**Summaries (to report in LaTeX)**

**The Global Gender Gap Report 2017**

**Global Gender Gap Index** = framework for capturing the magnitude of gender-based disparities and tracking their progress over time. It benchmarks national gender gaps on economic, education, health and political criteria, and provides country rankings that allow for effective comparisons across regions and income groups. 3 underlying concepts:

* The Index focuses on measuring gaps rather than levels.
* The Index captures gaps in outcome variables rather than gaps in input variables.
* The Index ranks countries according to gender equality rather than women’s empowerment.

4 categories (subindexes): Economic Participation and Opportunity, Educational Attainment, Health and Survival, Political Empowerment.

* Current stagnation of progress towards closing the economic gender gap. Reasons:
* Global labour force participation has been in decline globally for both men and women, but this decline has been particularly accentuated for women.
* Earned incomes of both men and women have been increasing, but this upward trend has been steeper for men than for women.
* Women’s share among senior positions both in the public sector and in business is not trending towards equal representation.
* Under-use of the ever-increasing numbers of educated women because of discrepancies in caregiving and unpaid work, institutional and policy inertia, outdated organizational structures and discrimination, but also skills differentials in the types of degrees women and men seek out in their education.
* In a lot of countries, a variety of social circumstances limit women’s access to technology and therefore their ability to gain proficiency in its use. When women do have the relevant mathematical and technology skills, unconscious biases can influence their peers’ recognition of their capabilities.
* Imbalances in the specific fields of study in which men and women tend to specialize. Women are underrepresented in the Engineering, Manufacturing and Construction as well as Information, Communication and Technology fields.
* Tendency towards lower pay for occupations that have historically developed as predominantly female. When women enter a profession in large numbers, the pay-related benefits of participating in the profession depreciate.
* Female leadership representation remains below 50% in all industries, often significantly so, and every industry exhibits a leadership gender gap.
* Unconscious biases and systemic efforts focused on driving change at the industry or country level through public-private collaboration remain scarce.

U.S. → rank 49 / 144, score: 0.718 (1 = parity).

Political Empowerment: 0.124, Economic participation and opportunity: 0.776.

**Gender and sex inequalities: Implications and resistance**

Considerations related to the gender gap, as depicted in *The Global Gender Gap Report 2017* → 4 categories:

* **Economic Participation and Opportunity**

Women more likely than men to be living at or below poverty. Reasons:

* Across the globe, many women remain economically dependent on men.
* Women more likely to be unemployed or to work in positions in which they don’t get paid.
* Women more likely than men to be concentrated in industries and occupations with low wages, long hours, and no social protections, and less likely than men to hold management positions.
* Women in general earn only 82% compared to White men. Gender wage gap further complicated when race/ethnicity is considered; Asian women earn 93%, Hispanic women earn 62% and Black women 68% compared to White men. *Industry segregation* responsible for 50% of the gap seen today.
* **Education**

Women are concentrated in traditionally female and lower paying CTE (Career and Technical Education) programs in both secondary and postsecondary educational settings, and are still underrepresented in science, technology, engineering and math (STEM) programs. Gender stereotypes and bias in education and the potentially hostile climate of academic departments continue to deter women from these lucrative career opportunities.

* **Health and Survival**
* Poor access to information, early marriage, lack of decision-making power continues to increase women and girls’ exposure to sexually transmitted diseases, unwanted pregnancies and the risk of unsafe abortions.
* Women constantly bombarded with media advertisements that sexualize their bodies, and media images of extremely thin models with impossibly perfect hair and skin. The influence of media, television, movies, etc. has led to increased prevalence of body dissatisfaction and eating disorders globally.
* Violence toward women continues to impact women’s health worldwide, and make it difficult for women to pursue educational opportunities or to perform their jobs.
* **Political Empowerment**

Across the globe, women hold a minority of political and institutional decision-making positions. Gender norms and prejudices work to both reduce the number of female candidates and contribute to the obstacles faced by women in elections.

**Gender inequality and bargaining in the U.S. labor market**

Empirical research on the causes of the persistent earnings gap between women and men often takes the form of statistical models that control for as many variables as possible—race, ethnicity, education, labor force experience, job tenure, hours of work, occupation, industry—but ignore any measures of bargaining power other than unionization. However, control variables cannot be explained purely as the result of individual choices. Rather, they reflect structural inequalities related to **unequal bargaining power**.

**Bargaining** often characterizes situations where two parties, whether individuals or groups, see potential gains from cooperation but disagree over how those gains should be shared.

Most women do put in fewer hours of employment than men. They are more likely to be employed part time and much less likely to put in more than 40 hours per week.

