent thought it was a serious problem; an informal survey of 875 workers at the United Nations revealed 50 percent of the women and 31 percent of the men had either been sexually harassed or knew of people being sexually harassed; and at a naval base in California, 81 percent of the women had been harassed at some point in their career.⁸⁵

In 1979, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House of Representatives initiated an investigation into sexual harassment in federal government. The Committee recommended the EEOC be asked to improve its processing of sexual harassment complaints and to train EEO officials in handling of such complaints.⁸⁶ In November 1980, new sex discrimination guidelines covering sexual harassment on the job were adopted by the EEOC.⁸⁷ The guidelines were issued

in March 1980 when it was clear that sexual harassment charges represented an increasing share of charges filed with the EEOC.⁸⁸ Sexual harassment, defined as unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors and other verbal or physical conduct of sexual nature, constitutes sex discrimination in violation of Section 703(a) of Title VII:

It shall be unlawful employment practice for an employer . . . to discriminate against any individual with respect to compensation, terms, conditions of privileges of employment because of an individual's . . . sex.

The guidelines noted three criteria for application of the definition: (1) where sexual conduct is used as a condition of an individual's employment, (2) where sexual conduct is used as a basis for employment decisions affecting an individual, and (3) where sexual conduct interferes with work performance or creates a hostile or offensive work environment.⁸⁹

Employers are liable, under the guidelines, for misconduct of supervisory employees or agents regardless of whether the conduct was known to, authorized, or forbidden by the employer. This standard of employer liability was articulated in 1979 in the Miller v. Bank of America case for the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.⁹⁰ The court held an employer to be liable for the sexually harassing acts of its supervisors even if the company had a policy of prohibiting such conduct and even if the victim did not formally notify the employer of the problem. Earlier court decisions had disagreed over whether sexual harassment cons-

stituted sex discrimination under Title VII and whether the employer was liable for an employee's actions. The guidelines expanded the employer liability standards of the courts by including co-workers, non-employees, and third parties. Also under the guidelines, employers are responsible for developing affirmative programs to prevent sexual misconduct, investigating all complaints alleging sexual harassment, and are required to undertake corrective action to remedy illegal activities.⁹²

In January 1981, in the case of Bundy v. Jackson, the United States Court of Appeals in Washington, D.C., ruled that sexual harassment is a violation of Title VII and that the victim was not required to prove she resisted and was penalized for the resistance. Employers are liable for sexual harassment in the workplace because it creates an offensive discriminatory environment by poisoning the atmosphere of employment.⁹³

With these stringent guidelines on sexual harassment, many women report that overt harassment (sexual conduct being made a condition or basis for employment) is declining somewhat. But many say they still experience less obvious forms of harassment. In a study conducted by Anne Harlan and Carol Weiss, women in management corporations gave no evidence of being coerced into sexual relationships to retain their position or to advance to better jobs. Many of the women did report they still experienced inappropriate comments and sexual remarks that interfered with their ability to do their jobs and

that created an offensive work atmosphere. Harlan and Weiss stated that sexual harassment is still a method of discrimination used in the workplace, in that it sometimes emerges in a subtler form.⁹⁴

Sexual harassment often is seen when women move into traditionally masculine work. It is used by some men as a way of demeaning women and "putting them in their place."⁹⁵

Lin Farley, author of Sexual Shakedown, states,

It is important to remember that sexual harassment is not an issue of sex but one of power, an expression of dominance, and women who do not respond submissively find harassment increases until they are driven to leave their jobs. All types of harassment, from very subtle to brutally blatant, are equally important in terms of female job loss.⁹⁶

Farley also states that an additional problem for women in the workplace is the hiring standard that sometimes divides women, pitting the young against the old, "pretty" against "plain" and minority against white.⁹⁷ She said harassment continues to be prevalent because society, both male and female, accepts it to a strong degree.⁹⁸

The Harvard Business Review in March-April 1981 reported on a survey of sexual harassment based on 1,846 replies from 7,408 surveyed. The main conclusion was that, while men and women tended to agree on what sexual harassment was, they tended to disagree strongly on how often it occurs. Many female respondents said they were frustrated with management's lack of understanding about the problem. Most respondents believed the problem would be difficult to resolve, partly because of EEOC guidelines - although reasonable in theory -

would be difficult to implement.⁹⁹

Childcare

Another result of increased numbers of women entering the workforce is greater concern over the quality and method of childcare and its effect upon women in the workplace.¹⁰⁰

One major issue whose importance has heightened due to increased female labor force participation is pregnancy and maternity benefits. In October 1978, President Carter signed the Pregnancy Discrimination Act, which amended Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and reaffirmed, with minor modifications, EEOC's guidelines. Employers were required to modify fringe benefits and insurance programs to assure that pregnant workers were granted the same benefits as employees unable to work for other medical reasons. In addition, the amendment prohibits terminating or refusing to hire or promote a woman solely because she is pregnant. It also bars mandatory maternity leaves arbitrarily set at a certain time in their pregnancies and not based in their ability to work.¹⁰¹ The amendment also protects reinstatement rights of women in leave for pregnancy-related reasons, including credit for previous service and accrued retirement.¹⁰²

Maternity sometimes is used as a reason for women's failure to advance to high-level positions in business. Susan Fraker states that it clearly slows the progress of women who decide to take a long maternity leave or who choose to work part-time.¹⁰³ She states that even those committed to work-

ing full-time upon return believe they sometimes are held back - purposely or inadvertently. They believe supervisors make too many assumptions that women with children aren't free to take on time-consuming tasks.¹⁰⁴

In the UNESCO study of women in the media, it appeared that women in the communications industry also had difficulty advancing in careers because of maternity issues.¹⁰⁵ The study suggests that perhaps industry should begin to look at parenting as a two-person responsibility, even to the point of suggesting that companies begin to offer paternity leave.¹⁰⁶ It also was suggested that company-sponsored daycare become more widely accepted (industry does not seem to be accepting the idea at the present time), and that more flexible work hours and programs such as flex-time and job-sharing be implemented.¹⁰⁷

Conclusion

It is evident that women have made strides in gaining acceptance in the business world within the past two decades. As stated earlier, the number of women in the workforce has increased and women are advancing somewhat in gaining more powerful positions in business.

There are still many forces, however, which hinder women in their quest for advancement and job opportunity. There are also many problems women face because of their gender, once they have advanced into higher positions.

