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**Module Eight questions**

1. **Do you think there will ever be equal employment in the workforce?**

Today the current makeup of the labour force is 52 percent male and 48 percent female (Jalilvand, 2000). Women are represented almost equally with men in the workforce. When it comes to low and mid-level management positions women and men are also represented almost evenly. This is not the case with top management positions and women also make less per dollar than men for the same positions and responsibilities.

Honestly I do not think there will ever be equal employment in the workforce in the near future because of the following reasons.

Usually the people promoted to the highest levels deal with some aspect of overseeing profits and losses for the company or bring revenue into the organization. The pool of management typically comes from management in the areas of finance, sales, or production. Managers in those key areas reach the high level positions, whereas women manage areas such as human resources and administration, which do not follow a path to the top positions within an organization (Federal Glass Ceiling Commission, 1995)

Another reason is attributed to the education and work environment women seek. Women often look for jobs that have normal hours, good working conditions, and safety. Men without a college education enter occupations such as firefighting, truck driving, and construction which are highly male occupations but also highly dangerous. Women without a college education enter female occupations such as being a secretary, cashier, and child caretaker. The men in essence earn more due to the hazardous nature of the work environment, “of the deaths that occur in the workplace, 92% occur to men” (Farrell, 2005 p. 29).

We also see a disparity in the areas of education women and men pursue as well as the education level. Women tend to choose their field of study in the arts and social sciences more than men. Women also pursue their area of interest over an area that will lead to a stable high paying career. For example, women earned 71 percent of the doctorates in psychology, 52 percent in the life sciences but only 18 percent in engineering (Jancsurak, 2008).

Also women earn less and do not get what they want is because women are raised to believe that nice girls don’t ask. Women often earn less and do not get what they want for the simple reason of not speaking up or negotiating. According to Linda Babcock and Sara Laschever, they state about women “their perception that their circumstances are more fixed and less negotiable than they really are. This highlights the assumption made by many woman that someone or something else is in control” (Babcock & Laschever, 2003, p. 12). Babcock conducted a survey study, where respondents rated each question on a seven point scale on the

degree to which they either agreed or disagreed with each statement. Respondents’ answered questions such as “there are many things available to people, if only people ask for them.” The results are aligned with what could be expected. Women were 45% more likely to score lower than men on the scale. Thus showing how men know the importance of asking for what they want. Overall men just ask for what they want with greater frequency than women (Babcock & Laschever, 2003, p. 20).

To further examine how men and women differ and put that into relation to why men typically earn more, we can look at the locus of control research that has been done. This research measures the extent to which individuals believe that their behavior influences their circumstances. The results again coincide with a plausible reason women earn less. The scores of the women are significantly higher on locus of control scales than those for men. To interpret what this means in the real world, women are more likely to believe that their circumstances are controlled by others (Babcock & Laschever, 2003, p. 23).

In many ways the lives of women have and continue to be controlled by others. Little girls are often raised differently than little boys. Little girls are protected and watched over more than boys. Even the types of choirs done differ with gender. Girls do indoor activities such as cleaning and cooking and boys do outside chores such as yard work and construction. Girls are taught to wait for a boy to call, to wait to be asked on a date, to dance, and to get married. In addition, women lose their name after marriage. For much of the 1900s women were in many ways at the hands of men. The father was in control of the daughter until she was married, at which time the control was transferred to the husband. Some of this has changed but much of it has not and explains some of the gender pay gap. Women have been raised to wait for someone else and not to directly ask for anything.

“Men are thought to be assertive, dominate, decisive, ambitious, and self-oriented, whereas women are thought to be warm, passive, nurturing, emotional, and friendly. These are gender stereotypes” (Babcock & Laschever, 2003, p. 62). The difference in gender characteristics can be explained in part from biological factors. Women had the ability to have children and were physically weaker than men due to their smaller bodies, which lead to working in the home. Men on the other hand were larger and more capable to build, hunt, and protect their families. Women were viewed as the weaker sex. This continued for hundreds if not thousands of years and as science and technology eased the pressure of gender roles, we as a culture have them ingrained in our society.

