

GENDERED CUES IN JOB ADVERTISING:  
PERPETUATING OCCUPATIONAL  
SEGREGATION

by

STEPHANIE MASTROMORO

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of  
The University of Texas at Arlington in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements  
for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT ARLINGTON

December 2013

Copyright © by Stephanie Mastromoro 2013

All Rights Reserved

### Acknowledgements

I am grateful for the University of Texas at Arlington, for providing a quality graduate program in which I developed my love for Sociology.

Several individuals provided support throughout the development of this thesis. Specifically, my committee members, Dr. Beth Ann Shelton, Dr. Ben Agger, and Dr. Heather Jacobson, were beyond instrumental in guiding me throughout the process of developing my research question, designing and executing my research model, and providing unique insight into my findings. I am grateful for their assistance and unfailing support as I worked on this project.

Finally, I am also thankful for my family who consistently encouraged me to keep challenging myself throughout the research process and supported my interest in graduate school.

October 02, 2013

Abstract

GENDERED CUES IN JOB ADVERTISING:  
PERPETUATING OCCUPATIONAL  
SEGREGATION

Stephanie Mastromoro, M.A.

The University of Texas at Arlington, 2013

Supervising Professor: Beth Anne Shelton

Current approaches within literature inadequately explain the presence and persistence of occupational sex segregation. In addition, little research empirically examines allocation methods as a key contributor to this phenomenon. I consider the role that allocation methods, such as job recruitment and advertisement, play in maintaining occupational sex segregation. Specifically, I examine the gendered nature of language used within job advertisements and how this acts as a filter for job applicants. The literature review outlines material concerning occupational segregation, gendered language, and gender cues in job ads. I reveal gaps in this literature in order to solidify the need for more research prior to explaining the methodology and findings of my study. Ultimately, identifying the gendered language in formal job advertisements contributes to a neglected topic within gender stratification literature. Through this process I evaluate the relationship between gendered job advertising and occupational sex segregation.

## Table of Contents

Acknowledgements .....	iii
Abstract .....	ivv
List of Tables.....	vii
Chapter 1 Introduction to the Topic .....	1
Chapter 2 Literature Review .....	3
Occupational Segregation.....	3
Job Recruitment.....	7
Gender Cues in Job Ads .....	9
Gaps in the Literature .....	11
Segregation Prior to Job Search.....	12
Chapter 3 Goals of Current Research.....	14
Chapter 4 Methodology.....	15
Chapter 5 Findings and Discussion .....	18
Quantitative Overview.....	18
Statement of Equal Opportunity Employment.....	20
Education and Gendered Words .....	20
Masculine and Feminine Wording across Occupations .....	22
Discussion.....	23
Qualitative Themes.....	24
Flexibility.....	25
Benefits.....	26
Employee Recognition.....	28
Desirable Employee.....	30
Summary and Future Research.....	31

Chapter 6 Conclusion .....	34
Appendix A Coded Masculine and Feminine Words .....	36
Appendix B Sum of Masculine and Feminine Words Found .....	38
References .....	40
Biographical Information .....	46

List of Tables

Table 5-1 Most Frequently Used Masculine and Feminine Words .....	19
Table 5-2 All Job Ads and Statement of EEOC .....	20
Table 5-3 Median Number of Coded Words by Minimum Level of Education Required .....	21
Table 5-4 Total Coded Words Across Engineer and Registered Nurse Ads .....	22

## Chapter 1

### Introduction to the Topic

Occupational segregation is a well-studied phenomenon; however, no existing explanation completely accounts for how gendered job-allocation methods may perpetuate labor force segregation. For purposes of this study, occupational segregation is important because it is an “extensive...and enduring” aspect of labor markets (Anker 1997:315; Kmec 2008).

Occupational sex segregation is problematic because it perpetuates various forms of gender inequality, such as the pay gap, the glass ceiling and elevator, as well as traditional expectations of male and female gender roles, between men and women (e.g. England, Allison, and Wu 2007; Marini 1989; Maume 2004; Ridgeway 1997). Inequality stemming from occupational segregation also has long term consequences for society. Not only are men and women disadvantaged as individuals, but society, as a whole, suffers because the labor force may not be operating as efficiently as it could be, were it more diverse. While occupational segregation can certainly be maintained through methods beyond job allocation, recruiting is one of the first hurdles for applicants to overcome potential stereotype and discrimination.

The presence of gendered linguistic cues within job advertisements is understudied, although there is research establishing how language reflects gender. In her study of male and female language differences, Haas (1979) found that feminized speech is more emotional, nonassertive, and supportive due to the use of euphemisms and other politeness forms. Male speech, on the other hand, is typically more assertive and includes more commands (Haas 1979). Similarly, types of speech, such as assertive or nonassertive, are often viewed differently based on the gender of the speaker (Carli 1990). Research has also explored how language can associate gender with occupations, such as law enforcement (Liben et al. 2002). For example, policeman and waitress vs. police officer and server are examples of how occupational titles use language to convey a gender bias. Language is gendered because it can be associated with either sex, be



viewed as either masculine or feminine, and is still frequently used to associate gender with specific occupations.

Stereotypical masculine or feminine language is widely accepted, used, and embedded within a society's structure, thus it often goes unnoticed or corrected (Gaucher, Friesen and Kay 2011). Despite a lack of current research, the study of gender cues in job advertising is important, especially in light of continued occupational sex segregation and our failure to fully understand what maintains it. I empirically examine formal job advertisements and explore the gendered nature of the language used within them. Gendered language in job ads may be functioning as a subtle cue that helps generate undesirable outcomes such as occupational sex segregation. This avenue requires further exploration and I begin to lay a foundation which argues for the relevance and necessity of this research.

## Chapter 2

### Literature Review

#### Occupational Segregation

Occupational sex segregation is defined consistently in the research literature as the separation of men and women into different occupations (Anker 1997; Kmec 2005; Williams 1989). Historically, the index of dissimilarity has rarely shown any significant drop in the level of occupational segregation and, although men and women are less segregated at work than in the past, many men and women still work in either male or female dominated occupations (Reskin 1993:247). Some explanations examine outcomes of occupational segregation; however, I review approaches that focus on occupational segregation itself rather than consequences, such as the pay gap (e.g. England, Allison, and Wu 2007; Marini 1989), which are beyond the scope of this review.

Some research suggests that occupational segregation exists due to worker choices. These arguments advocate that men and women's primary orientations are different and assume that workers perpetuate occupational segregation (Anker 1997; Okamoto and England 1999; Reskin 1993). In other words, men and women prefer, choose, or "self-select" (Kmec 2005:322) to work in different occupations. These "rational" decisions lead men and women to acquire different amounts and types of human capital (marketable commodities such as education, training, and experience). Historically, this meant that women might choose occupations which allowed them to remain primarily responsible for their family by not penalizing actions such as intermittent working patterns, but this resulted in their placement in sex-traditional jobs (Anker 1997; Okamoto and England 1999; Reskin 1993). This approach has not been an adequate explanation for the persistence of occupational segregation (Anker 1997; England 1982), but offers an explanation for why men and women have differing amounts of human capital. The labor market

itself also promotes or stunts the amount of human capital gained based on the worker's perceived beneficial returns. Worker choice approaches fail when they assume that all male and female workers rationally choose to enter a certain occupation and when they exclude other processes which may impact a worker's decision (Hanson and Pratt 1991).

A second approach to explaining occupational segregation accounts for other's' (namely employer) actions. Employers are guilty of statistical discrimination when they make decisions heavily based upon and rationalized by predetermined stereotypes:

...profit-maximizing employers will reserve jobs with high replacement costs for the group with the greater expected productivity. Group differences may in fact be small relative to variation within groups; there may be many female applicants with lower quit propensities and greater work commitment than the average male applicant. But if employers are unable to obtain this information for individual applicants, expected profits are maximized by segregating workers by sex. The result is discrimination because the applicant or employee is being judged on the basis of knowledge about their 'group' rather than individual characteristics. (Bielby and Baron 1986:762).

