

노동정책연구
2008. 제8권 제2호 pp.25-62
© 한국노동연구원

연구논문

Another Look at Affirmative Action : Voices of U.S. Beneficiaries

Haejin Kim*

Affirmative Action was designed to expand the equality notion from 'equality of opportunities' to 'equality of outcomes.' Regarding the equality vs. difference debate on women, it is based on the equality side. While Affirmative Action is appraised to enable more women to get into non-traditional occupations, it is also criticized of ignoring women's traits and making them imitate men. This paper, through voices of women in non-traditional occupations in the U.S., one group of beneficiaries of Affirmative Action, concludes as follows: The existence of women in nontraditional jobs in itself doesn't guarantee the equal status for these women. However, it does not lead to these women accepting and following male norms, either. For survival, these women use different strategies, some challenging the given distinction between masculinity and femininity. In the process, they deconstruct the masculine and feminine identities and reconstruct them. The voices of Affirmative Action beneficiaries in the U.S. shed light on a potential of Affirmative Action for building "equal and different" workplaces in Korea.

Keywords : Affirmative Action, equality, difference, women in non-traditional occupations, masculinity, femininity.

논문접수일 : 2008년 4월 22일, 심사의뢰일 : 2008년 5월 2일, 심사완료일 : 2008년 6월 23일

* School of Business, Sejong University(haejinkim@sejong.ac.kr).

I. Introduction

Affirmative Action was introduced in 2006 in Korea. It was a late start from international standards, which means that Korea has opportunities to learn from others' experiences for the successful implementation of Affirmative Action. In this regard, this paper tries to introduce experiences of U.S. women who were assumed to take benefits from Affirmative Action.

One of the aims of Affirmative Action in the U.S. was to integrate the sexes in the workplaces. Along the over forty years of Affirmative Action history in the U.S., there are some studies evaluating Affirmative Action (Hartmann, Ross, Ronnie Steinberg, Bergmann, and Padia, 1993; Kim, 1993; Simon, 1986; Bergmann, 1986). Most of them focus on its results in terms of the probability of female entering male-dominated occupations or change in gender wage gap. While recognizing these studies valuable, I think these studies miss another important point, the qualitative aspect in envisioning the possibilities and limitations of Affirmative Action from the eyes of beneficiaries.

Apart from the scholarly research, different opinions have been voiced by some women. One stream expresses positive evaluation of Affirmative Action: Affirmative Action gives women a chance to get a decent job. However, another stream indicates negative attitudes towards Affirmative Action; Affirmative Action gives disillusion that women can get equal status in the workplaces just by getting into male-dominant jobs. When you go after this split a little bit deeper, it is not hard to find out that this split mirrors the different views on Affirmative Action among feminists: the equality side vs. the difference side. This paper takes a look at Affirmative Action in this equality/difference context, but as having a potential of transcending the equality/difference dichotomy. There is still another view on Affirmative

Action by some women; Due to the stigma attached to Affirmative Action, women are not recognized as competent as men even with the same or better qualification for non-traditional jobs. This paper, however, doesn't include this view in the analysis since it is not thought as a feminist viewpoint.

What happened to women who got their jobs through Affirmative Action, especially in traditional male jobs? Do women who entered male-dominant occupations feel equal status, as the equality side argues? Are women in these jobs acculturated/masculinized once they enter, as the difference approach criticizes? What happens to their gender identity? From the experiences of these women, what possibilities and limitations could be extracted for Affirmative Action?

Since it is in the inception stage of implementation, Affirmative Action does not yet draw much debate in Korea. However, some complaints about Affirmative Action are sure to be raised after it gains visibility in the workplaces. Therefore, an effort to predict debates on Affirmative Action and integrate others' experiences will be useful for successful implementation in Korea.