This can be seen today with the different jobs and degrees men and women seek and pursue. “As recently as 2001, 98 percent of child care workers, 82 percent of elementary school teachers, 91 percent of nurses, 99 percent of secretaries, and 70 percent of social workers in the United States were women. In the same year 87.5 percent of the corporate officers of the 500 largest companies, 90 percent of all engineers, 98 percent of all construction workers, and 70 percent of all financial managers were men.” We have carried over our biological roles into our current culture and society. The traditional women roles have a tendency to pay less than the traditional male roles, which leads to women earning less (Babcock & Laschever, 2003, p. 65).

1. **Do you think there is a correlation between how women are treated in society and how women are treated in the workforce?**

I thinks there is a correlation between how women are treated in society and how women are treated in the workforce. One reason women earn less and do not get what they want is because women are raised to believe that nice girls don’t ask. Women often earn less and do not get what they want for the simple reason of not speaking up or negotiating. According to Linda Babcock and Sara Laschever, they state about women “their perception that their circumstances are more fixed and less negotiable than they really are. This highlights the assumption made by many woman that someone or something else is in control” (Babcock & Laschever, 2003, p. 12). Babcock conducted a survey study, where respondents rated each question on a seven point scale on the

degree to which they either agreed or disagreed with each statement. Respondents’ answered questions such as “there are many things available to people, if only people ask for them.” The results are aligned with what could be expected. Women were 45% more likely to score lower than men on the scale. Thus showing how men know the importance of asking for what they want. Overall men just ask for what they want with greater frequency than women (Babcock & Laschever, 2003, p. 20).

In many ways the lives of women have and continue to be controlled by others. Little girls are often raised differently than little boys. Little girls are protected and watched over more than boys. Even the types of choirs done differ with gender. Girls do indoor activities such as cleaning and cooking and boys do outside chores such as yard work and construction. Girls are taught to wait for a boy to call, to wait to be asked on a date, to dance, and to get married. In addition, women lose their name after marriage. For much of the 1900s women were in many ways at the hands of men. The father was in control of the daughter until she was married, at which time the control was transferred to the husband. Some of this has changed but much of it has not and explains some of the gender pay gap. Women have been raised to wait for someone else and not to directly ask for anything.

In the workforce women use the feminine style of management and they use a feeling approach when making decisions. This means the feeling types “prefers making decisions based on subjective values, allowing emotion, sympathy, and the desire for harmony to enter in the equation” (Mueller, 2007). The masculine style of management uses a thinking approach when making decisions. The thinking approach “prefers logic, objective values, principles, laws, and standards in making a decision” (Mueller, 2007). Research shows that more men prefer the masculine thinking approach, were more women prefer the feminine approach of feeling when making decisions. Self-employed people who use the feminine approach earn less because often emotion can come into play when making a decision, which leads to making an empathetic decision usually not in the favor of increased profits and the bottom line. This leads to the conclusion that “self-employed professionals who are highly empathetic in their dealing with clients will achieve a lower level of income than self-employed professionals who are less empathetic” (Mueller, 2007).

Often men earn more than women and on average obtain 97% of the key executive positions such as CEO, let us discuss what women can do. Knowledge is power, and knowing why men earn more will enable women to play in the same sand box if they choose to do so. Women can start to get what they want now by simply realizing that the world is not fair. Just because someone works hard and plays by the rules does not mean the superiors will notice and offer them a fast track to the top position. Women need to speak up and start asking. Throw out the stereotypical mindset that nice girls don’t ask. People who get what they want ask for it.

1. **What recommendations do you have for women in the workforce?**

There are at least three different explanations for why women are treated as second-class citizens in the workforce. The first reason is that women are not as competitive as men. Thus, women need to become more competitive in the workforce. Beckman and Menkhoff (2008) explain that women are more risk averse, tend to be less confident, and are not as competitive (p. 379). The second explanation is that women do not negotiate as well as men. Babcock (2008) explains that men are more aggressive when negotiating resources, training, and other significant factors (p. 1). Thus, women need to develop their negotiating skills. The final explanation is that women lack self-confidence in the workforce.

The recommendation I would give for women in the workforce are; women need to develop their self-confidence. The aforementioned skills that are needed can be developed by majoring in Business Administration because the curricula in most business programs teach the value of competitiveness, the art of negotiation, and the importance of self-confidence when conducting business.