From this perspective, occupational segregation is perpetuated by employers and their hiring agents. However, actions such as statistical discrimination are illegal in the U.S. and employers are cautious about openly discriminating (Reskin 1993). This results in difficulty documenting and studying the extent of employer contributions to occupational segregation. It is uncertain to what extent employers' actions continue to impact occupational segregation. This is a major limitation and, again, potential cues generated by employers and their hiring agents within job allocation methods are either generalized or overlooked in this explanation.

Another approach proposes the dichotomization of two economic sectors: core and periphery. Within this dichotomy is a further distinction between primary and secondary labor markets which is highlighted in dual labor market theory (Gordon 1974:43). Core and periphery sectors are a form of "industrial stratification" (Gordon, Edwards, Reich 1982:192) and are summarized in the following quote:

The industrial 'core' of the American economy is one with large oligopolistic firms...[that]...have high product market concentration, product diversification, high profit margins, capital intensiveness, sophisticated internal labor markets, extensive unionization, high job skill requirements, high wage rates, and low worker turnover. The "periphery" sector...is organized on the basis of competitive capitalism and...[is] characterized by low profit margins, undeveloped internal labor markets, low job skill needs, low wage rates, minimal on-the-job training, and high worker turnover...While the core sector requires a workforce that is trainable and stable, the periphery requires a labor force that will accept inferior working conditions, lower pay, and higher risk of work instability. As a result, industries in the periphery recruit those who historically have had the weakest position in the labor market. (Beck et al. 1980:114).

The primary labor market is associated with men, and exists within the core economic sector (Mencken and Winfield 1999), whereas the secondary labor market is associated with women, and exists within the periphery sector. Ultimately, dual labor market theory as well as core and periphery sector distinctions suggest that occupational segregation results because of men and women's different concentrations within these two labor market and sector types. This perspective distinguishes between occupational categories based on worker demographics, but it does not account for the mechanisms which prompt workers to become segregated within these two different realms. This approach only identifies characteristics of workers and industries once they are already segregated. Allocation methods, a precursor to ending up in either of these labor markets, are neglected.

Feminist or gender explanations argue that occupational segregation reflects predominant gender stereotypes. These approaches take a closer look at "non-labor market variables" such as patriarchal norms and the household division of labor (Anker 1997:324). These variables determine amounts of human capital gained by men and women which then impacts labor force participation patterns. Gender role socialization theory says that socialization patterns instill a desire to conform to socially acceptable roles within the workplace and society. In other words, "differences in the sexes' socialization may contribute to their concentration in different occupations..." (Reskin 1993:260). Socialization differences shape the stereotypes associated with

men and women, masculine and feminine jobs. Most importantly, this perspective suggests that a viable explanation for occupational segregation exists in a mechanism which is learned during gender socialization and trains children to associate things such as language with different genders. As children grow up, utilizing language in a gendered manner, especially in relation to gender-traditional occupations, these patterns become ingrained and perpetuated (Liben, Bigler, and Krogh 2002). For example, specific gender differences in language, such as the use of intensifiers and verbal reinforcers, “appear to reflect women’s greater emotional expressiveness and sociability...[perhaps] gender differences in the use of intensifies and verbal reinforcers [is due] to a gender difference in the orientation that men and women have toward others” (Carli 1990:942). Any gender difference in the orientation that men and women have is cultivated largely through socialization, language being one such form of socialization. Gendered language in job allocation methods may impact applicants by triggering knowledge and acceptance of previously learned stereotypes. Research on occupational choice is helpful because it shows where individuals end up in the labor market, but it does not always account for the mechanisms which prompt applicants to make that choice. Gender explanations offer promise concerning future research examining gender socialization and gendered job allocation practices in relation to occupational segregation, but this link has yet to be fully explored.

Lastly, the gatekeeping framework is relevant. The majority of research on gatekeeping either presumes gatekeepers to be human or only discusses human gatekeepers. I focus on non-human gatekeepers (e.g. job advertisements) and argue that a gatekeeper may also be a structurally developed object. In reference to a gatekeeper’s function:

Gatekeepers control access to ‘benefits’ valued by others who are their ‘clients.’ ... [this] access is granted, not to something owned by the gatekeeper, but to benefits external to both the gatekeeper and the client-gatekeeper relation... gatekeepers control access to, but never own, the benefits received by their clients.” (Corra and Willer 2002:180).

A key function of a gatekeeper, whether human or non-human, is the control of access; thus, gatekeepers act as filters. If gatekeepers have the power to maintain a sex-traditional work force then they also have the power to encourage a more diverse and equitable workforce. Gatekeepers rarely serve the latter function. Current gatekeeping frameworks are limited because, while some research examines human gatekeepers (Chase and Bell 1990; Kerekes 2006), little research identifies non-human gatekeepers, such as job ads, as functioning in the same way as their human counterparts. Identifying non-human gatekeepers might further explain occupational segregation because it will create accountability of yet another filter which maintains sex-traditional workforces much like human gatekeepers.

The inability of any one of these approaches to fully explain occupational segregation rests partially on the lack of focus on allocation methods. Research should further explore allocation methods, such as job advertising, as yet another filter or gatekeeper which maintains segregation. Also, research should examine the link between gendered socialization and responses to job allocation processes. Existing literature is deficient in these two critical areas.

#### Job Recruitment

Employers use various methods to recruit employees and advertise open positions. Literature broadly defines *recruitment* as organizational practices that impact who will apply for and accept an advertised job position (Barber 1998; Breaugh 1992:429; Rynes 1991:4). Informal and formal advertising are two broad categories of methods that are highlighted below along with their gendered outcomes.

Skuratowicz and Hunter's 2004 study revealed that images are one method of informal advertising for a job or occupation. A U.S. bank used signs, photographs, and videos to advertise newly created job positions; however, these methods were highly gendered. The bank posted signs listing the characteristics and duties related to the new position and included an image of a male or a female; this associated gender with each job title (Skuratowicz and Hunter 2004). Existing

employees who were being rerouted into one of the two new job positions were shown videos about the job in which gender was conveyed. In the new customer representative position video, the bank specifically showed women in this job as well as crediting the “ladies” for their exceptional work in this position (Skuratowicz and Hunter 2004:86). In this study, gender was visually conveyed during job advertising.

A second informal job advertising method is word-of-mouth recruiting. In this method, employers rely on existing employees to advertise new job openings. This effectively reproduces the existing labor force (Reskin 1993). Women who use informal methods of job search often end up in more sex-traditional or female dominated occupations as opposed to women who use formalized methods of job search (Drentea 1998). Kmec notes that:

...because it is characteristically casual and unregulated, recruitment via current employee referrals grants employers discretion to consider an applicant’s sex when hiring and gives him or her the license to rely on sex stereotypes when evaluating the applicant. At the same time, recruitment through current employees automatically disadvantages applicants with no personal ties to a workplace. (Kmec 2005:324).

Employers may use informal recruitment because they want to reduce costs and/or rely on current employee ability to find an accurate position match. Unfortunately, this often perpetuates any existing sex segregation.

Formal advertising methods include using an intermediary such as an employment agency, job posting, or open recruitment (Kanter 1977). This may be done through newspaper advertisements (Born and Taris 2010) or electronic advertisements (Gaucher, Friesen, and Kay 2011). Formal methods are considered to be objective since they involve more accountability of company recruiters (Kmec 2005), but subtle cues can shape the potential pool of applicants and affect existing levels of segregation.

Job allocation processes whether formal or informal affect the sex composition of a labor force; thus, they are critical to helping explain occupational segregation. Bem and Bem (1973) and Gaucher et al. (2011) found that the wording of job advertisements impacted who would be more

likely to apply for a job. Job ads using stereotypical masculine or feminine language may signal to applicants which gender would best fit or be more welcome in the job. This is discriminatory if it alienates a particular group from applying. Existing literature suggests that gendered allocation methods may be contributing to the perpetuation, rather than the elimination, of occupational segregation.