A recent survey conducted by the Gallup Organization for

the Wall Street Journal points out the general concerns and attitudes many executive women hold toward issues of equality in the workplace. The survey, in which 722 executive women participated, indicated that, in general, respondents believed it was very difficult to be a woman in the male corporate world.¹⁰⁸

Participants said that, while women are advancing more easily, attitudes toward their perceived competence on the job have changed little. For example, a director of marketing stated:

In upper levels, a woman is still not taken seriously. There's always an uncomfortable psychological feeling that (men in) senior management experience. Most are of an age where they grew up with a set of rules that women are subservient and have psychological problems. Rationally, they can deal with women, but psychologically they cannot.¹⁰⁹

Age also plays a role in discrimination. A 58-year-old woman working in low-level management stated, "The older a woman gets, the greater the problems. The attitude is: she's an old bag - what does she know?"¹¹⁰

The study also provided evidence that respondents had experienced various forms of discrimination. Seventy percent of those surveyed believed they were being paid less than a man of equal ability. Sixty percent had the impression their views were not respected as much as a man's in certain areas, and 41 percent believed a male subordinate resisted taking orders from them because he felt threatened by a female boss.¹¹¹

Many respondents also indicated that being female affected personal and social behavior on the job. Sixty-one percent

felt cut off from social conversations or activities among their male colleagues. Forty-four percent believed they were being patronized by older executives.¹¹²

Other responses frequently given by participants were that women are judged on the basis of appearance more than men, that many of their ideas were discounted or ignored, and that their personal lives are scrutinized more closely than those of their male counterparts.¹¹³

These women did not feel totally negative toward the men they work with. Most said they had been helped by men in advancing on the job. Eighty-two percent said the person who had been most helpful in their advancement was a man.¹¹⁴ Most respondents also indicated it makes little difference whether their boss is a man or a woman.¹¹⁵ These women merely expressed views concerning issues and problems that women continue to face as they struggle to gain respect in the corporate world.¹¹⁶

The author contends that women who work in the advertising industry have the same concerns expressed by women in the general work force. In formulating the hypotheses, it was contended that women who are older and those who have jobs which put them in a supervisory position will indicate that discrimination is more prevalent. As the review of literature states, women in advertising are moving into the ranks of management.¹¹⁷ Many of the same issues of equality (equal pay, promotion, etc.) studied in other areas of industry are also important to women in advertising as they advance in

their careers.¹¹⁸

Because of the increased number of women in the work force, the increase in anti-discriminatory legislation, and the evidence that some women are advancing in their careers, it is easy to be led to believe that women have gained equality in the workplace. Consequently, many people may believe there is no need to pursue the issue of equality. But, as the review of literature indicates, there are still a number of areas in which women have not been treated equally. Many issues have yet to be resolved. It is important that research continue and that solutions to problems of inequality continue to be sought.

ENDNOTES

¹Phyllis A. Wallace, Women in the Workplace (Boston: Auburn House Publishing Company, 1982), p. 4.

²Nancy S. Barrett, "Women in the Job Market: Occupations, Earnings, and Career Opportunities," in Ralph E. Smith (ed.), The Subtle Revolution (Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, 1979), p. 54.

³Manpower Data Resource Service, Professional Women and Minorities (Scientific Manpower Commission, 1982), p. 3.

⁴Wallace, p. 8.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Barrett, p. 55.

⁷Ibid.

⁸Wallace, p. 9.

⁹Ibid.

¹⁰Barrett, p. 56.

¹¹Wallace, p. 4.

¹²Barbara Allen Babcock, Anne E. Freedman, Eleonor Holmes Norton, and Susan C. Ross, "State Labor Laws and the BFOQ," in Sex Discrimination and the Law (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1975), Chapter II, Sec. 3B (3).

¹³Wallace, p. 4.

¹⁴Ibid.

¹⁵Ibid.

¹⁶Barrett, p. 56.

¹⁷Manpower Data Resource Service, p. 3.

¹⁸Ibid.

¹⁹Wallace, p. 5.

²⁰Oklahoma Statutes 1981, Vol. 2 (St. Paul: West Publishing Company, 1981), p. 2492.

²¹Ibid., p. 2493.

²²Ibid., p. 3019.

²³Barrett, p. 56.

²⁴Wallace, p. 8.

²⁵Ibid.

²⁶Ibid.

²⁷Gary S. Becker, The Economics of Discrimination (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957), p. 9.

²⁸Alice M. Yohalem, The Careers of Professional Women (New York: Allanheld, Osmun and Company and by Universe Books, 1979), p. 150.

²⁹Ibid.

³⁰Ibid., pp. 50-51.

³¹Ibid., p. 51.

³²Ibid.

³³UNESCO, Women in the Media (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 1980), p. 42.

³⁴Ibid., p. 44.

³⁵Ibid.

36
Barrett, p. 40.

37
Ibid., pp. 40-41

38
Ibid., p. 41

39
Ibid.

40
Julianne M. Malveaux, "Moving Forward, Standing Still: Women in White Collar Jobs," in Phyllis A. Wallace (ed.), Women in the Workplace (Boston: Auburn House Publishing Company, 1982), p. 103.

41
Barbara Bergmann, "Occupational Segregation, Wages and Profits When Employers Discriminate By Race or Sex," Eastern Economic Journal, April/July 1974, pp. 103-110.

42
Malveaux, p. 103.

43
Women in Communications, Inc., Oklahoma City Chapter, "1983 Job/Salary Survey," (Journalism Research Center, University of Oklahoma), pp. 5-6.

44
Lin Farley, "Power Play: Workplace and Campus," in Patricia Stover and Yvonne Gillies (eds.), Conference Report: Stop Sexual Harassment in the Workplace (Ann Arbor: Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, University of Michigan/Wayne State University, 1979), p. 5.

45
Anne Harlan and Carol L. Weiss, "Sex Differences in Factors Affecting Managerial Career Advancement," in Phyllis A. Wallace (ed.), Women in the Workplace (Boston: Auburn House Publishing Company, 1982), p. 59.

46
Ibid., pp. 59-60.

47
Yohalem, p. 150.

48
Smith, p. 21.

49

Ibid.

50

Barrett, p. 46.

51

Ibid.

52

Ibid., pp. 46-47.

53

Ibid., p. 35.

54

Ibid.

55

Ibid.

56

Ibid., p. 48.

57

Ibid.

58

Edith M. Lynch, The Executive Suite: Feminine Style
(New York: American Management Associations, Inc., 1973),
p. 25.

59

Smith, pp. 21-22.

60

Ibid. p. 22.

61

Ibid.

62

Ibid.

63

Ibid.

64

Barrett, p. 49.

65

UNESCO, p. 31.

66

Ibid., pp. 31-32.

67

"Women Get Their Chance in Media," Media Decisions, Vol. VIII, August 1978, p. 64.

68

Diane Sears Bugeja, "The Status of Women in Journalism: A Trend Analysis of Women in Editor and Publisher in the Years 1962, 1963, 1964, 1972, 1973, 1974," p. 1.

69

Ibid., p. 2.