Corporations need to recognize the differences in males and females and use it to the betterment of the organization. Women also need to understand the differences and continue working to equality in pay and benefits, while realizing the reasons males often earn more.

1. **Do you think there will be a new glass ceiling in the future? If so, who will it impact?**

The term “glass ceiling” refers to an artificial barrier based on attitudes or bias that prevents qualified women from advancing into mid-level and senior-level management positions. In other words, women can advance so far, but hit an invisible barrier and can advance no farther. If you feel that you have been discriminated against based on a “glass ceiling” at your company, you may bring a claim under Title VII or state or local anti-discrimination laws.

I do not think there will be a new glass ceiling in future because of the following reason.

Employers can and should take some or all of the following steps to eliminate the glass ceiling from their companies.

* Make sure that nondiscriminatory practices and requirements are used.
* Examine subjective or neutral criteria to ensure that they do not have a disproportionate impact on women.
* Set up workforce diversity programs to eliminate disadvantages and create a work environment where all employees feel comfortable.
* Make sure to hire employees based on true qualifications, not stereotypical ideas of a candidate's qualifications.
* Monitor and ensure the development of female employees.
* Establish network and mentoring programs to help train and inform employees of opportunities for promotion.
* Require all job postings to state promotion criteria and affirm the employer's commitment to diversity in management.

1. **What can employers do to help women in the workforce?**

Employers can help women in the work force in the following ways. Through offering flexibility: Often flexible work schedules can be a myth. True flexibility means that the employees have the freedom to set their own goals and adjust their schedules around other needs in their life, such as childcare, school pick-ups, urgent hospital appointments and so on. This way the employees feel valued, in control and are more productive. It creates a positive workplace culture, where the company places more emphasis on productivity and performance rather than hours spent at the desk

Encourage Female Role Models: Companies and organizations that actively encourage, nurture and foster women in leadership roles also encourage more women into their workforce. Research has shown that diversity is good for business. Creating a truly gender diverse and inclusive workplace is a leadership issue. It has to be a key component in the company's policies and mission statements and demonstrated through actions. Manage Bias: It has been reported that women face more bias, both explicit as well as implicit hidden bias from both men and women. Unconscious bias is a result of ingrained cultural conditioning where women are not considered as valuable to the workforce, and they are seen as not very committed to the job or the organization because of family responsibilities and conflicts. Women might not be as forthcoming in expressing their discontent and their expectations from the employers as they are socially conditioned to undervalue themselves. Women demand less often because they do not want to create a fuss, they want to be seen as an asset and prove their worth. When a community is under-represented, they have more expectations and responsibility to prove themselves. It has also been shown that women tend to face more workplace bullying and undergo much more stress and anxiety in the workplace. Actively encouraging an open dialogue and discussion in the workplace around bias and bullying will support more women be employed and retained.

Understanding that families and childcare is not just a 'woman issue' but a societal issue is very important. Companies can create their own policy documents that actively supports childcare and provides suitable alternatives to that offered by the government. A healthy policy with equal maternity and paternity leave allows all parents to make personalized decisions around childcare which can support mothers returning back to work after childbirth. Ultimately, it is up to the company to encourage and promote a gender diverse workforce, acknowledge the unique challenges that women face and facilitate support networks that help women at all levels an equal opportunity in the workplace. Most importantly, it is about acknowledging the skills and expertise that women bring to the workplace, and demonstrating an active commitment to giving women a voice and allowing it to be heard.

Make equal pay a priority. The first step is to undertake a pay gap analysis in order to identify the extent of the problem. Employers should consider opportunities to help close and avoid these gaps, including by potentially allocating a pool of funds to make the necessary adjustments, as Energy Australia has done, and addressing new ways to negotiate salaries and set wages. Also, employers must consider the economic security of women over the long-term, and consider following the lead of organizations like HSBC and Viva Energy Australia in paying superannuation during parental leave.

Champion women’s career progression. Women continue to be less likely to progress into managerial positions compared to their male colleagues. Many companies have seen success through setting targets for women in leadership positions, although such success will again depend on the buy-in for programs from those already in power. Linking targets to performance reviews and even bonuses would help. Another meaningful way a company can support women’s career development is through a sponsorship program (a more holistic version of mentoring).Put simply, sponsorship programs can help women overcome career barriers by pairing them with a senior manager who is well-placed to vouch for them to receive suitable promotions and opportunities. An analysis of 93 (women and men) participants in one program, found that most experienced greater visibility and development opportunities through their involvement with a sponsor.