#### Gender Cues in Job Ads

Research exploring gendered cues within job recruitment is important, because recruitment is a “transition” point (Moore 1995; Powell 1987:731). Social dominance theory (Sidanius and Pratto 1999) states that institutional-level mechanisms exist to “reinforce and perpetuate existing group-based inequality” (Gaucher et al. 2011). Job advertisements are institutional-level barriers to job applicants and represent the first phase of potential discrimination. With this in mind, it is important to view these ads as filters that reflect the gendered condition of the larger organization or institution. This is another reason why formalized job ads cannot be neglected when attempting to determine when and how discrimination may be occurring during the recruitment process.

Gender cues vary based on the type of recruitment being examined. As discussed, informal methods of job recruitment are more likely to contain obvious gendered cues than formal methods, which are subject to more legal and social accountability. I illustrate how gendered cues still exist within *formal* methods of job recruitment and advertising. Below I discuss three studies that are relevant to this specific focus.

The most dated study that relates to this topic was conducted by Bem and Bem in 1973. They examined three job recruitment situations in which they tried to determine the effects of word choice on job seekers. They exposed subjects to three types of job advertisements: sex-biased, sex-unbiased, and sex-reversed “affirmative action” job advertisements meant to appeal to job seekers who were not normally recruited into the advertised jobs. They found that sex-biased



job advertisements discouraged men and women from applying to sex-opposite jobs, but in situations where the advertisements were sex-unbiased, or specifically stated that the employer was an affirmative action employer, women were especially likely to apply for jobs where women are underrepresented. This study demonstrated how sex-biased advertising creates and perpetuates gendered preferences, but gender unbiased advertising may help alter these preferences (Bem and Bem 1973:16). Their experiments discovered a correlation between use of masculine and feminine stereotyped language and job-applicant responses by asking respondents to indicate their willingness to apply for various job advertisements. Although, willingness to apply and actual application are different, interest in applying provided a way to further explore how gendered language might impact an applicant. Bem and Bem (1973) concluded that their methods, due to lack of exposure to actual discrimination by applicants, likely underestimated the extent to which sex-biased advertisements impacted their respondents (16).

Another example is provided by Born and Taris (2010), who conducted a study where they examined the impact of the wording of employment advertisements on a student's willingness to apply for a job. They discovered that female students were more inclined to apply for jobs with a more feminine job profile (a profile listing stereotypical feminine characteristics); however, males were not significantly impacted by a job's profile, whether stereotypically masculine or feminine. Gender cues within job advertisements may impact who applies for a job, especially if one sex is more sensitive to gendered cues as was indicated in this study since female students decisions were more greatly impacted by a job's profile than male students. The use of gendered language or characteristics in a job description may lead to the perpetuation of a sex-traditional workforce because it may encourage men, but women especially, to apply for a job in which they perceive a better fit with traditional gender stereotypes.

The most recent and notable piece of research examining gendered cues within job advertisements was conducted in 2011 by Gaucher, Friesen, and Kay on Canadian electronic job

advertisements. Gaucher et al. (2011) were interested in the “institutional-level contributors to gender inequality” (110) since much of the research done on women’s underrepresentation in male-dominated fields has been at the individual level. The institutional- or structural-level variables are often so imbedded that many overlook them (Deutsch 2006) and may be acting as barriers to women’s entrance and participation in male-dominated occupations. They found that gendered terms in job advertisements affected perceptions about the job and who would most likely be in and welcome to the job. This was related to the sex composition of the job itself. Their results showed that masculine wording in job advertisements leads to less anticipated feelings of belonging and job interest among women, which is likely to perpetuate gender inequality in male-dominated fields. In post-experimental briefings their subjects never attributed their job advertisement responses to the gender-stereotypical wording. While these discriminatory outcomes may be unintended (Gaucher et al. 2011:120), they are still problematic and should be addressed.

#### Gaps in the Literature

This literature is a helpful starting point for examining gendered cues in job advertising, but Fernandez and Sosa (2005) caution that much of the existing data used to study gender segregation in the workplace are collected *post-hire*. Kmec’s 2005 study used information on a company’s last hire to determine the impact of organizational practices upon the segregation of an occupation. These data are limited in their ability to help researchers identify the gender sorting mechanisms present in *pre-hire* processes (Fernandez and Sosa 2005). Although mechanisms identified post-hire have theoretical importance, empirical research should identify the pre-hire gendered mechanisms in job recruitment simply because little research examines pre-hire mechanisms without using post-hire data. This is a major drawback to existing literature. Literature also neglects to thoroughly examine the gendered cues within job advertising that are not being curtailed by legal and social efforts such as gendered language. While overt feminine or

masculine language is generally avoided by most companies, there are still lapses in awareness concerning language that is highly associated with either men or women.

Prior research suggests the continued existence of gendered cues within job recruitment, but there are limitations to the existing literature. Few studies examine the presence of gendered cues in U.S. job advertisements. Gaucher et al. (2011) used Canadian data for their study and Born and Taris (2010) conducted their study on Dutch employment data. The one study that was completed using U.S. data was published in 1973. Both the presence of subtle gender cues and their impact may have changed in the last 35 years.

#### Segregation Prior to Job Search

Some factors segregate men and women prior to their search for a job. Within higher education there are male and female dominated fields of study. Science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) fields are heavily male dominated (Kohlstedt 2004) while “soft” sciences (e.g. liberal arts) are female dominated. I examine job ads for engineers and registered nurses, both of which are gender segregated academically and occupationally. Women have begun to enter more male-dominated fields, but their progress has been small (Catalyst 2013; Frehill 1997; Ransom 1990). On the other hand, males have had more success steadily entering female-dominated fields (Kmec 2008). Although the segregation occurring within academia will impact the pool of applicants looking for a career in their respective fields, neither of these realms is totally gender-segregated. In other words, there are male nurses (Kmec 2008) and female engineers (Bix 2004) who also will be looking for jobs in these fields. It is these individuals who will be impacted by the gendered nature of job advertisements. If the individuals attempting to enter opposite sex-dominated occupations are being discouraged by gendered job allocation methods, then there is little hope for reducing existing amounts of occupational sex segregation in these realms. Gendered barriers should be eliminated in education, since they do limit the amount of men and women who would even be available to apply for a job, but even if they are removed,

individuals will still face them in their future job search. Occupational segregation is not only impacted by the number of people qualified for the job (i.e. those with the appropriate educational background), but also by those being allowed to enter. It is this process of gendered filtering through qualified applicants that is the focus of this study.

## Chapter 3

### Goals of Current Research

There is a lack of research utilizing U.S. data in examining job allocation methods as well as little recent research based on U.S. data. I address these gaps by utilizing current U.S. data for analysis and comparing the results to Gaucher et al.'s 2011 study (the most recent and relevant piece of research on this topic). I also seek to clearly distinguish between pre-hire and post-hire data in my study as this has also been shown to impact findings. I examine data that applicants view prior to actual application for the job in order to locate gendered cues within the first phase of the allocation process. By using data that remain the same whether or not the applicant actually applies for or accepts the job, I eliminate any post-hire bias that might occur as a result of using only the data that result in the successful application to and acceptance of the job.

The majority of occupational segregation explanations fail to consider the segregating potential of job ad language. My research is geared toward highlighting this additional mechanism. I seek to further understand how gendered cues are used within job advertising and speculate about how they may contribute to the perpetuation of occupational sex segregation.

## Chapter 4

### Methodology

Quantitative portions of my research resemble the content analysis conducted by Gaucher et al. (2011) who suggested, in accordance with social dominance theory, that some factors are so structurally embedded that they are overlooked by the majority of society. Their research examined the presence of gender cues (coded masculine and feminine words) within job advertisements and applicant response to these cues.

Their content analysis utilized electronic job ads to look for evidence of gendered language. They hypothesized, as do I, that job advertisements for positions within male-dominated fields would contain more masculine wording than would job advertisements for female-dominated jobs. Gaucher et al. (2011) analyzed ads from Canada's leading job search websites and they chose six male-dominated and five female-dominated jobs to perform a content analysis of 60 electronic/online job advertisements per occupation. Their selection of job ads was not random; they chose the first job ads to appear on the websites.