70

Ibid., Table 1, p. 6.

71

Ibid., p. 4.

72

Ibid., pp. 4-5.

73

"Women Get Their Chance in Media," p. 65.

74

Ben Bodec, "Why So Few Women at the Top?" Marketing & Media Decisions, Vol. XVII, No. 4, April 1982, p. 70.

75

"Women Get Their Chance in Media," p. 66.

76

Ibid., p. 109.

77

Ibid., p. 69.

78

Bodec, p. 118.

79

Susan Fraker, "Why Women Aren't Getting to the Top," Fortune, Vol. CIX, No. 8, April 16, 1984, p. 40.

80

Ibid.

81

Smith, p. 22.

82

Fraker, p. 45.

83

Wallace, p. 14.

84

Patricia Stover and Yvonne Gillies, Conference Report: Stop Sexual Harassment in the Workplace (Ann Arbor: Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, University of Michigan/Wayne State University), p. 21.

85

Ibid.

86

Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Services, House of Representatives, 96th Congress, 2nd Session, Sexual Harassment in the Federal Government, Committee Print No. 96-11 and 96-112 (Part II).

87

Guidelines on Sexual Harassment (Guidelines on Discrimination Because of Sex), 29 Congressional Federal Record (November 10, 1980), Chapter XIV, Sec. 1604.11.

88

"EEOC Devises Rules Defining On-the-Job Sexual Harassment," Wall Street Journal, March 12, 1980.

89

Wallace, p. 14.

90

Ibid.

91

Ibid., p. 15.

92

Ibid.

93

Harlan and Weiss, p. 89.

94

Ibid. p. 88.

95

Barrett, p. 48.

96

Farley, p. 5.

97

Ibid., p. 7.

98

Ibid.

99

Wallace, p. 15.

100

Kristin A. Moore and Sandra L. Hofferth, "Women and Their Children," in Ralph E. Smith (ed.) The Subtle Revolution (Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, 1979), p. 125.

101

Wallace, p. 13.

102

Ibid., p. 14.

103

Fraker, p. 44.

104

Ibid.

105

UNESCO, p. 49.

106

Ibid., p. 50.

107

Ibid.

108

Helen Rogan, "Women Executives Feel That Men Both Aid and Hinder Their Careers," Wall Street Journal, October 29, 1984, p. 31.

109

Ibid.

110

Ibid.

111

Ibid.

112

Ibid.

113

Ibid., p. 41.

114

Ibid., p. 31.

115

Ibid.

116

Ibid.

117

"Women Get Their Chance in Media," p. 64.

118

Ibid.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

From the literature on equality in the workplace, a number of issues of concern to women in the general workforce became apparent. This study sought to determine perceptions of women employed in the advertising industry in Oklahoma about the issues of equality in the workplace. Did these women believe they received treatment comparable to their male co-workers? Were they concerned about the problems described in the literature review? Were there issues of particular concern to the advertising industry? The study attempted to measure attitudes of these women toward issues of equality in the workplace.

Selection Process

The Tulsa and Oklahoma City markets were used as a universe for the study. One hundred women employed as advertising practitioners were selected randomly from membership listings of the Tulsa and Oklahoma City chapters of the American Advertising Federation.

A cover letter describing the study and requesting participation was sent, along with a copy of the opinionnaire, to each subject. A stamped, self-addressed envelope was

enclosed to encourage return. Copies of the cover letter and the survey instrument are found in Appendixes A and B.

Method of Scoring

An opinionnaire comprising 26 items was constructed to measure the reactions of individual respondents somewhere on the agree/disagree continuum of the equality issue in question.

A five-point Likert scale was used to measure the attitudes studied. Each respondent was asked to mark the appropriate scale point which represented her degree of agreement toward equality in the workplace. An example of a scale item is:

Women in the advertising industry are currently receiving "equal pay for equal work."

Strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 Strongly Disagree

To avoid potential response bias, the numerals under scale positions, as shown above, were not included on the actual opinionnaire.

Some items were worded favorably toward equality in the workplace (i.e., men and women are treated equally concerning the particular issue in question), while some were worded unfavorably (i.e., men and women are not given equal treatment concerning the particular issue in question). The highest scale value was given to responses indicative of the most favorable attitude toward equality in the workplace, while the lowest scale value was given to responses indica-

tive of the least favorable attitude. Placement of items on the survey instrument was determined by simple random assignment.

Though not used in the measurement of the participants' attitudes, space was provided at the end of the opinionnaire to encourage any additional comments respondents wished to give.

The majority of items (17 items) was concerned with discrimination in the respondent's specific place of employment. Did they believe, for example, that in the ad agencies in which they work, women are treated equally? One section of items, comprising items 6, 7, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, and 25, concerned the industry in general. Did respondents believe, for example, that in the general advertising industry, women were treated equally?

Though there was no strict, structured categorization of items in the survey, several general categories emerged. Items 1, 3, 4, 12, 16, 19, 22, and 26 comprised various issues of job opportunity and advancement. Items 2, 5, 7, 14, 17, 20, 23, 24, and 25 comprised issues of attitudes toward women working in the ad industry in general; that is, how are they viewed and accepted by co-workers and clients in their professional capacity? Items 9, 11 and 18 comprised the social aspects of the work environment as they affected women in their professional capacity. Items 1 and 13 comprised the specific issue of equal pay. Item 6 comprised the specific issue of anti-discriminatory legislation. Item

8 comprised the specific issue of sexual harassment in the workplace. Item 10 comprised the specific issue of child-care. Item 15 comprised the specific issue of media recognition women receive for professional achievement.

Pretesting

Part II, the control portion of the opinionnaire, was pretested on 15 individuals. Reliability of the instrument was estimated by analysis of variance among respondents. This type of analysis allowed the researcher to determine how efficiently the attitude items extracted the "true" variance among respondents. This procedure enabled a powerful control of variance. By matching a respondent with herself across the 26 opinion items, the researcher had greater control over the influences of independent variables extraneous to the purpose of the survey instrument reliability test.¹ A .92 reliability coefficient indicated items measured attitudes very consistently.

Validity

According to Fred Kerlinger, validity of content of an instrument is basically judgmental.² The items of the test must be studied, each item being weighed for its presumed representativeness of the universe. This means that each item must be judged for its presumed relevance to the property being measured.³ According to Kerlinger, usually other "competent" judges should judge the content of items.⁴

The validity of the survey instrument in this study was measured by the procedure of content and logical validity before the survey questionnaire was mailed to the subjects. The original opinion statements were presented to the committee which judged that the survey instrument measured the attitude object in question.

Design

A three-factor analysis of variance with repeated measures on one factor was used to analyze the data obtained in the study. In this way the interaction of independent variables could be studied as well as the direct relationship between each independent variable and the attitudes of the respondents.