Address unconscious bias. One of the most difficult challenges for companies is to address workplace culture that has been shaped by unconscious bias, in which policies and practices are skewed in favour of hiring and promoting men. Unconscious bias is one of the biggest factors limiting a woman’s career potential, and sadly, it’s endemic in most industries. In fact, 76% of respondents to a global online research study by Harvard University agreed ‘men were better suited for careers and women better suited as homemakers’.

A common psychological experiment undertaken at leadership workshops asks participants to draw an ‘effective leader’ — and the results almost always depict a man. Another study found people had a different response to an identical resume depending on if the job applicant was a man or woman.

Company-wide training programs help staff to recognize their own implicit bias so they can make fairer decisions and introduce better company policies. US and Canadian Starbucks employees underwent training after an incident in which two African-American men were arrested for using a Starbucks bathroom which was ‘reserved for paying customers’ while waiting for a business associate.

Companies like Unilever are more proactive in their approach, incorporating sophisticated technology into the recruitment process which eliminates unconscious bias from hiring decisions.

Extend more family-friendly policies to male employees. As long as women are considered the primary caregivers of children, we will never achieve gender equality in the workplace. Men typically only have access to two weeks paid paternity leave under the Dad and Partner scheme (and just a small proportion actually access this government entitlement). This lack of time off impacts a man’s ability to raise his family, and similarly impacts a woman’s ability to return to work and progress in her career.

1. **Do you support affirmative action? Explain why.**

Affirmative action is a way to ensure that diversity is obtained and maintained in schools and in the workplace. In so doing it also helps create tolerant communities because it exposes people to a variety of cultures and ideas that are different from their own.

I partly support affirmative action because it helps disadvantaged people who come from areas of the country where there are not very many opportunities be able to advance where they otherwise could not. In other words, it gives everyone an equal playing field. Affirmative action will help compensate for the fact that, due to many years of oppression, some races "started late in the race." Again, it helps level the playing field.

The past discrimination against certain minority groups does not justify present discrimination against non-minorities. All people are equal under the laws and should be treated accordingly.

On the other hand I would disagree with affirmative action because, it destroys the idea of a meritocracy and instead puts race as the dominant factor in admissions and hiring procedures. The best people for the position should be put there, regardless of race.

Secondly workers who are put into a position through affirmative action often are not fully ready for the task. Not only is this not good for the company, but it is also not good for these workers as well because it lowers self-esteem.

Affirmative action reinforces stereotypes and racism because of the previous point. People given a position purely because of affirmative action often are not qualified, and the idea that all people of that race must be "stupid" is perpetuated. Also, it presupposes that all people of the same skin color are from the lower class, and therefore need help. This also reinforces stereotypes and even embeds them permanently into the system.

Simply having people of different races or ethnicities in the workplace/university does not necessarily mean diversity of opinion. People with the same skin color are not necessarily the same in opinion or even culture.

1. **How is the Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act different from the Civil Rights Act of 1991?**

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 is one of the most influential laws affecting employment in the United States. The Civil Rights Act of 1991 amended some of its provisions. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 is one of the great pieces of 20th century legislation. The Act prohibits discrimination based upon race, color, sex, religion, and natural origin in public forums. These are often referred to as protected classes. Its scope is broad and applies to not only employment but also education, housing, public accommodation, and programs that receive federal assistance.

Title VII of the Act, relates to employment. Title VII generally applies to private sector employers who employ at least 15 employees and state and local government agencies employing at least 15 employees.

Title VII is one of the most important laws that an HR professional needs to know because it regulates pretty much every type of employment action in the employee-employer relationship.

When you are in the process of hiring a new group of production workers. Title VII prohibits one from discriminating against job applicants based upon their race, color, sex, religion, or national origin. We cannot use any of these characteristics as a hiring criteria. During interviews, you are not permitted to ask questions about an applicant's race, color, religion, or national origin. You also can't give different rates of pay or types or quality of benefits based on these protected classes.