I focus only on ads for engineers and registered nurses rather than analyzing ads for 11 different occupations. Both of these were included by Gaucher and were chosen based on the 2007 U.S. Department of Labor report on median weekly earnings for specific jobs and occupations. I utilize the same index of coded masculine and feminine words that Gaucher et al. (2011) used for their content analysis (See Appendix A). I chose the two most popular job websites in the U.S.: CareerBuilder.com and Monster.com (<http://www.ebizmba.com> 2012). Both websites are fully accessible to those with internet access and allowed me to copy and paste text into another document for more efficient analysis. Electronic job advertisements were only pulled from these two websites.

I non-randomly selected the first 50 job ads for each occupation from each website for a total of 200 job advertisements: 100 registered nursing job ads and 100 engineering job ads. To

avoid duplicating ads, possible since the same advertisement may be included on both websites, I conducted quota sampling. This sampling was used because it allowed me to collect the same number of ads per job. In addition, a minimum and maximum word length was established in order to somewhat standardize the size of the job ad. I sampled only ads with word counts between 150 and 550. No other restrictions were placed as other restrictions may have impacted what gendered content was discovered.

I analyzed the job ads for the amount of total coded words present as well as the breakdown of masculine and feminine coded words. Quantitative data were entered into SPSS statistical software with every variable numerically coded. Variables included each individual coded word as listed in Appendix A, the number assigned to each collected job ad, industry type (manufacturing or service), whether or not the ad stated equal opportunity employment (EEOE/EOE) in any form, the month the job ad was collected, the website the ad was collected from, and minimum level of education required as stated within the ad. Minimum education meant that if an ad stated, for example, an Associate's degree OR a Bachelor's degree would be acceptable I coded for the Associate's degree since that was the lower/minimum education requirement. I did not code any ads for education level twice. This information was further broken down by job ad type and education level. This data does not allow for extensive multivariate analyses; therefore, the quantitative results presented are in basic frequency and cross-tabulation tables. These numerical data are provided primarily for basic descriptive and exploratory purposes; however, one hypothesis was tested since a portion of this analysis was replicating Gaucher's 2011 study.

In addition, the job ads are coded and discussed qualitatively. I approached the ads inductively when analyzing them qualitatively and made no predictions about how gender would be conveyed. I coded phrases and terms within the job ads which may also indicate gender in

addition to and apart from the quantitative results. A combination of basic frequency statistics with these qualitative analyses provide a fuller picture of how gender is being conveyed.



## Chapter 5

### Findings and Discussion

Using both quantitative and qualitative methodology provides a big picture of how gender may be portrayed within electronic job ads. A simple word count incompletely reflects the context in which coded words are used; therefore, a qualitative analysis provides needed clarification of the role of gender in job ads. The quantitative findings are discussed first to provide a general “feel” for the language used within the job ads. Beyond testing and comparing a simple hypothesis, the only purpose of these findings is to be descriptive. Once the quantitative results are outlined, the qualitative findings are discussed.

#### Quantitative Overview

The quantitative analysis partially replicates Gaucher et al.’s’ (2011) analysis of gendered language in job ads. Basic frequencies provide word counts and describe the language used. Coded words are isolated as a gendered cue regardless of their context. In their analysis, Gaucher et al. (2011) did not elaborate on the context in which coded words were being used. After analyzing my results, a word-context comparison between my study and Gaucher et al.’s would have been helpful. Context proves to be an important factor for some words because they may not have been used to signal gender, as was assumed in Gaucher’s 2011 study. In my analysis of 200 job ads, overall I find more feminine words than masculine words. I identify 584 masculine words and 665 feminine words for a total of 1,249 gendered words. The table in Appendix B displays the number of times each coded word is discovered in the job ads.

Although my analysis uses the categories employed by Gaucher, one word, identified as feminine by Gaucher et al., reflects a variety of job expectations that cannot all be appropriately categorized as feminine. Various forms of the word *respon\** are used, but one use is particularly problematic. In many job ads “*responsibilities*” is followed by an itemized list of areas for which the successful applicant would be responsible. In these instances, the root form of “*respon\**” does

not help identify a feminine word. To assess the impact of the different uses *respon\** reflects, I ran comparison analyses to examine how much the results varied depending on whether or not *respon\** was included. All quantitative findings discussed will exclude *respon\**. Listed below are the top 3 masculine and feminine words used in all 200 job ads.

Table 5-1 Most Frequently Used Masculine and Feminine Words

Masculine Words	Feminine Words
Lead* 27% (N=159)	Support* 37% (N=166)
Analy* 19% (N=112)	Understand* 17% (N=74)
Compet* 14% (N=80)	Commit* 9% (N=39)
Other 40% (N=233)	Other 37% (N=164)
100% (N=584)	100% (N=443)

These words appear more frequently than any other coded word listed in Appendix A and it is interesting to note how different the terms are from each other. For example, variations of the feminine words *Support\**, *Understand\**, and *Commit\** are softer terms implying emotion, sensitivity, and relational abilities. On the other hand, variations of the masculine words *Lead\**, *Analy\**, and *Compet\** denote strength of mind. While there are more obviously gendered words that were not found in any of the coded ads, these words, in addition to being used the most frequently, also represent traditional notions of gender. As discussed before, emotional words are associated with women while strong and assertive words are associated with men (Haas 1979). The frequent presence of the coded words listed in Table 5-1 suggest that not only are words that

convey gender being used within job advertisements, but the gendered words frequently used are associated with traditional notions of masculinity and femininity.

#### Statement of Equal Opportunity Employment

Table 5-2 displays the findings concerning whether or not a job advertisement states if the employer is equal opportunity or not.

Table 5-2 All Job Ads and Statement of EEOC

	Engineer	Registered Nurse	T-Value
Stated EEOC	20% (N=20)	23% (N=23)	.514
No EEOC	80% (N=80)	77% (N=77)	.514
	100% (N=100)	100% (N=100)	

A two-tailed t-test shows no significant difference between the amount of times EEOC is stated in job ads for engineers and registered nurses. Unfortunately, not even 25% of the job ads state EEOC. It is unknown how this might compare across other occupations or if this finding would be consistent, but this finding does not appear to indicate gender.

#### Education and Gendered Words

The majority of engineering ads state that the applicant is required to have a Bachelor's degree while the majority of registered nurse ads either did not state any minimum level of education required or were unclear about what was required. To explore whether or not this indicates gender, I examine the median number of coded words by the stated level of education required. This is broken down by occupational type and is displayed in Table 5-3.

Table 5-3 Median Number of Coded Words by Minimum Amount of Education Required

	Engineer	Registered Nurse	Overall
Associate's Degree And Lower	5 (N=3)	3 (N=12)	4 (N=15)
Bachelor's Degree And Higher	7 (N=74)	5 (N=21)	6 (N=95)
Other <sup>a</sup>	6 (N=23)	5 (N=67)	6.5 (N=90)
	(N=100)	(N=100)	(N=200)

<sup>a</sup>Level of education required was either unstated or unclear.

One finding requires attention. Engineering ads more frequently state that a Bachelor's degree or higher level of education is required while Registered Nurse Ads more frequently did not state a minimum level of education requirement or are unclear. Despite there being comparable numbers of job ads within these categories, 74 vs. 67, Engineering ads contained a higher median number of total coded words. Regardless of coded word type (masculine vs. feminine), the fact that Engineering ads, specifically stating a minimum education level of a Bachelor's degree or higher, contain a higher median of coded words is interesting. One might assume that occupations advertising for jobs in which higher levels of education are required would use less gendered language, perhaps due to higher social awareness. These data suggest otherwise and may be more support for Gaucher et al.'s (2011) claim that gendered language is still such an embedded mechanism within the social structure that it goes unnoticed. This finding requires further exploration.

Educational differences may be able to explain the finding that Registered Nurse ads less frequently stated a minimum level of education. Nursing programs have certifications not equivalent to a 4-5 year Bachelor's degree and can be completed in shorter periods of time. Due to

this ability, job ads for registered nurses may not state a minimal degree requirement since a degree, per se, is not required to meet the certification of a registered nurse.