The independent variables examined in this study were:

1. Age of subjects
2. Subjects' job level
3. Workplace: each subject was measured on attitudes toward equality in the workplace on two levels:
 - a. Specific place of employment
 - b. Advertising industry in general

The dependent variable was attitude of subjects toward equality in the workplace with equality defined as the sameness in treatment and opportunities given to males and females.

ENDNOTES

1
Fred N. Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioral Research
(Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973), p. 309.

2
Ibid., p. 459.

3
Ibid.

4
Ibid.

CHAPTER IV

*

FINDINGS

Primary purpose of this study was to determine subjects' attitudes toward various issues of equality in the workplace, as well as to determine what extent age and occupational position related to subjects' attitudes.

Of the 100 surveys mailed out, 60 were returned for a rate of 60 percent. Of those 60 returned, 57 were scorable, yielding a usable return rate of 57 percent.

Respondents were categorized into groupings shown in Table II. Hereafter; the groupings will be referred to as: Young age group for 20-34, Older age group for 35 and older, Executive for account work and management, non-executive for clerical, media and creative; Lower salary for \$10,000 - \$24,999, Upper salary for \$25,000 and above; Smaller agency for gross of less than \$2.5 million, Larger agency for gross of \$2.5 million or more.

The researcher points out that the above-established dichotomies are not to be taken literally. They result from this study's data distributions and serve to facilitate the analysis and interpretation.

Though a respondent's length of time in present position was included as an attribute variable, there were not

TABLE II

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS
BY CATEGORIES

Category	Number	Percent
AGE:		
20 - 34	28	49.1
35 and above	29	50.9
TOTAL	<u>57</u>	<u>100.0</u>
OCCUPATIONAL POSITION:		
Non-Executive:		
Clerical	0	0.0
Media	7	12.3
Creative	8	14.0
SUBTOTAL	<u>15</u>	<u>26.3</u>
Executive:		
Account Work	19	33.3
Management	23	40.4
SUBTOTAL	<u>42</u>	<u>73.7</u>
TOTAL	57	100.0
LENGTH OF TIME IN POSITION:		
1 - 5 years	46	80.7
6 -10 years	9	15.7
11 -15 years	1	1.8
16 -20 years	1	1.8
20 or more years	0	0.0
TOTAL	<u>57</u>	<u>100.0</u>
SALARY:		
10,000 - 14,999	3	5.4
15,000 - 19,999	7	12.5
20,000 - 24,999	13	23.2
25,000 - 29,999	6	10.7
30,000 - 34,999	9	16.1
35,000 and above	18	32.1
TOTAL	<u>56*</u>	<u>100.0</u>
COMPANY GROSS:		
Less than \$2.5 million	20	35.7
\$2.5 million or more	36	64.3
TOTAL	<u>56*</u>	<u>100.0</u>

*NOTE: One respondent provided no income information and one respondent provided no company gross information.

enough in each group to allow analysis of data by length of time in present position (1 - 10 years, 55 or 97 percent, 11 years or more, 2 or 3 percent). Likewise, data were collected for study of salary, but were not distributed in a way which allowed for a salary variable.

Hierarchy of Opinion Items

Each of the 57 surveys was scored from a summated ratings scale with values assigned 1 to 5 to each of the five different scale positions under the attitude statements. The "1" value was always assigned to the negative end of the statement (women are not receiving equal treatment) and the "5" value was always assigned to the positive end of the statement (women are receiving equal treatment).

The mean attitude of all 57 respondents toward each of the 26 statements measuring attitudes toward equality in the workplace are shown in Table III. The statement items are rank-ordered by the highest positive attitude rating given to each item by all 57 respondents.

In reviewing Table III, items earning the most positive response were #8--Sexual harassment in the workplace (4.14 mean attitude), #2--Women mainly are given accounts for "women's" products and services (4.09 mean attitude), and #9--Business is too often conducted in social situations from which women are excluded (3.74 mean attitude).

Responses to these statements indicate that subjects believe women are treated equally in these areas; that is,

TABLE III

MEAN ATTITUDE SCORES OF ALL RESPONDENTS
ON EQUALITY IN THE WORKPLACE:
ACROSS ALL LEVELS

Item Number	Equality-in-Workplace Items	Mean Attitude
8	Sexual harassment in workplace	4.14
2	Women given accounts for "women's" products and services	4.09
9	Business conducted in social situations from which women are excluded	3.74
1	Women receive equal pay	3.53
15	Equal media recognition for promotion	3.49
13	Women seen as working for "pocket money"	3.47
12	More women acceptable in top positions	3.42
5	Respect given by male clients to professional skills of female ad practitioners	3.29
10	Maternity benefits	3.28
22	Career-ladder jobs given to men	3.23
19	"Men's jobs" and "women's jobs"	3.21
25	Acceptance of women's professional views	3.21
17	Acceptance of female supervisors	3.14
3	Too few women in upper management	3.10
4	Being male or female makes no difference in career advancement	3.09
16	Women are not promoted to executive positions	3.09

TABLE III (Continued)

Item Number	Equality-in-Workplace Items	Mean Attitude
14	Capable women viewed as threat	3.07
11	Good ole boy system works against women	3.03
6	Anti-discriminatory laws are effective	3.02
24	Women are not judged on appearance more than men are	2.92
21	Opportunity for career advancement	2.85
23	Assertive women seen as aggressive	2.77
7	Respect given to female ad practitioners by international clients	2.77
26	Women n t seen as permanent employees	2.70
18	Acceptance of women's time spent in business social functions	2.52
20	Women too often given entertainment responsibilities	2.28
Mean Total Attitude		3.17

there is little (if any) sexual harassment in the subject's workplace. Women are not mainly given accounts for women's products and services, and business is not often conducted in social situations which exclude women.

Items receiving the most negative response were #18-- Family and friends are more accepting of the time a man spends participating in business social functions after work than of the time a woman spends in these functions (2.52 mean attitude), #20--Women too often are given entertainment responsibilities in advertising because they are natural hostesses (2.28 mean attitude). This response would indicate that subjects believe women and men are not treated equally in these areas; that is, time spent in business social functions is more acceptable for men than for women, and women too often are given entertainment responsibilities.

Total mean attitude for the 26 items was 3.17, indicating a somewhat neutral position. Over-all, respondents gave a more positive response toward questions concerning their specific place of employment than toward questions concerning the advertising industry in general. It should be noted that, in Table III, questions concerning a subject's specific place of employment generally ranked higher than those concerning the advertising industry in general.

To aid further in interpretation of Table III, the mean attitude of all 57 respondents toward equality in the workplace was subdivided into the two levels: 1) attitude toward equality in the advertising industry in general, and

2) attitude toward equality in the subject's specific place of employment. Mean attitudes of all 57 respondents by levels of measurement are shown in Tables IV and V.