There is an important exception to this rule. If the characteristic is a bona fide job qualification, then normally prohibited criteria can be used. For example, a synagogue that wants to hire a Rabbi can require that the person hired be a member of the Jewish faith, because Jewish religious faith is a necessary qualification for the job.

For example a supervisor seeking permission to terminate an employee has approached you. You should ask him why he wants to fire the employee. The supervisor tells you that that customers just don't want to deal with Middle Eastern Muslims. He doesn't have a problem with the employee, but customers feel uncomfortable around him. You tells the supervisor that firing an employee because of his race or religion is absolutely a violation of Title VII and this is the case even if the problem is with the customer not wanting to deal with an employee. Title VII, Beth explains, doesn't let an employer discriminate just because its customers want to do so.

After a series of United States Supreme Court decisions viewed as hurting victims of employment discrimination, Congress enacted the Civil Rights Act of 1991 that amended not only Title VII, but also the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, and the Civil Rights Act of 1866. Let's take a look at some of the key changes. The 1991 Act extended coverage of Title VII to U.S. citizens that work abroad for U.S. companies as well as for Senate employees.

The 1991 Act changed the requirements necessary for an employee to establish discrimination through what is known as a disparate impact. A disparate impact case is where the plaintiff establishes that an apparently neutral employment policy, practice, or procedure adversely impacts the members of a protected class - for example, requiring a certain level of science education for engineers or technicians. While the policy may be neutral in its intent, it may have a bigger impact on minorities who may not pursue engineering degrees in as large numbers as white middle class males. The existence of a disparate impact doesn't necessarily mean an employer is liable for it as we will see below.

1. **Do you think that some women are not hired for upper level management positions because a female may become pregnant and may take a significant amount of time off which may hurt the organization? Do you agree with this notion?**

Only fewer women are hired for upper level management position because primarily women take time off after having a child and being the primary caretaker of the children and home. This leads to lapses in employment. Often when they reenter the workplace they are essentially starting over. Furthermore, women on average retire earlier than men. This points out that not only do women have less continuity in the workforce they also have less years in the workforce compared to their male counterparts and helps explain why they earn less than men (Gayle, Golan, & Miller, 2008).

It can also be pointed out that women work more part time positions than men. The Bureau of Labor Statistics for 2007 shows that 59.3 percent of all women and 73.2 percent of all men were in the labor force. 75 percent of employed women worked full time and 24 percent worked part time. 89.5 percent of employed men worked full time and 10.5 percent worked part time. Women also were two-thirds of all part time workers. It can be concluded that all of this has an impact on women earning less compared to men. It is also interesting to point out that according to the Bureau, women in their forties who are not in the labor force mostly are taking care of the family at 58% giving that as their reason for non-participation in the workplace and 29 percent stating retirement (United States Department of Labor, 2007).

Men get promoted quicker than women because they are more willing to relocate and it is more acceptable to move the family for the husband’s job. Men also have the ability to work longer hours since the wife takes on the primary caretaking of the children and home. The man’s contribution to the family is more often than not a financial contribution. Men have it easier when it comes to the work life balance. Men have a wife but women do not. The Department of Labor conducted and recently released the finding of a survey. The findings showed “that the average working women spends almost twice as much time as a working man on household chores and care of the children and that 78% of women and 85% of men are in the workplace. Men and women are equally likely to work on the weekends and take work home in the evenings” (Skoloda, 2005). When it comes to men and women in high level executive positions the majority of men are married with children but on the other side over half of the women are single and do not have any children (Elmuti, Lehman, Harmon, & Lu, 2003).

To further examine how men and women differ and put that into relation to why men typically earn more, we can look at the locus of control research that has been done. This research measures the extent to which individuals believe that their behavior influences their circumstances. The results again coincide with a plausible reason women earn less. The scores of the women are significantly higher on locus of control scales than those for men. To interpret what this means in the real world, women are more likely to believe that their circumstances are controlled by others (Babcock & Laschever, 2003, p. 23).