#### Masculine and Feminine Wording across Occupations

Table 5-4 shows support for my comparison hypothesis that job ads for male-dominated occupations will contain more masculine wording than female-dominated job ads.

Table 5-4 Total Coded Words across Engineer and Registered Nurse Ads

	Engineer	Registered Nurse	T-Value
Masculine Words	64% (N=357)	49% (N=227)	4.333*
Feminine Words	36% (N=205)	51% (N=238)	-1.484
	100% (N=562)	100% (N=465)	

\* $p < .05$

After removing all instances of the word respon\* a large gap appears in the number of masculine and feminine wording between the two ad types. There are 152 more masculine words after removing all variations of respon\* from the analyses. The difference in number of feminine words is small before and after accounting for respon\*. A difference of 130 words appears in the number of masculine words between engineers and registered nurse ads. A one-tailed t-test shows a significant difference between the number of masculine words in engineering and registered nurse ads ( $p = .03$ ). Perhaps the number of feminine words is not what may be acting as a gender trigger for applicants, but rather feminine words act as a baseline.

Meaning, feminine wording is always present to some extent, but this is not true of masculine words. The larger difference between the numbers of masculine words suggests that this

may be what is acting as a gender signal to applicants due to more variation in the number of masculine words. This will be discussed further in the following section.

#### Discussion

Overall, the primary finding supports my hypothesis, and that of Gaucher et al. (2011), because my job advertisements for a male-dominated occupation (engineering) contain more masculine words than do job ads for registered nurses. In addition, the fact that there is no significant difference in number of feminine words by job ad type supports another finding of Gaucher. They, too, found no difference in presence of feminine words across job advertisements for male- and female-dominated occupations (Gaucher et al. 2011:113). This finding suggests that feminized words may not be what signals gender. Rather, feminine words may be acting as a standard baseline and the number of masculine words may be signaling gender since there is greater variation in the number of masculine words. Within both male- and female-dominated job ads, the number of feminine words is consistent. The number of masculine words is much higher in job ads for engineers, whereas registered nurse ads did not have a significantly greater number of feminine words.

If job ads for male-dominated occupations more heavily utilize words that convey masculinity, they may be more likely to attract applicants that mirror the existing work force. This possibility may be less likely for female-dominated job ads due to little variation in feminine wording and may reflect a female-dominated occupation's willingness to accept male applicants. Some research argues that factors such as pay inequality give women more incentive to want to enter male-dominated occupations; however, there is no such incentive for men (Kmec 2008). While this may be true, this does not mean that female-dominated occupations are less receptive to male applicants entering.

Some research links the feminization of an occupation with outcomes such as lower pay and occupational prestige (England 1992; Steinberg 2001). Regardless of the accuracy of this

belief, if female-dominated occupations are more receptive to male applicants because of the belief that greater male entrance will decrease these negative outcomes, than this may contribute to the greater variation in masculine wording across job ads for different occupations. A higher concentration of masculine wording in male-dominated job ads may reflect the occupation's unreceptiveness to female applicants regardless of their qualifications. In contrast, if female-dominated jobs maintain the assumption that the entrance of more male applicants will positively impact factors such as the pay or occupational prestige of the job, they may be less likely to utilize terms that are attractive to either sex in order to encourage the entrance of males.

Whether or not feminine words act as a baseline for gendered language used within job ads requires further exploration, including actual applicant responses to these ads, in order to determine impact. Other findings discussed here, such as stated level of education, also require further exploration in order to determine how these patterns may convey gender across broader samples. I now turn my attention to the qualitative findings.

#### Qualitative Themes

Gaucher et al. (2011) did no qualitative analysis of their electronic job ads for further context of coded words or other patterns of language which may indicate gender. A qualitative analysis adds depth to the cursory quantitative findings and provides insight into other ways that gender may be conveyed. I approached the ads inductively when qualitatively analyzing them which allowed me to simply code themes prior to assuming a gender bias. Once themes were coded, they were analyzed for their gendered potential. Four categories of themes emerge that indicate gender and are discussed as they appear in both engineer and registered nurse ads. All four themes are discussed or framed differently within the two ad types. The four themes involve discussions of: flexibility, benefits, employee recognition, and characteristics of a desirable employee.

## Flexibility

Job ads for both engineers and registered nurses discuss the concept of flexibility; albeit differently. The term flexibility, once coded for context, appears to mean two different things for engineering and registered nurse ads. Engineering ads frame flexibility as a job requirement placed on the future worker, thus leading to a sense of work-life incompatibility. Job ads for registered nurses framed flexibility as a perk or benefit of the job that contributes to work-life balance.

### Engineer Ads: Work-Life Incompatibility

Engineering ads frequently mention that the applicant should be “flexible.” For example, one ad states that “Candidates must be able to work a flexible schedule including nights and weekends as required...” Another ad states that “it is expected that [workers] work off-shifts as needed to support the functions of [the job’s] role.” Other statements include requiring “24/7” availability, willingness to travel (or simply stating a travel percentage requirement), and that there is “expected overtime.” Flexibility, by virtue of being a requirement placed on the worker, is not discussed as a benefit of the job.

### Registered Nurse Ads: Work-Life Balance

Registered nurse ads emphasize flexibility as a perk, benefit, or “luxury” of the job or occupation. Statements of “work-life balance” are specifically used in conjunction with discussions of flexibility within the job. One ad states “You can schedule your work around everything else in your life instead of the other way around.” Another ad describes workers as “enjoying the freedom of a flexible schedule.” Due to these statements, flexibility is framed as a positive concept because it is presented as an option that benefits the worker.

## Discussion

Ultimately, flexibility is presented as a restricting or filtering component of engineering jobs, but a positive benefit of registered nurse jobs. I describe flexibility as a filter for engineering



ads since it is presented as an unfortunate or necessary aspect of the job; an occupational hazard. On the other hand, flexibility is a recruiter for registered nurse ads because it is presented as a helpful and attractive aspect of the occupation. While discussions of flexibility in engineering ads most likely narrow the applicant pool, flexibility in registered nurse ads has the potential to broaden the applicant pool by making the job more appealing.

These varying conceptions of flexibility may signal gender based on traditional notions of what men and women look for in a job. As discussed previously, some research has explained occupational segregation by looking at worker choices. Research focusing on worker choice assumes that men and women's primary orientations to work are different and that these different orientations are the source of occupational segregation (Anker 1997; Kmec 2005; Okamoto and England 1999; Reskin 1993). Hanson and Pratt (1991) found that a higher percentage of women preferred "nonwage" job attributes such as job flexibility; 73 percent of women to 56 percent of men (246). Although Hanson and Pratt's study is somewhat dated, if women in the labor force are still assumed to be primarily responsible for the family sphere, as evidenced through phenomena such as the "second-shift" (Hochschild 1989), this explains why flexibility continues to be more important to women than to men. This may partially explain why female-dominated job ads continue to emphasize flexibility as a benefit of the job. Not only is flexibility an attribute that women have historically been found to desire more than men, but the greater frequency in its appearance in female-dominated job ads betrays the gendered nature of the job and who is being recruited. Engineer job ads did not focus on this concept nearly to the extent that registered nurse ads suggesting that this is not a job attribute that men are as concerned with or value as highly (Hanson and Pratt 1991).

#### Benefits

My job ads rarely failed to discuss benefits of the job. Often, the formatting is similar across job ads; benefits are listed somewhere or highlighted in a separate paragraph. Again, this

theme is discussed differently by occupational type. Engineering ads more frequently promise tangible benefits, whereas registered nurse ads tend to emphasize the intangible benefits of the job.

#### Engineer Ads: Tangibility

Tangible benefits commonly discussed in engineer job ads include examples such as: “If hired, you’ll receive...free food, massages on Friday, and much more!” Another ad states that the company offers “sponsored functions: lunches, happy hours, etc.” Other tangible benefits include a gym membership and a car allowance.