STEREOTYPES - In the U.S. women who move into better paying but stereotypically masculine occupations often face sexual harassment and disapproval. When wives earn more than husbands, both spouses slightly tilt their reported earnings to conform to gender stereotypes, overstating the relative size of husbands’ earning.

PAY PENALTIES - Many women self-select into traditionally female occupations because they consider these more compatible with the demands of family care. But while they may be aware that these jobs pay less than traditionally male jobs, they don’t choose the size of the resulting pay penalties. In the U.S., the percentage of women in an occupation is inversely related to its average pay, even controlling for human capital characteristics.

MOTHERS DISCRIMINATION - Across all occupations, many women experience wage penalties as a result of becoming mothers. Discrimination against mothers is based on rather subtle cues, such as participation in a parent-teacher organization listed on a job resume, because employers may well assume that mothers of young children face other demands on their time that lower their performance in paid employment.

MOBILITY - Women’s labor supply is less elastic than men’s because women’s mobility between jobs is limited by obligations of family care. Employers can easily take advantage of this difference, engaging in what might be termed “strategic discrimination.” That is, they pay women less than men not because they prefer hiring men but because they recognize that women are more likely to accept lower wages.

OCCUPATIONAL SEGREGATION - High levels of occupational segregation were—and remain today—the largest immediate cause of gender inequality in earnings. Efforts to improve the relative pay of primarily female jobs met powerful criticism based on the assumption that occupational pay was largely determined by occupational “value added” or productivity. Finally, the supply of women’s labor to the market was treated merely as the result of individual choices, with little attention to the constraints imposed by a traditionally male-oriented organization of work, school, housework, and childcare.

INFORMATION ASYMMETRIES - Employers are often able to use their control over information to lower women’s wages relative to men’, because not all the workers are covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act, and others remain unaware of their rights. Furthermore, employers in most states have the right to ask job applicants what they earned in their previous jobs, information that allows them to accurately assess individual fallback positions and minimize their salary offers. For this reason, women’s entrance into previously male-dominated occupations tends to lower the average occupational wage. This “devaluation,” is at least partially driven by the fact that women start out in lower-paying occupations, which lowers their bargaining power. Employers don’t need to ask a specific salary question to know that the average female worker earns less than her average male counterpart, and to adjust wage offers accordingly.

“EQUAL VALUE” PRINCIPLE - Whatever a worker is paid represents his or her value added. Therefore, men earn more than women because men contribute more to society BUT many female-dominated services have a public good dimension—their social value exceeds their private value. The work of caring for others creates value that is difficult to capture through the market because it has positive spillover effects and involves emotional engagement, teamwork, and person-specific skills. Women’s tendency to devote more hours to unpaid care work than do men is interpreted because of feminine preferences rather than as the result of institutional pressure to ensure a generous supply of female effort to activities such as family care that cannot be rewarded by market forces.

PAID WORK/FAMILY WORK CONSTRAINTS - Responsibility for the care of family, friends, and neighbors weighs more heavily on women than men, not because women necessarily prefer this arrangement but because men often have sufficient bargaining power to minimize demands on their time. Women labeled as uncaring are typically stigmatized. Employers use this social norm to justify lower pay offers to women.

In conclusion, social institutions solidify differences in collective bargaining power, making institutional change difficult to achieve.

**Introducing the Historical Gender Equality Index**

Because gender inequality is a multifaceted concept, measuring it is often done using multiple indicators. To compare the overall performance of countries in achieving gender equality, a measure is needed that combines these indicators into a composite index. Plus, since gender inequality is strictly related to the human history, historical measures are needed to understand how it is determined and evaluate progress → **Historical Gender Equality Index (HGEI)**.

4 requirements:

* Coverage (limited for indicators, but indicators should cover as many dimensions of gender equality as possible).
* Availability of data for many countries.
* Simplicity in calculation and understanding.
* It should allow comparisons between countries but also over time.

The aim of the index is to provide a global overview of gender equality in the long run, as well as to give an indication of gender disparities in well-being outcomes that result from institutional, cultural, and social influences.

4 dimensions: Health (sex ratio, life expectancy ratio), Autonomy within the household (marriage age ratio), Political power (parliament seats ratio), Socioeconomic status (average years schooling ratio, labor force participation ratio).

By focusing on ratios rather than levels, we evaluate the position of women relative to men in each society rather than the actual levels of resources and opportunities available to women. This allows both for comparisons between countries, as well as a notion of an ideal level of equality.

Shortcomings:

* The index does not capture how women are doing in absolute terms, but only relative to men.
* Composite indicators calculated on the macro level (countries or states).
* The index cannot show if there are cases where women are outperforming men.
* The index cannot provide a full overview of gender disparities in all the dimensions captured by other composite indices.