In many ways the lives of women have and continue to be controlled by others. Little girls are often raised differently than little boys. Little girls are protected and watched over more than boys. Even the types of choirs done differ with gender. Girls do indoor activities such as cleaning and cooking and boys do outside chores such as yard work and construction. Girls are taught to wait for a boy to call, to wait to be asked on a date, to dance, and to get married. In addition, women lose their name after marriage. For much of the 1900s women were in many ways at the hands of men. The father was in control of the daughter until she was married, at which time the control was transferred to the husband. Some of this has changed but much of it has not and explains some of the gender pay gap. Women have been raised to wait for someone else and not to directly ask for anything.

“Men are thought to be assertive, dominate, decisive, ambitious, and self-oriented, whereas women are thought to be warm, passive, nurturing, emotional, and friendly. These are gender stereotypes” (Babcock & Laschever, 2003, p. 62). The difference in gender characteristics can be explained in part from biological factors. Women had the ability to have children and were physically weaker than men due to their smaller bodies, which lead to working in the home. Men on the other hand were larger and more capable to build, hunt, and protect their families. Women were viewed as the weaker sex. This continued for hundreds if not thousands of years and as science and technology eased the pressure of gender roles, we as a culture have them ingrained in our society.

This can be seen today with the different jobs and degrees men and women seek and pursue. “As recently as 2001, 98 percent of child care workers, 82 percent of elementary school teachers, 91 percent of nurses, 99 percent of secretaries, and 70 percent of social workers in the United States were women. In the same year 87.5 percent of the corporate officers of the 500 largest companies, 90 percent of all engineers, 98 percent of all construction workers, and 70 percent of all financial managers were men.” We have carried over our biological roles into our current culture and society. The traditional women roles have a tendency to pay less than the traditional male roles, which leads to women earning less (Babcock & Laschever, 2003, p. 65).

1. **What other law suits can you think of regarding unequal pay and benefits for women?**

*How an informal survey led to a lawsuit. August 15, 2018*. This lawsuit filed captures the frustration of multiple women who tried to climb the corporate ladder at Nike, which employs more than 67,000 workers in the United States and around the globe.

“At Nike, the numbers tell a story of a company where women are devalued and demeaned. For many women at Nike, the company hierarchy is an unclimbable pyramid — the more senior the job title, the smaller the percentage of women. The inequity for women at Nike starts before they do, with decisions about starting pay,” they wrote in their complaint. One plaintiff, Kelly Cahill, is a former brand marketing director, who said she was paid $20,000 less than the salary of a male colleague who did the same work. Cahill left the company in 2017 to work for Adidas after filing several internal complaints. Another plaintiff, Sarah Johnston, worked as a business systems analyst at the company for six years, and said her career suffered after she rebuffed sexual advances from a male co-worker. Johnston quit in 2016 after filing multiple internal complaints.

In their complaint, the women question the company’s ability to police itself and reform its practices. They pointed out that the former head of human resources sent an email to employees in 2017 saying that the company was going to review potential pay disparities between men and women at the company.

“About one month later, Mr. Ayre, Nike’s HR Chief sent another companywide email stating that Nike had reviewed whether there was gender discrimination, that any issues that had been identified were corrected, and that there were no remaining gender discrimination issues. Absent from Mr. Ayre’s email was any data or other support for his assertions that there were no remaining gender discrimination issues,” the plaintiffs wrote in their complaint.

The lawsuit does not give details about specific pay disparities across the company, but it cites the informal survey of female employees as evidence that it remains a problem.

They also point out that women and people of color remain vastly underrepresented in the company’s top ranks, with women in only 29 percent of the company’s VP positions across the globe.

Nike lawsuit goes farther than similar claims against Google and Uber, where women have filed similar class-action lawsuits against these America’s most successful companies whose cases are still pending. They want to take their case to a jury. The challenges women described at Nike are hardly unique. The lawsuit against Nike seeks goes beyond others in its demands. Like the others, it demands that the company compensate women financially for reportedly harming their careers, and to stop the illegal practice of paying women less than men for doing similar work.

The plaintiffs in the Nike case want something even more specific. They want the court to force Nike “to develop and institute reliable, validated, and job-related standards for evaluating performance, determining pay, and making promotion decisions.” They also want a court-appointed monitor to make sure Nike complies with the plan, and they want Nike to offer back jobs to the women who left because of the alleged discrimination.