In reviewing these tables, attitudes of respondents can be viewed by each level of measurement and allow for differentiation between attitudes toward the advertising industry in general, and the subject's specific place of employment.

Attitude Toward Equality in the Advertising Industry in General

No items in this level of measurement received a clear-cut positive response, as shown in Table IV. The item receiving the highest mean attitude was #15--Media recognition for promotions and professional achievement within the ad industry--seems to be about equal for men and women (3.49 mean attitude).

The item with the strongest negative response was #20 - Women are too often given entertainment responsibilities - (mean attitude of 2.28). Other attitude scores ranged from 2.52 to 3.21. Overall, mean attitude toward equality in the advertising industry in general was 2.88.

Attitude Toward Equality in Subject's Specific Place of Employment

Three items in this level received clearly positive responses. Item #8--Sexual harassment in the workplace--received the highest (4.14) mean attitude, as shown in Table V.

TABLE IV
 MEAN ATTITUDE SCORES OF ALL RESPONDENTS
 ON EQUALITY IN THE WORKPLACE BY LEVELS

Item Number	General Ad Industry Items	Mean Attitude
15	Equal media recognition for promotion	3.49
25	Acceptance of women's professional views	3.21
16	Women are not promoted to executive positions	3.09
6	Anti-discriminatory laws are effective	3.02
21	Opportunity for career advancement	2.85
7	Respect given to female ad practitioners by international clients	2.77
26	Women not seen as permanent employees	2.70
18	Acceptance of women's time spent in business social functions	2.52
20	Women too often given entertainment responsibilities	2.28
Mean Total: General Industry		2.88

Item #2--Women are mostly given accounts having to do with "women's" products and services--received a mean attitude of 4.09, and #9--Business is too often conducted in

TABLE V

MEAN ATTITUDE SCORES OF ALL RESPONDENTS
ON EQUALITY IN THE WORKPLACE BY LEVELS

Item Number	Specific Place of Employment Items	Mean Attitude
8	Sexual harassment in the workplace	4.14
2	Women Given accounts for "women's" products and services	4.09
9	Business conducted in social situations from which women are excluded	3.74
1	Women receive equal pay	3.53
13	Women seen working for "pocket money"	3.47
12	Women accepted in top positions	3.42
5	Respect given by male clients to professional skills of female ad practitioners	3.29
10	Maternity benefits	3.28
22	Career-ladder jobs given to men	3.23
19	"Men's jobs" and "women's jobs"	3.21
17	Acceptance of female supervisors	3.14
3	Too few women in upper management	3.10
4	Being male or female makes no difference in career advancement	3.09
14	Capable women viewed as threat	3.07
11	Good ole boy system works against women	3.03
24	Women are not judged on appearance more than men are	2.92
23	Assertive women seen as aggressive	2.77
Mean Total: Specific Workplace		3.14

social situations from which women are excluded - received a mean attitude of 3.74.

The statement in this level receiving the most negative response was #23--Assertive women are often seen as aggressive while assertive men are often seen as competent--(mean attitude of 2.77). The remaining 13 items in this level received mean attitude scores ranging from 2.92 to 3.53. mean attitude toward equality in the subject's specific place of employment was 3.14.

Analysis of Variance Among Variables

A three-factor analysis with repeated measures on one factor determined any significance between, and interaction of, types of respondents and levels of workplace equality.

The variance analysis addressed the following questions:

1. Did younger respondents register significantly different attitude levels than did older respondents?
2. Did respondents holding executive positions differ significantly in attitude levels from those in nonexecutive positions?
3. Did respondents regard one level of workplace as "more equal" than another?
4. Was Age related to Level of Workplace in respondents' perception of equality?
5. Was Age related to Job Level in respondents' perceptions of equality?
6. Was Level of Workplace related to Job Level in

respondents; perceptions of equality?

Findings related to each of these questions are addressed below:

Age-by-Levels of Workplace

The researcher tallied the attitudes of subjects by age (20 -34 and 35 and up). Did the age groups hold different attitudes toward equality in the workplace?

As shown in Table VI, mean attitudes for women 20 - 34 and 35 and over were 3.31 and 2.81, respectively. There was a significant difference indicated by the F-ratio, and this difference explained 20 percent of the total variation in attitudes. This difference indicates a difference as large as that between the mean attitudes of older and younger women toward equality in the workplace would occur by chance less than one time in 100.

TABLE VI

MEAN ATTITUDES TOWARD EQUALITY IN TWO LEVELS
OF THE WORKPLACE: BY AGE

Age	Levels of Equality		Mean Totals
	Industry in General	Specific Place of Employment	
20 - 34	3.09	3.53	3.31
35 and above	2.67	2.95	2.81
Mean Totals	2.88	3.24	3.08

Younger respondents perceived a significantly higher level of equality than did older respondents, when industry levels were disregarded ($F = 25.17$, $df = 1/53$, $p < .01$). At the same time, attitudes varied according to level of workplace: specific or advertising industry in general ($F = 16.11$, $df = 1/53$, $p < .01$). The mean attitude toward equality in the specific workplace was significantly more positive than the mean attitude toward equality in the advertising industry over-all (3.24 v. 2.88). The mean difference of .36 explained 22 percent of the total variation in attitudes.

Age and Level of Workplace worked independently to "affect" attitudes toward equality. Put another way, the more positive attitudes shown by the younger women in Table V held for references to both the specific workplace and the advertising industry in general. In turn, the more positive attitude toward the specific workplace was registered by both age groups.

Job Level-by-Level of Workplace

Job Level (executive or nonexecutive), itself, was not significantly related to mean attitudes toward equality ($F = .03$, $df = 1/53$, $p > .05$).

In the analysis of attitude scores (Table VII), no significant mean attitudinal difference was found between the women holding executive positions (3.09) and those holding nonexecutive positions (3.03).

This held true for statements concerning a respondent's

specific workplace (3.33 v. 3.15) and the advertising industry in general (2.86 v. 2.90).

*
TABLE VII

MEAN ATTITUDES TOWARD EQUALITY:
BY LEVELS OF JOB AND WORKPLACE

<u>Level of Workplace</u>	<u>Job Level</u>		Mean Totals
	Executive	Nonexecutive	
Industry in General	2.86	2.90	2.88
Specific Workplace	3.33	3.15	3.24
Mean Totals	3.09	3.03	3.06

Job Level-by-Age

Job level did not operate independently of age, as it did with level of workplace. Results of the analysis indicated a differential attitude pattern due to interaction (Table VII).