II. Equality/Difference Debate

The public/private separation and its association with men/women have been modified with the capitalist demand for women in the labor force. Under the expanded notion of the public, to include economic activities, women who previously had been excluded from all public activities could participate in some selective economic activities 'publicly.'¹⁾ But this process was also the

1) 'Publicly' means that, even though women had always participated in economic activities, before this revised version of private/public definition, their activities were not recognized as 'public.'

process of structuring the gender relations of power and domination into the labor market (Ackelsberg and Shanley, 1997), positioning women as second-class workers as well as second-class citizens. Occupational sex segregation accompanied by wage gap is one of the most salient phenomena of the new labor market structure.

‘Family wage’ for men, the notion that men are primary providers of family, whereas women’s primary place is home, is one notion to support for the discrimination of occupational opportunity and wage against women. Because women are, first of all, mothers, they should be protected from some jobs, which usually pay decent wages. Even though this separation of men’s and women’s work changed its contents according to technology development and structural change of the economy, women’s lower wages and status has not improved much because pay is determined by who performs the work.²⁾

Many efforts have been made to improve women’s lower workplace status. These efforts can be classified around the equality/difference debate. There have been equality-side policies such as ‘equal pay for equal work’ and Affirmative Action, and difference-side ones like ‘comparable worth’ and protective labor legislation. ‘Equality’ has been one of the central concepts supporting the modern western society. Liberal individualism, “the view of the individual pictured as atomized and disconnected from the social relations that actually affect his or her choices and options” in Eisenstein's terms (1981: 114), promises equality of opportunity and freedom of choice as its core provisions. Under this view of the society, failure in using this equality of opportunity and freedom of choice is seen as an individual’s inadequacy or inability. Of course, women as a group were seen as inadequate and unable because their reproductive capacity was thought to be incompatible with the ability of reasoning and making decisions. For the early feminists including

2) Reskin and Roos (1990) shows that women’s inroads into some male jobs finally made these as female jobs, which was followed by the lowering of wages on those jobs.

John Stuart Mill (1869) and Mary Wollstonecraft (1792), however, this ‘equality of opportunity’ was a tool for advocacy of women's rights. A woman has the ability to reason if an equal opportunity, especially in education, is given, Wollstonecraft argued (1792). Even though she argued for equal opportunity for women in terms of their better roles as wives and mothers, equality of opportunity for women was a cry to drop all barriers preventing a woman from participating into the public activities.

This early equality concept supposed androgyny and proposed identical treatment between the sexes in the public sphere including the labor market, represented by ‘equality before the law’ or ‘equality of the procedure.’ This equality of opportunity has been substantiated by anti-discrimination laws around the workplaces. For example, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act in the U.S. prohibits any kind of discrimination on the basis of sex. But the limitation of this equality before the law was apparent from at least two points. First, it could be used to ignore biological differences between the sexes. The discrimination against pregnant women in employment was, at first, not seen as unlawful sex discrimination at the courts, because there was no counterpart for comparison, pregnant men. Next, equality of opportunity was blind to the fact that women were not at the same starting line with men because women were often deprived of opportunities to become as well qualified as men. Therefore, the equality of opportunity approach, the identical treatment, appeared to reinforce women's inequality rather than marching for their equality (Jaggar, 1990).

Some approaches to overcome these limitations were taken by expanding the equality notion. Women's biological differences, pregnancy for example, were treated in the same way as other disabilities at the workplaces, through the Family and Medical Leave Act. To correct disadvantages at the starting line, the preferential treatment was tried to ensure that women's opportunities were genuinely equal with men's. Affirmative Action is a representative example of

this kind. By setting up a timetable to correct past under-representation of certain groups, women in this instance, Affirmative Action expands equality to include the ‘equality of outcome’; Affirmative Action leads disadvantaged groups to achieve their fair representation through temporary preferential treatment. However, the equality approach, even with its expanded meaning, is criticized for its individual basis, grounded in liberalism. It tends to ignore the disadvantageous burden of women who take that opportunity (dual work at home and at workplace, for example) and their unique experiences and characteristics, either from biological or psychological differences from men. As a result, it makes women follow male norms. In short, the equality approach does not challenge the public/private separation, the basis of liberalism (Kessler-Harris, 1987).