This kind of multipronged demand is known as a “structural reform mandate,” and it could involve a variety of reforms, such as making sure hiring managers don’t ask job candidates about their salary history (one culprit in perpetuating the gender pay gap), or it could involve implementing a leadership mentoring program for women at the company. These kinds of mandates are rare, but research shows they are far more effective in addressing workplace inequality than monetary damages alone.

Similarly a 2017 study by sociologists at Indiana University and the University of British Columbia analyzed the outcome of 500 major workplace discrimination lawsuits filed in federal court between 1996 and 2008. They found that court-mandated bias training and educational efforts were the least effective in addressing inequality. The most effective were the type of structural mandates listed in the Nike lawsuit: specific plans to promote the recruitment, hiring, and advancement of women or people of color who work at a company, together with a monitoring plan to make sure the company meets their goals.

*“In short, specificity and oversight are key ... and prove successful in increasing managerial diversity in the wake of litigation,”*

None of this means it will be easy for women to hold Nike accountable if the company did violate the law. The federal courts are hostile to workplace discrimination lawsuits. And the federal courts have generally held a narrow view of what jobs can be analyzed for illegal pay gaps under the Equal Pay Act, though a recent court ruling in California broadened the Ninth Circuit’s interpretation of the law in favor of employees. The Nike is not concluded, but if the Nike lawsuit is successful, the demand for structural reform at the company could become a model for other workers who want an equal opportunity to succeed.

1. **Should hiring be based exclusively on merit? Justify your thoughts.**

I belief that hiring should be based on merit in order to promote equality between men and women. This can be enforced by all organization by having a planned recruitment and selection policy which is a statement of principles, outlining how your organization should conduct its recruitment and selection process. The aim of such a policy is to ensure that a transparent and unbiased recruitment and selection process is followed. The one that results in the appointment of the best candidate, based solely on merit and best-fit with your organizational values, philosophy, and goals. Good reasons for having such a policy are to ensure that:

* Job descriptions meet business requirements;
* Candidates are assessed against consistent selection criteria at every stage;
* The recruitment process is lawful;
* The candidate can be confident it is a genuine job offer; and
* The process can be followed by all stakeholders.

This merit system is the process of promoting and hiring government employees based on their ability to perform a job, rather than on their political connections. Smart business owners make hiring top talent a priority. After all, a company's productivity and profitability depend on the quality of its workers. When reviewing candidates, consider a mix of factors, including credentials, work experience, personality and skills.

The education background of your potential employee is important. Check for a degree or completion of classes that complement your business. For example, if you own a heating and air conditioning company, you would want employees who have a certification in HVAC. Some of the positions for which you advertise might not require any advanced education, but the possession of a high school diploma or GED demonstrates the ability and work contributed by the individual to complete an educational program.

Work experience might be one of the most important considerations you have for particular jobs at your facility. Experience in particular areas such as answering busy telephone lines or handling accounts, for example, can be essential for specific staff roles. For other positions, work experience might not be absolutely necessary, but a strong work background is always a good thing as it exemplifies a good work ethic.

An applicant who approaches you with a confident attitude makes a good first impression. This is also probably the way this person will approach your clients. An applicant who exudes self-confidence believes in herself. She will believe she can handle the job and exceed expectations.

Self-belief is important for facing and succeeding in challenges. Your workplace will benefit from the hiring of individuals who are confident they can learn and perform as needed.

Warmth and smiles indicate the type of employee who will work well with others, including your clientele. Personality is one of the most important traits of a customer-oriented employee. Of course, an amenable person is one who will also work well with you and your staff. Talk with the applicant at length to get an idea of his natural characteristics. Introduce him to others in your workplace to judge how well he responds to different types of individuals. You want a people person but not a people pleaser to the point he sacrifices honesty.

The specific skills set of potential employees is a critical factor that can often determine who you hire. For instance, if you own a handyman service, you want people who can handle carpentry jobs. Likewise, if you own a nail salon, your employees will need to be able to give manicures. In addition to specific necessities, a variety of skills are desirable. The potential employee who has experience with a variety of computer programs, can type and key by touch and knows how to balance the books is a great resource. The University of Oregon recommends giving tests in essential skills your employee will need. For example, you might want to have evidence as to the applicant's word processing prowess.
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