Mean attitude toward equality in the workplace was 3.16 among younger women holding executive positions, 3.46 for younger women holding nonexecutive positions, 3.03 for older women holding executive positions, and 2.59 for younger women holding nonexecutive positions. Significant differences were

indicated by the Age-by-Job Level ($F = 5.38, p < .05$).

TABLE VIII

MEAN ATTITUDES TOWARD EQUALITY:
BY AGE AND JOB LEVEL

<u>Age</u>	<u>Job Level</u>		Mean Totals
	Executive	Nonexecutive	
20 - 34	3.16	3.46	3.31
35 - up	3.03	2.59	2.81
Mean Totals	3.09	3.03	3.06

Whether respondent held executive-level job made no difference in perceived equality in the case of younger respondents. Younger executives registered a mean perception of 3.16 compared to 3.46 by younger nonexecutives.

Job level made a difference among older respondents, in that older nonexecutives perceived significantly less equality than did older executives (2.59 v. 3.03, critical difference = .45, $df = 53$). This "less equal" treatment was perceived in both the specific workplace and in the industry in general.

An eta correlation ratio showed six percent of the

total variance in attitude toward equality was explained by interaction of Age and Job Level.

Summary

Overall, the respondents indicated there was somewhat less discrimination in their specific workplace than in the advertising industry in general. Items concerning the general advertising industry tended to rank the lowest in mean attitudes toward equality (12.88)--lower than the mean attitude of statements concerning the subject's specific place of employment (3.14).

A subsequent analysis of variance reinforced the statistical significance of this finding in that statements concerning subjects' specific place of employment received significantly higher mean scores than those statements concerning the advertising industry in general.

There were several items in the study which received positive mean responses, indicating that subjects believe there is equal treatment in these areas. Item # 8--addressing sexual harassment in the workplace--received the highest mean attitude (4.14) indicating that respondents, in general, believe there is little sexual harassment in their place of employment. Items #2, #9, and #1 also received positive mean attitude scores.

Items receiving the lowest mean attitude scores, indicating negative response (i.e., women are not receiving equal treatment) included #20--Women too often are given enter-

tainment responsibilities (2.28)--, #18--Family and friends are more accepting of the time a man spends in business social functions than of the time spent by women in these functions. The remaining attitude scores ranged from 3.49 to 2.70

In an analysis of variance, age was a significant factor in explaining differences in respondents' mean attitudes. Younger respondents perceived more equality in the workplace than did older respondents, both in the specific workplace and in the advertising industry in general. This supports the hypothesis stating older women perceive more discrimination in the work force than younger women.

Job Level in itself (when Age and Industry Levels are disregarded) did not affect significantly mean attitude scores. Through interaction of Job Level and Age, however, Job Level was found to be a significant variable among older respondents in that older nonexecutives perceived significantly less equality than did older executives. But among younger respondents, Job Level was not related to attitudes toward equality.

Level of Workplace was related to mean attitude, in that respondents, over-all, perceived significantly higher equality of treatment in their own agencies than in the industry in general. Interaction between Level of Workplace and Age, between Level of Workplace and Job, and between Levels of Workplace and Job and Age indicated no significant differences in mean attitude scores.

In summary, Age and Levels of Workplace, as two major independent variables, made a difference in respondents' mean perception of equality. Job Level was related to attitude among older respondents, but not among the younger. Older nonexecutives saw less equality than older executives. Nearly half the total variation in attitudes was explained by these main effects and interaction.

At the conclusion of each opinionnaire, space was provided for any additional comments respondents wished to express. A number of respondents used this portion to give additional information. These comments provided insight into the particular work situations of the women.

A number of women stated the main reason they saw little discrimination against women in their specific places of employment was due to the large percentage of female employees (including many in management) in their workplace. Several stated that, due to the number of women in their place of employment discrimination against women was greatly reduced. Some stated they did not believe this to be typical of the entire advertising industry, however. One woman stated, "I'm in a very unusual company where there is a woman president and virtually no discrimination. I do not believe this is the case throughout the entire industry."

Many women expressed some incidences of sex discrimination in their careers. One stated that in the three years she has been employed at the company where she works, there have been no female managers in any capacity. Another spoke

of an experience in which, after leaving her job, her male successor was offered more than double the salary (and additional benefits) she received for precisely the same job. She added that she believes sex discrimination is still evident in the advertising industry.

Several women indicated that, while the majority of clients treated them with due professional respect, there were some male clients who did not respect the professional capabilities of female advertising practitioners. Another stated that, while the dedication and hard work of the female employees in her place of employment generally receives much respect and appreciation, there will always be a handful of male clients who consider the female staff as secretaries and will work only with male staff members.

Summarization of the comments received in the opinionnaires indicates that many women expressed the belief that they were receiving equal treatment on the job, but they believe this may not be the case throughout the advertising industry. They also expressed belief in the importance of respect based upon the professional capabilities of each employee, whether male or female. As one respondent said: "Each person should be judged only by creativity, respect of co-workers and the aggressive duties that make each one stand alone."

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This study had two main objectives:

1) To determine the attitudes of women employed in the advertising industry in Oklahoma toward equality in the workplace.

2) To determine to what extent three factors--Age, Level of Workplace, Job Level--were related to attitudes of respondents concerning equality in the workplace.

One hypothesis contended that women who were older would perceive more discrimination than women who were younger. Another hypothesis contended that women who held positions in account work and management would perceive more discrimination than women employed in clerical, media and creative positions.

The population sampled was women employed as advertising practitioners in the Tulsa and Oklahoma City markets. One hundred opinionnaires with 26 attitude statements were distributed and 60 were returned. Of the 60 surveys returned, 57 were scorable.

A three-factor analysis of variance with repeated measures on one factor was used to test for significance of mean

attitudinal differences between levels of each variable, as well as interaction between variables. Attitude toward equality was measured on two Levels of the Workplace:

- (1) In the advertising industry in general
- (2) In the respondent's specific place of employment.

In reviewing and ranking attitude scores across all 57 respondents, several factors were apparent. The mean attitude toward all 26 items by the 57 respondents was 3.17, indicating a neutral or varied response to the attitude statements.

In general, items concerning the advertising industry in general ranked lower than items concerning the respondent's specific place of employment. Although over-all means of the majority of items were in the neutral range, several items received clear-cut positive or negative responses. Items #8 (Mean: 4.14), #2 (4.09) and #9 (3.74) had mean attitude scores indicating clearly positive response. Subjects indicated that women receive equal treatment in the areas addressed by these statements. Items #18 and #20, with mean attitude scores of 2.52 and 2.28, respectively, were the lowest ranked among the 26 attitude statements. These scores indicate a negative response; that is, subjects generally believed women were not treated equally in the areas addressed by these items.