#### Registered Nurse Ads: Intangibility

Registered nurse ads more frequently use adjectives such as “friendly,” “caring,” “positive,” “warm,” “family-friendly,” “flexible,” and “fun” to describe the work environment. These descriptions of the work environment or potential co-workers are specifically listed in a “benefits” section of the job ad. One ad states “We work together as a team...and are dedicated to fostering an environment where...members are treated like family.” Other benefits include having an emotionally rewarding career. For example, the job would give the worker the “ability to...feel good at the end of the day.” This theme overlaps with the notion that the job would give the worker the ability to “enrich” and “make a difference in” the lives of patients and clients. The job is a “privilege.” All of these benefits are intangible and emotionally-based..

#### Discussion

The notion of tangibility vs. intangibility is not one that is found in literature discussing gender cues in job ads or in reference to benefits listed in job ads. While these two concepts may not necessarily be gendered, there is room for speculation about gender since these two types of benefits are so obviously split between engineering and registered nurse ads. Engineering ads, unlike registered nurse ads, never state an emotional benefit to the job, instead focusing more on material aspects that an applicant can rely on or use. Objective factor theory says that applicants

choose a job after evaluating attributes and vacancy characteristics of the job (Behling, Labovitz, & Gainer 1968; Chapman et al. 2005:929). Chapman et al. also found that:

...women placed more weight on job characteristics and less weight on fairness perceptions than did men in determining the attractiveness of the job–organization...Women used information about job characteristics (e.g., location...) more than men in determining the attractiveness of the position...women may be more likely than men to seek out positions that offer a location or benefits that minimize conflicts with other life roles (e.g., spouse, parent). (2005:936-939).

If women are likely to weigh benefits, such as flexibility or a “family-friendly work environment”, more heavily than men, and if female-dominated jobs expect that benefits of this nature will be attractive to applicants, this may indicate their expectation for female applicants. This may be related to the connection between emotional labor requirements and female-dominated occupations. The term “emotional labor” stems from research done by Arlie Hochschild in her book, *The Managed Heart* in 1983, and refers to “the management of feeling to create a publicly observable facial and bodily display.” (1983:7). Female-dominated occupations, such as nursing, require extensive emotional labor (Morris and Feldman 1996). If the perception of emotional gratification as a benefit can be conveyed in the job ad, this may be done to appeal to applicants who are similar to existing workers: women. These two benefit types may convey something about the dominating gender in that occupation, or about the employers’ desired applicants.

#### Employee Recognition

Both types of job ads contain statements of employee recognition by the hiring company. Engineering ads praise their employees by rewarding them with commodities. Registered nurse ads praise their employees by recognizing individuals. Must like job benefits, employee recognition is more likely to be tangible for engineers and intangible for nurses.

#### Engineer Ads: Material Rewards

Engineering ads validate their employees through material recognition which often includes financial rewards. One ad promises “For your hard work, you will be rewarded with an offer that will include an aggressive base salary” Another states that “We understand our employees work hard, so you will receive a competitive base salary and an annual performance bonus and a generous benefits package.” Work effort, more so than the worker, is primarily recognized either monetarily or through other material benefits, as seen in the previous section.

#### Registered Nurse Ads: Non-Material Rewards

Registered Nurse ads not only recognize employees differently, they contain more instances of employee recognition than engineering ads do. Registered nurse ads appeal to an intangible method of recognizing employees. For example, one ad states that “You are not just a number when you work with Integrated Healthcare - you become a part of our family. We pride ourselves on developing long-term relationships with our valued staff- you are the secret to our success!” In addition, employees are described as sincerely appreciated, “respected,” and “valued.” Compensation and other material benefits are occasionally described as a reward for a handful of registered nurse ads, but this is not the pattern. Employees are validated and praised through worker recognition, rather than the work and subsequent financial or material reward.

#### Discussion

Employee recognition occurs in different ways and amounts across engineering and registered nurse ads. Engineering ads tend to praise employee work by promising financial or material rewards. Registered nurse ads praise employees by describing ways in which the worker is valued. Registered nurse ads also contain more instances of employee recognition than engineering ads do. These differences may reflect gendered notions about what men and women “need” to feel valued or respected. Also, the greater quantity of times that registered nurse ads recognize employees may reflect gendered ideas about how much emotional support is needed by

workers in this field (predominantly women). This pattern requires further exploration as themes of this nature have not been explicitly studied in existing literature on gender cues in job ads.

#### Desirable Employee

Both engineering and registered nurse job ads contain information that states or implies worker characteristics that the hiring company finds desirable. Engineer ads emphasize traits such as independence, self-motivation, and creativity. Registered nurse ads emphasize characteristics such as compassion and positivity.

#### Engineer Ads: Independent, Self-Motivated, and Creative

Engineering ads emphasize traits, such as self-motivation, as desirable. One ad states that a desirable worker will be: “proactive, driven to excel, and get things done on time.” Another ad states that the job “requires a self-starter.” Desirable workers should also contain a “get-it-done attitude.” Independent is another adjective frequently used to describe a desirable worker; workers should have “the ability to work independently.” Other traits fall, broadly, into a category of creativity. Examples of this include being an “out-of-the-box thinker” and the ability to be “innovative.” These three qualities are all described as desirable in a future engineering employee.

#### Registered Nurse Ads: Compassionate and Positive

Registered nurse ads describe desirable employees as “positive” people. The desirable worker will have a “Positive attitude and [be] truly eager to help families with sensitive issues.” In addition, positivity should be displayed, not only as a character trait, but also as support toward the hiring organization. Other desirable traits are compassion and empathy. Workers “must be empathetic” and have a “passion to continually go the extra mile.” Other ads combine these two traits. For example, “As a Registered Nurse, it is vital that you have a passion for providing the best in nursing care and also display [a] positive and professional attitude at all times.” These two traits are the most commonly cited in reference to a desirable registered nurse.

## Discussion

Both types of job ads list qualities or character traits that are desirable in a worker.

Engineering ads emphasize the importance of being independent, self-motivated, and creative. Registered nurse ads focus on compassion and positivity. Traits listed in registered nurse ads reflect feminine gender stereotypes; for example, the stereotypes of women as compassionate and empathetic (Haas 1979) are more interpersonal skills that are less focused on in engineering ads. “A number of researchers have noted that, in general, women tend to exhibit a social-emotional or relational orientation in interactions with others, whereas men tend to exhibit a more independent and unemotional orientation (Chodorow, 1978; Dinnerstein, 1977; Eagly, 1987; Gilligan, 1982; Miller, 1976)” (Carli 1990:943). Marini (1990) notes that expressive traits are often associated with females which supports how this requirement of interpersonal skills may be a feminine gender cue based on historical or traditional gender stereotypes.

## Summary and Future Research

These four themes, flexibility, benefits, employee recognition, and characteristics of a desirable employee are present in both types of job ads; however, each theme is framed differently by occupation. Literature is deficient discussing several of these topics in reference to job recruitment and how these themes may perpetuate gendered outcomes.

The most obvious gendered theme that is consistent with prior research is “flexibility.” Multiple studies have documented flexibility as either being more desirable for women, or, at least, assumed to be more desirable for women. The decidedly lesser amount of interest in this option for males, especially in male-dominated jobs, highlights the fact that women are still primarily responsible for the home sphere. Thus, for many women, work must still accommodate family pressures and needs. Discussions of flexibility as a positive work benefit are not surprising when considering the expectations of female workers. It was, however, unexpected to see such an opposite conception of flexibility within engineering ads. Lack of discussion about flexibility as a

benefit did not seem unusual given what existing literature discusses about male- and female-dominated occupations, but to use flexibility as a filter was interesting. This finding conveyed gender in a traditional sense because notions of flexibility appeared to be based on traditional ideas concerning men and women's expectations.

The categories of "benefits" and "employee recognition" reflect gender in similar ways. Registered nurse ads discussed benefits and recognized employees intangibly while engineering ads discussed benefits and recognized employees tangibly. This overarching pattern of tangibility vs. intangibility, material vs. non-material, is not one that has appeared in the research literature discussing gender cues in job advertising. The gender bias is not necessarily due to the fact that these two types of benefits and forms of employee recognition are present, but that tangibility and intangibility are so clearly dominating one type of ad over the other. This suggests that discussions of benefits and methods of employee recognition may be occurring in different ways and for gendered reasons. This, too, requires further exploration and documentation.