The resulting index reveals that most regions and countries of the world made progress toward gender equality over the past fifty years. However, while there has been much progress, there is little convergence between countries.

**Statistical Discrimination and the Rationalization of Stereotypes**

**Statistical discrimination**: employers have imperfect information about the future productivity of job candidates, which gives them an incentive to use easily observable ascriptive characteristics, such as race or gender, to infer the expected productivity of applicants. In this model, discrimination does not arise from animus or antipathy toward members of a group; rather, it is portrayed as a rational solution to an information problem. Rather than merely explaining discrimination—statistical discrimination theory helps rationalize and justify discriminatory decisions.

**Taste-based model**: unlike statistical discrimination theory, which taps into the culturally valued discourse of instrumental rationality and frames discrimination as a logical solution to an information problem, the taste-based model is about negative attitudes, such as overt racial prejudice and sexism, that tend to be publicly disavowed and are often perceived as socially unacceptable.

Status beliefs and stereotypes about demographic groups subtly but powerfully shape how employers evaluate workers and how they distribute rewards among them. When employers treat ascriptive group membership as a proxy for the likely quality of workers, bias easily creeps into their evaluations because their perceptions of different groups reflect cultural beliefs that are often inaccurate and resistant to change, even in the face of disconfirming evidence. It is not simply that some employers engage in intentional discrimination; rather, it is that the very definitions of competence and worth that employers use are shaped by broader societal forces and are biased against certain groups. These employers may decline to hire members of certain groups or, if they do hire them, they may offer them lower wages for identical productivity.

Statistical discrimination theory is likely to have some resonance and normative acceptability, at least in Western cultural contexts, for 3 reasons:

* The theory emphasizes that statistical discrimination is a rational, profit-maximizing,

incentive-driven decision, “efficient” and “profit maximizing” and represents “the optimal solution to an information extraction problem”.

* Some economists characterize the practice as fair and morally defensible, by implying that categorical differences are rooted in statistical considerations that rational employers consider, and by suggesting that statistical discrimination is fair and neutral because it treats people with the same expected productivity identically.
* Economists often emphasize that it is ubiquitous and practically inevitable in many domains of life.

Thus, the use of stereotypes is depicted as cognitively and economically useful as well as consistent with social norms, in the sense that “everyone is doing it.” Exposure to the idea of statistical discrimination strengthen people’s belief in the validity, usefulness, and acceptability of relying on stereotypes and hence increase their likelihood of engaging in discrimination because of ascriptive group characteristics. When employers feel confident that their decisions are impartial, rational, and ethically defensible, they feel more justified in relying on stereotypes and exert less effort to suppress their biases. Statistical discrimination may also become self-fulfilling if it leads members of negatively stereotyped groups to believe that investing in their skills will not be fully rewarded.

Participants exposed to statistical discrimination theory (without a critical commentary) perceived stereotyping as more acceptable and stereotypes as more accurate than did participants in the control groups, and selected fewer women for their teams in the hiring simulation. Group representation is also impacting on decisions, since male participants and those who did not identify as either male or female were, on average, less convinced of the acceptability and accuracy of stereotypes than were male respondents. Likewise, Black respondents expressed less agreement with these items than did White participants.

**The Institutional Environment: Implications for Race and Gender Inequality in the U.S. Labor Market**

Local and national institutional environments influence race and gender inequality in job level and pay, and the economic opportunities of the individuals in these organizations.

Organizations compete not just for resources and customers, but for political power and institutional legitimacy, for social as well as economic fitness. An important factor to consider is the force of public opinion: when new definitions or practices become legitimated and accepted, organizations are under considerable pressure to incorporate them.

Hypotheses:

* Within industries, the higher the proportion of workers employed in states with high support for equality, the lower the levels of race and gender inequality in jobs and earnings.
* The higher the proportion of federal public sector employees in an industry, the lower the levels of race and gender inequality in jobs and earnings.

Measures:

* Independent variables
  + Local institutional environment
  + National institutional environment
* Dependent variables
  + Quality of employment
  + Earnings inequality
* Control variables
  + Industrial structure
  + Human capital inequality
  + Employment inequality

Results:

* **Effects of the institutional environment on quality of employment.** The local institutional environment affects race and gender inequality in the quality of employment. Greater support for equality in the local institutional environment is associated with lower levels of inequality in quality of employment among minority race/gender groups. Greater federal public sector employment in an industry is strongly associated with less inequality in quality of employment for all minority race/gender groups.
* **Effects of the institutional environment on earnings.** The greater the support for equality in the local institutional environment, the better the earnings position of each minority race/gender group relative to White men. The level of federal public sector employment in an industry is positively associated with the earnings position of all minority race/gender groups relative to White men.

→ The local (state) and national institutional environments affect race and gender inequality.