An analysis of variance of the subjects' mean attitudes indicated significant differences in attitude toward equality in the workplace when the subject's age was considered. Findings indicate subjects 35 and older perceived less equal-

ity in the workplace than did women 34 years and younger. This supports the hypothesis that older women would perceive more discrimination in the workplace than would younger women.

Job Level was not found to be significant in itself. Mean attitudes of respondents holding executive positions did not differ significantly from those of respondents in nonexecutive positions. Thus, the hypothesis stating women in executive positions would perceive more discrimination than women in nonexecutive positions was not supported in the main.

Job Level did not make a difference when combined with Age. Whether respondent had an executive-level job made no difference in perceived equality in the case of younger respondents, but did make a difference among older respondents, in that older nonexecutives perceived significantly less equality than did older executives.

There was a significant difference in attitudes concerning Levels of Workplace. Respondents, over-all, perceived significantly higher equality of treatment in their own place of employment than in the advertising industry in general.

No statistically significant effects were found when interactions between Age and Industry Levels, and between Job Levels and Industry Levels were tested. There also were no significant effects in attitudes when interaction of Age, Job Level, and Industry Level were tested.

Conclusions

In drawing any conclusion from this study, it is important to remember the study encompassed a very small universe. The following conclusions can serve only as indicators for future research. Caution must be taken to avoid projection of results to populations outside of that researched in this particular study.

Responses to items in this study seemed to be more issue-oriented rather than of pointing out whether men and women receive equal treatment in general in the workplace. While basic issues of equal pay, sexual harassment and job opportunity generally received more positive scores, issues involving attitudes toward women (once in the profession) tended to receive more negative attitude scores.

The author contends that perhaps this is a result of initial gains made by women in the workforce. Women now may be receiving pay more comparable to that of men and may now have more opportunity to hold positions and advance in careers. The concern may now be expanding to attitudes toward women once they do become successful in the industry. Acceptance of the professional capabilities of female advertising practitioners by co-workers and clients seems to be a concern expressed by subjects in the study.

It also was interesting to note that many women gave statements about equality in their specific place of employment higher scores than were given to statements about equality in the advertising industry in general. Several subjects

commented that while they believed women receive equal treatment in their workplace, they did not believe their situation was typical of the advertising industry as a whole.

It was encouraging to note the various occupations, ages and income levels held by women in the study. Occupational positions and income levels seemed well distributed, with many subjects (23) holding management positions and many (27) earning \$30,000 or more a year.

In the universe used in this particular study, there appeared to be a much larger percentage of women holding management and higher salary positions than in studies discussed in the literature review concerning the status of women in media.

As stated in the study's introduction, there has been very little research on women in advertising. Hopefully, this study provides needed information in this area and may serve as a basis for further study.

Recommendations

Much research has been conducted on the status of women in business and even in certain areas of the communications industry. More information is needed, however, on women employed in the advertising industry. It is hoped this study will provide further information in this area and will serve as a springboard for future research. Possible additional research would include studies using expanded sample: including and comparing geographical areas outside Oklahoma,

studies analyzing attitudes and job status of women in related areas of communications (such as public relations), and continuing comparative studies to measure improvement of women's job status in advertising over a period of time.

Increasing number of women are receiving degrees and are pursuing careers in advertising. Opportunities for women in this field have increased steadily in the past decade and should continue to expand in the future. It is important, however, to realize there are still issues of concern to women in the industry.

It is crucial that research and information on the status of women in areas of business continue to develop. Women's progress, including that in the advertising industry, must continue to be monitored.

It is hoped this study offers information on the current status of women in advertising and will encourage additional, continuing research.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Babcock, Barbara Allen, Anne E. Freedman, Eleonor Holmes Norton and Susan C. Ross. "State Labor Laws and the BFOQ." Sex Discrimination and the Law. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1975.
- Bardwick, Judith M. In Transition. Holt, Rinehart, Winston, 1979.
- Barrett, Nancy S. "Women in the Job Market: Occupations, Earnings, and Career Opportunities." The Subtle Revolution. Ed. Ralph E. Smith. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, 1979.
- Becker, Gary S. The Economics of Discrimination. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957.
- Bergmann, Barbara. "Occupational Segregation, Wages and Profits When Employers Discriminate by Race or Sex." Eastern Economic Journal. April/July 1974, pp. 103-110.
- Bodec, Ben. "Why So Few Women at the Top?" Marketing and Media Decisions. Vol. XVII, No. 4, April 1982, p. 70.
- "EEOC Devises Rules Defining On-the-Job Sexual Harassment." Wall Street Journal. March 12, 1980.
- Farley, Lin. Power Play: Workplace and Campus. "Conference Report: Stop Sexual Harassment in the Workplace." Eds. Patricia Stover and Yvonne Gillies. Ann Arbor: Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, University of Michigan/Wayne State University, 1979.
- Fraker, Susan. "Why Women Aren't Getting to the Top." Fortune. Vol. CIX, No. 8, April 16, 1984, p. 40.
- "Guidelines on Sexual Harassment (Guidelines on Discrimination Because of Sex). 29 Congressional Record (Nov. 10, 1980), Chapter XIV, Sec. 1604.11.
- Harlan, Anne and Carol L. Weiss. "Sex Differences in Factors Affecting Managerial Career Advancement." Women in the Workplace. Ed. Phyllis A. Wallace. Boston: Auburn House Publishing Company, 1982.

- Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973.
- Lynch, Edith M. The Executive Suite: Feminine Style. New York: American Management Associations, Inc., 1973.
- Malveaux, Julianne M. "Moving Forward, Standing Still: Women in White Collar Jobs." Women in the Workplace. Ed. Phyllis A. Wallace. Boston: Auburn House Publishing Company, 1982.
- Mandell, Maurice I. Advertising. Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1980.
- Manpower Data Resource Service. Professional Women and Minorities. Scientific Manpower Commission, 1982.
- Moore, Kristin A. and Sandra L. Hofferth. "Women and Their Children." The Subtle Revolution. Ed. Ralph E. Smith. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, 1979.
- Oklahoma Statutes 1981, Vol. II. St. Paul: West Publishing Company, 1981.
- Rogan, Helen. "Women Executives Feel That Men Both Aid and Hinder Their Careers." Wall Street Journal, October 29, 1984.
- Sears-Bugeja, Diane. "The Status of Women in Journalism: A Trend Analysis of Women in Editor and Publisher in the Years 1962, 1963, 1964, 1972, 1973, 1974." Unpublished Pilot Study.
- Smith, Ralph E. The Subtle Revolution. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, 1979.
- Stover, Patricia and Yvonne Gillies (Eds.) Conference Report: Stop Sexual Harassment in the Workplace. Ann Arbor: Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, University of Michigan/Wayne State University.
- Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Services, House of Representatives, 196th Congress, 2nd Session. Sexual Harassment in the Federal Government. Committee Print No. 96-11 and 96-112, Part II.
- UNESCO. Women in the Media. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 1980.
- Wallace, Phyllis A. Women in the Workplace. Boston: Auburn House Publishing Company, 1982.
- "Women Get Their Chance in Media." Media Decisions, Vol. VIII, August 1978, p. 64.