Themes surrounding "desirable employee" criteria indicate gender based on traditional stereotypes about feminine and masculine traits. These characteristics are more indirectly gendered as they could arguably relate to the job, itself. For example, creativity may be more necessary for an engineering position, whereas compassion and empathy may be more necessary for a registered nurse position. Although these traits relate to the job, they have also been associated differently with men and women, historically. Gaucher et al. (2011) also specified these terms as gendered in their list of coded words (see Appendix A) which provides more support for the conclusion that these characteristics convey gender.

Future research should continue to qualitatively analyze job ads to explore how language conveys gender to potential applicants. This requires more than simply analyzing ads, but also applicant response to ads. This study is limited in its ability to determine how the qualitative themes might be interpreted by job applicants and whether or not these themes would impact the

decision to apply for the job. Also, these themes are not overtly or consistently studied in the existing literature, which made establishing some of them as gender biased difficult. More research on how each of these themes may indicate gender would be helpful in further clarifying how hiring organizations may be subtly cueing gender. There is far too little research on the topics of gendered language usage, current methods of formal job recruitment (e.g. internet advertising), and gendered cues in job advertising. Multiple facets of these three areas should be explored in order to define a broader understanding of the intersection between these three topics and their impact upon the labor force and workers.



## Chapter 6

### Conclusion

Occupational sex segregation remains a problematic phenomenon in the labor force because it perpetuates various forms of gender inequality between men and women. Although occupational sex segregation is highly studied, historic and current explanations fail to completely explain its persistence. This is due, in part, to a lack of focus and study on the role that recruitment and job-allocation methods play in maintaining occupational sex segregation. Research has discussed the difference in gendered outcomes that formal vs. informal job advertising creates for applicants, but little research has continued to explore how formal methods of job recruitment still contain gender bias. Some researchers, such as Gaucher et al. (2011) argue that this may be because gender bias exists in mechanisms that are so deeply embedded that they often go unnoticed, much less recognized as problematic. An example of one such gendered mechanism is language.

Various forms of language have been and continue to be associated with either men or women. Gendered language usage is modeled for and used by children during critical periods of socialization; therefore, it becomes embedded and less likely to be recognized as problematic. Utilizing language in a gendered manner becomes normal, expected, and perpetuated. When gendered language is used in job ads, it presents a subtle danger to applicants, especially those seeking jobs in occupations dominated by the opposite sex. The use of gendered language may trigger knowledge and acceptance of previously embedded gender stereotypes which may impact an individual's decision to apply for the job (Gaucher et al. 2011). A shift to become more gender neutral in language socialization will be gradual, but it is necessary.

While attracting and hiring the “best” applicants is the touted goal of many labor force organizations (Chapman et al. 2005:928), this goal will go unmet in many situations where job ad language maintains a gender bias, whether intended or unintended. The labor force is a prominent

social structure that shapes the lives and experiences of men and women in various ways.

Unfortunately, the labor force is often a breeding ground for inequality between male and female workers by perpetuating outcomes such as occupational sex segregation. Research should seek to discover how these outcomes can be prevented through the study of variables such as job recruitment and allocation methods. While workers may experience discrimination and inequality at any level of participation in the labor force, reducing gender bias in some of the first interactions an individual has with the labor force (job advertising) may be one of the first steps in minimizing inequality.

If gender diversity is desired, labor force organizations must be gender neutral in all aspects of their organization. If the very first point-of-contact a potential applicant has with a hiring organization conveys gender in such a way that it prevents an applicant from applying, the organization has not only prevented diversity, but may have also excluded the candidate that would have best fit the job. This is highly problematic, but resulting inequality will continue to persist if awareness is not raised toward the existence of subtle mechanisms, such as gendered language, creating a gender bias within job advertising.

Appendix A

Coded Masculine and Feminine Words

Masculine Words:

Feminine Words:

Active  
Adventurous  
Aggress\*  
Ambitio\*  
Analy\*  
Assert\*  
Athlet\*  
Autonom\*  
Boast\*  
Challeng\*  
Compet\*  
Confident  
Courag\*  
Decide  
Decisive  
Decision\*  
Determin\*  
Dominant  
Domina\*  
Force\*  
Greedy  
Headstrong  
Hierarch\*  
Hostil\*  
Implusive  
Independen\*  
Individual\*  
Intellect\*  
lead\*  
Logic  
Masculine  
Objective  
Opinion  
Outspoken  
Persist  
Principle\*  
Reckless  
Stubborn  
Superior  
Self-confiden\*  
Self-sufficien\*  
Self-relian\*

Affectionate  
Child\*  
Cheer\*  
Commit\*  
Communal  
Compassion\*  
Connect\*  
Considerate  
Cooperat\*  
Depend\*  
Emotiona\*  
Empath\*  
Feminine  
Flatterable  
Gentle  
Honest  
Interpersonal  
Interdependen\*  
Interpersona\*  
Kind  
Kinship  
Loyal\*  
Modesty  
Nag  
Nurtur\*  
Pleasant\*  
Polite  
Quiet\*  
Respon\*  
Sensitiv\*  
Submissive  
Support\*  
Sympath\*  
Tender\*  
Together\*  
Trust\*  
Understand\*  
Warm\*  
Whin\*  
Yield\*

---

*Note.* The asterisk denotes the acceptance of all letters, hyphens, or numbers following its appearance.

Appendix B

Sum of Masculine and Feminine Words Found

Sum of Masculine and Feminine Words Found. (N=200)

Active	15	Affectionate	0
Adventurous	0	Child*	27
Aggress*	5	Cheer*	0
Ambitio*	1	Commit*	39
Analy*	112	Communal	0
Assert*	1	Compassion*	32
Athlet*	0	Connect*	11
Autonom*	1	Considerate	0
Boast*	1	Cooperat*	7
Challeng*	17	Depend*	13
Compet*	80	Emotiona*	7
Confident	2	Empath*	3
Courag*	0	Feminine	0
Decide	2	Flatterable	0
Decisive	1	Gentle	0
Decision*	19	Honest	0
Determin*	17	Interpersonal	22
Dominant	0	Interdependen*	0
Domina*	0	Interpersona*	0
Force*	1	Kind	2
Greedy	0	Kinship	0
Headstrong	0	Loyal*	2
Hierarch*	0	Modesty	0
Hostil*	0	Nag	0
Implusive	0	Nurtur*	1
Independen*	38	Pleasant*	0
Individual*	70	Polite	0
Intellect*	0	Quiet*	0
Lead*	159	Respon*	222
Logic	8	Sensitiv*	4
Masculine	0	Submissive	0
Objective	5	Support*	166
Opinion	0	Sympath*	1
Outspoken	0	Tender*	2
Persist	0	Together*	12
Principle*	21	Trust*	14
Reckless	0	Understand*	74
Stubborn	0	Warm*	2
Superior	5	Whin*	0
Self-Confiden*	0	Yield*	2
Self-Sufficien*	0		
Self-Relian*	3		
Total	584		665

Note. When all instances of *respon\** are removed, there are 443 feminine words.