Women in Communications, Inc., Oklahoma City Chapter.
"1983 Job/Salary Survey." Journalism Research Center,
University of Oklahoma, 1984.

Yohalem, Alice M. The Careers of Professional Women. New
York: Allanheld, Osmun and Company and by Universal
Books, 1979.

Yankelovich, Daniel. "Angry Workers, Happy Grads." Psychology Today. December 1974, pp. 81-87.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

COVER LETTER

Because of your position in the advertising industry in Oklahoma, you have been selected to participate in a study of attitudes of women in the advertising profession. The opinionnaire will take only 10 minutes of your time. I greatly appreciate your participation.

Following is a list of 26 opinions regarding equality in teh workplace. Notice that there are five blanks under each opinion statement, like so:

Strongly Agree Strongly Disagree

Reading from left to right, your anser choices are:

<u>Strongly</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly</u>
Agree		Opinion		Disagree

Please check the blank that best describes how much you agree with each opinion. Please go through the items as quickly as possible, and register your first reaction. Also, please make a selection for each and every statement. A postage-paid envelope is included for return of your completed opinionnaire.

Thank you for your participation in this study. The results will be available for your perusal in July 1985. If you are interested in the results of this study, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Beverly S. Bailey
Journalism/Broadcasting
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma

APPENDIX B

ATTITUDE SURVEY

1. In this agency, women mostly are given the accounts having to do with "women's" products and services.
Strongly Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree
2. For the most part, in this agency, women are currently receiving "equal pay for equal work."
Strongly Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree
3. In this agency, too few women hold upper management positions.
Strongly Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree
4. In this agency, male clients often do not give due respect to the professional skills of female ad practitioners.
Strongly Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree
5. In this agency, being male or female makes no difference in career advancement.
Strongly Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree
6. Federal and state anti-discriminatory laws have been very effective in bringing about equality in the workplace, including the ad industry.
Strongly Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree
7. With the increasing international business conducted by advertising agencies, female ad practitioners often have trouble gaining professional respect from international clients.
Strongly Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree
8. I see very little, if any, conduct that I would consider sexual harassment in this agency.
Strongly Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree
9. In this agency, business is conducted too often in social situations from which women are excluded.
Strongly Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree

10. This agency provides good maternity benefits.
Strongly Agree ___ . ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree
11. The male buddy system, sometimes called the "good ole boy network," often works against women here as they try to advance their careers.
Strongly Agree ___ * ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree
12. More and more women are acceptable in top positions in this agency.
Strongly Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree
13. In this agency it is often thought that women work only for extra pocket money and don't have to support families like men do.
Strongly Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree
14. In this agency, capable women are often viewed as a threat by male co-workers.
Strongly Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree
15. Women too often are given entertainment responsibilities (organizing parties, business dinners, etc.) in advertising because of the perceptions that they are "natural hostesses."
Strongly Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree
16. Women too often are not promoted to deserved executive positions based in the belief that agency clients prefer working with male executives.
Strongly Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree
17. Most men in this agency are very accepting of female supervisors.
Strongly Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree
18. Family and friends are often more accepting of the time a man spends participating in business social functions after work than of the time a woman spends participating in these functions.
Strongly Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree
19. There is no such thing as "men's jobs" and "women's jobs." in this agency.
Strongly Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree

20. Media recognition for promotions and professional achievement within the ad industry seems to be about equal for men and women.

Strongly Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree

21. In the advertising industry, women, for the most part, receive the same opportunities for career advancement that men do.

Strongly Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree

22. In this agency, "career-ladder" jobs often are restricted to male turf while women's jobs often offer fewer opportunities for advancement.

Strongly Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree

23. In this agency, assertive women often are seen as aggressive, while assertive men often are seen as competent.

Strongly Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree

24. In this agency, women are not judged on the basis of appearance to any greater degree than men are.

Strongly Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree

25. The professional views and ideas of women in the ad industry generally are accepted and respected as much as those of men.

Strongly Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree

26. A big stumbling block for women in the ad industry job market is the view that they will not be as permanent as male employees.

Strongly Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree

If you have any additional comments, please use space below:

The following information is asked only for classification purposes:

Age:

<input type="checkbox"/> 20 - 24	<input type="checkbox"/> 45 - 54
<input type="checkbox"/> 25 - 34	<input type="checkbox"/> 55 - 64
<input type="checkbox"/> 35 - 44	<input type="checkbox"/> 65 or above

Which one of the following best describes your position in the agency?

<input type="checkbox"/> Clerical	<input type="checkbox"/> Account Work
<input type="checkbox"/> Media	<input type="checkbox"/> Management
<input type="checkbox"/> Creative	

How long have you held your present position?

<input type="checkbox"/> 1 - 5 years	<input type="checkbox"/> 16 - 20 years
<input type="checkbox"/> 6 - 10 years	<input type="checkbox"/> 20 years or above
<input type="checkbox"/> 11 - 15 years	

What is your present salary?

<input type="checkbox"/> \$10,000 - \$14,999	<input type="checkbox"/> \$25,000 - \$29,999
<input type="checkbox"/> \$15,000 - \$19,999	<input type="checkbox"/> \$30,000 or above
<input type="checkbox"/> \$20,000 - \$24,000	

Approximately how much does your agency gross each year?

<input type="checkbox"/> Less than \$2.5 million	<input type="checkbox"/> \$2.5 million or more
--	--

Next copy
VITA 1

Beverly Suzanna Bailey

Candidate for the Degree of
Master of Science

Thesis: ATTITUDES OF OKLAHOMA WOMEN IN ADVERTISING
CONCERNING EQUALITY IN THE WORKPLACE

Major Field: Mass Communications

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Cincinnati, Ohio, January 21,
1960, the daughter of Robert B. and Marjorie A.
Bailey.

Education: Graduated from Memorial High School, Tulsa,
Oklahoma in May 1978; received Bachelor of Arts
degree from University of Tulsa, Tulsa, Oklaho-
ma, in May 1982; completed requirements for
Master of Science degree from Oklahoma State
University, Stillwater, Oklahoma in July 1985.

Professional Experience: Corporate Communications
Intern, Philbrook Art Center, 1982; Public
Affairs Intern, Oklahoma Natural Gas Company,
1982; Lab Instructor and Teaching Assistant,
Oklahoma State University, 1982-1985.