## References

- Anker, Richard. 1997. "Theories of Occupational Segregation by Sex: An Overview." *International Labor Review* 136(3):315-339.
- Barber, A. E. (1998). *Recruiting employees: Individual and organizational perspectives*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Beck, E.M., Patrick M. Horan, and Charles M. Tolbert II. 1980. "Industrial Segmentation and Labor Market Discrimination." *Social Problems* 28(2):113-130.
- Behling, O., Labovitz, G., & Gainer, M. (1968). College recruiting: A theoretical basis. *Personnel Journal*, 47, 13–19.
- Bem, Sandra L. and Daryl J. Bem. 1973. "Does Sex-biased Job Advertising 'Aid and Abet' Sex Discrimination?" *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 3(1):6-18.
- Bielby, William T. and James N. Baron. 1986. "Men and Women at Work: Sex Segregation and Statistical Discrimination." *American Journal of Sociology* 91(4):759-799.
- Bix, Amy Sue. 2004. "From "Engineeresses" to "Girl Engineers" to "Good Engineers": A History of Women's U.S. Engineering Education." *NWSA Journal* 16(1):27-49.
- Born, Marise Ph. and Toon W. Taris. 2010. "The Impact of the Wording of Employment Advertisements on Student's Inclinations to Apply for a Job." *The Journal of Social Psychology* 150(5):485-502.
- Breaugh, J. A. (1992). *Recruitment: Science and practice*. Boston: PWSKent.
- Carli, Linda L. 1990. "Gender, Language, and Influence." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 59(5):941-951.
- Catalyst. *Catalyst Quick Take: Women in Male-Dominated Industries and Occupations in U.S. and Canada*. New York: Catalyst, 2013.
- Chapman, Derek S., Krista L. Uggerslev, Sarah A. Carroll, Kelly A. Piasentin, and David A. Jones. 2005. "Applicant Attraction to Organizations and Job Choice: A Meta-Analytic

- Review of the Correlates of Recruiting Outcomes.” *Journal of Applied Psychology* 90(5):928-944.
- Chase, Susan E. and Colleen S. Bell. 1990. “Ideology, Discourse, and Gender: How Gatekeepers Talk about Women School Superintendents.” *Social Problems* 37(2):163-177.
- Chodorow, N. (1978). *The reproduction of mothering: Psychoanalysis and sociology of gender*. Berkeley: University of California Press
- Corra, Mamadi and David Willer. 2002. “The Gatekeeper.” *Sociological Theory* 20(2):180-207.
- Deutsch, M. 2006. “A Framework for Thinking About Oppression and Its Change.” *Social Justice Research* 19:7-41.
- Dinnerstein, D. (1977). *The mermaid and the minotaur: Sexual arrangements and human malaise*. New York: Harper & Row
- Drentea, Patricia. 1998. “Consequences of Women’s Formal and Informal Job Search Methods for Employment in Female-Dominated Jobs.” *Gender and Society* 12(3):321-338.
- Eagly, A. H. (1987). *Sex differences in social behavior: A social-role interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum
- eBIZMBA.com. 2012. *Top 15 Most Popular Job Websites*. <http://www.ebizmba.com/articles/job-websites>. 8 October 2012.
- England, Paula. 1992. *Comparable Worth: Theories and Evidence*. Hawthorne. Aldine de Gruyter, New York.
- England, Paula, Paul Allison, and Yuxiao Wu. 2006. “Does Bad Pay Cause Occupations to Feminize, Does Feminization Reduce Pay, and How Can We Tell With Longitudinal Data?” *Social Science Research* 36:1237-1256.



- Fernandez, Roberto M. and M. Lourdes Sosa. 2005. "Gendering the Job: Networks and Recruitment at a Call Center." *American Journal of Sociology* 111(3):859-904.
- Frehill, Lisa M. 1997. "Education and Occupational Sex Segregation: The Decision to Major in Engineering." *The Sociological Quarterly* 38(2):225-249.
- Gaucher, Danielle, Justin Friesen, and Aaron Kay. 2011. "Evidence that Gendered Wording in Job Advertisements Exists and Sustains Gender Inequality" *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 101(1):109-128.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and Women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press
- Gordon, David M. 1972. *Theories of Poverty and Underemployment*. Washington D.C.: D.C. Heath and Company.
- Gordon, David M., Richard Edwards, and Michael Reich. 1982. *Segmented Work Divided Workers*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Haas, Adelaide. 1979. "Male and Female Spoken Language Differences: Stereotypes and Evidence." *Psychological Bulletin* 86(3):616-626.
- Hanson, Susan and Geraldine Pratt. 1991. "Job Search and the Occupational Segregation of Women." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 81(2):229-253.
- Hochschild, Arlie. 1983. *The Managed Heart*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kanter, R.M. 1977. *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Kerekes, Julie A. 2006. "Winning an Interviewer's Trust in a Gatekeeping Encounter." *Language in Society* 35(1):27-57.
- Kmec, Julia A. 2005. "Setting Occupational Sex Segregation in Motion: Demand-Side Explanations of Sex Traditional Employment." *Work and Occupations* 32(3):322-354.

- Kmec, Julia. 2008. "The Process of Sex Segregation in a Gender-Typed Field: The Case of Male Nurses." *Sociological Perspectives* 51(2):259-279.
- Kohlstedt, Sally Gregory. 2004. "Sustaining Gains: Reflections on Women in Science and Technology in 20<sup>th</sup>-Century United States." *NWSA Journal* 16(1):1-26.
- Liben, Lynn S, Rebecca S. Bigler, and Holleen R. Krogh. 2002. "Language at Work: Children's Gendered Interpretations of Occupational Titles." *Child Development* 73(3):810-828.
- Marini, Margaret Mooney. 1989. "Sex Differences in Earnings in the United States." *Annual Review of Sociology* 15:343-380.
- Marini, Margaret Mooney. 1990. "Sex and Gender: What Do We Know?" *Sociological Forum* 5(1):95-120.
- Maume, David J. Jr. 2004. "Is the Glass Ceiling a Unique Form of Inequality?: Evidence From a Random-Effects Model of Managerial Attainment." *Work and Occupations* 31(2):250-274.
- Mencken, F. Carson and Idee Winfield. 1999. "Employer Recruiting and the Gender Composition of Jobs." *Sociological Focus* 32(2):201-220.
- Miller, J. B. (1976). *Toward a new psychology of women*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Moore, Dahlia. 1995. "Feminism and Occupational Sex Segregation." *International Journal of Sociology of the Family* 25(1):99-125.
- Morris, J. Andrew and Daniel C. Feldman. 1996. "The Dimensions, Antecedents, and Consequences of Emotional Labor." *The Academy of Management Review* 21(4):986-1010.
- Okamoto, Dina and Paula England. 1999. "Is There a Supply Side to Occupational Sex Segregation?" *Sociological Perspectives* 42(4):557-582.

- Powell, Gary N. 1987. "The Effects of Sex and Gender on Recruitment." *The Academy of Management Review* 12(4):731-743.
- Ransom, Michael R. 1990. "Gender Segregation by Field in Higher Education." *Research in Higher Education* 31(5):477-494.
- Reskin, Barbara. 1993. "Sex Segregation in the Workplace." *Annual Review of Sociology* 19:241-270.
- Ridgeway, Cecilia L. 1997. "Interaction and the Conservation of Gender Inequality: Considering Employment." *American Sociological Review* 62(2):218-235.
- Rynes, S. L. (1991). Recruitment, job choice, and post-hire consequences: A call for new research directions. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (2nd ed., Vol. 2, pp. 399–444). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Sidanius, J. and F. Pratto. 1999. *Social Dominance: An Intergroup Theory of Social Hierarchy and Oppression*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Skuratowicz, Eva and Larry W. Hunter. 2004. "Where Do Women's Jobs Come from? Job Resegregation in an American Bank." *Work and Occupations* 31:73-110.
- Steinberg, R.J. 2001. *Comparable Worth in Gender Studies*. In: Smelser, Neil J., Baltes, Paul B. (Eds.), *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*, vol. 4. Cambridge University Press, Oxford, pp. 2393-2397.
- U.S. Department of Labor. 2007. *Median Weekly Earnings of Full-time Wage and Salary Workers by Detailed Occupation and Sex*. <http://www.bls.gov/cps/cpsaat39.pdf>.18 February 2013.
- Wiersma, U. J. (1990). Gender differences in job attribute preferences: Work-home role conflict and job level as mediating variables. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, 231–243.

Williams, Christine L. 1989. *Gender Differences at Work: Women and Men in Nontraditional Occupations*. California: University of California Press.

### Biographical Information

Stephanie Mastromoro received her B.A. and M.A. in Sociology from the University of Texas at Arlington. She spent time as a tutor and graduate teaching assistant for the Sociology department and enjoyed working with students as both a peer and a mentor. Her research interests include gender and the workplace, as well as social stratification. Stephanie is currently employed as a Victim Services Coordinator with the Grand Prairie Police Department and works with victims of domestic violence. In the future, she intends to pursue her Ph.D. and further academic research.