The early ‘difference’ emphasis about women at the workplaces was shown in the protective labor legislation. It was based on the recognition that women's reproductive capacity had to be socially respected and protected because it was the process of supplying the future citizens and workers to the society. Protective labor legislation, which limited working hours for women, regulated women's night work, prohibited women from lifting heavy weights, and outlawed women's employment in certain jobs, gave women some short-term benefits by protecting them from excessive exploitation in the workplaces, especially in the early stage of industrial development. It, however, had its price. In the longer term, the protective labor legislation reinforced sex stereotypes and segregation in the labor market, depriving women of opportunities for men-occupied good jobs, and thus, contributed to lower wages in women-crowded occupations (Kessler-Harris, 1982; McCann, 1994).

While the restrictions by the protective labor legislation were based on the biological differences, a number of feminists later began to view difference in a broader way. They recognized women's reproductive capacity not as a disability but as a uniquely valuable potential. It is argued that this ability

gives rise to characteristically feminine ways of perceiving and dealing with the world, in moral or psychoanalytic terms, as in Gilligan's (1982). According to this approach, femininity has to be valorized to be fairly compared with masculinity. At the workplaces, the comparable worth (or pay equity) movement, which aimed to valorize traditional women's jobs and, thus, women's characteristics, is one example of this approach. Instead of masculinizing women by sex integration at the workplaces, feminine characteristics in most female jobs should be revalued, and women in female jobs should get paid according to their worth or value to firms or to the society. While equality approaches like Affirmative Action are individualistic, this valorization is collective, having some potential of influencing more women. More than that, this difference approach could be radical in that it "challenges individualism, competition, and the profit system" (Kessler-Harris, 1987: 536), the very foundation of the patriarchal society. By bringing valuable women's qualities like responsibility and cooperation, and their needs such as childcare, flextime, and extended parental leave into workplaces, this view argues, the difference position challenges the separation of private/public spheres (Kessler-Harris, 1987). This approach, however, has some problems.

Essentialism is one of the most common criticisms of this difference approach. Are those needs and values, which have been socially ascribed to women, more central than any other needs and values of women? How much of these feminine values are unique to women's biological or/and experiential differences, and how much are stereotyped by the masculine society to justify its domination? Is the women's essence ahistorical, immune to change? Doesn't the emphasis on sex differences have a danger of legitimating and reinforcing the existing, gendered social structure by forgetting the fact that differences are not just biological or psychological, but by-products of gender oppression through the history? In addition, the difference approach is not sensitive to differences among women. By emphasizing women's common differences from

men, it considers other differences among women as secondary in the formation of their gender identity. Other factors such as class, race, and sexuality, however, are interrelated with sex to produce an individual's identity in different ways to differently situated women.

It can be summarized that different approaches, from the equality and the difference sides, have been employed to improve women's lower status in the workplaces. The equality side tries to do it by integrating occupations, especially by getting more women into traditional male occupations. Affirmative Action is a representative policy. This approach assumes that sex integration of occupations with the same treatment between women and men solves workplace sex inequality, without consideration of the presence of strong men-centered workplace norms. On the other hand, the difference side criticizes this approach in the following reasons. First, Affirmative Action is based on individualism, thus, failing, in itself, to collectively challenge the male-dominant structure as the standard norms at the workplaces. Rather, Affirmative Action leads to reinforce the existing male norms those women should follow to be equal. Second, working in integrated occupations, which is a main goal of Affirmative Action, cannot be a desirable solution to women's inferior status at the workplaces. Instead, the difference side approaches to the problem by re-evaluating women's traditional occupations, exemplified by the comparable worth movement. Women fit better into some occupations than other occupations, based on their biological or psychological differences from men. Then women don't have to enter occupations that don't fit well. The goal should be to fairly evaluate female and male jobs, with eventual results of getting equal treatment (pay) for work of equal worth regardless of occupational segregation. This approach, according to the difference side, will lead to making female work norms and valuing them as highly as male norms in the workplaces, thus breaking down the dominance of male-centered patriarchal structure.

Which position is true in reality, regarding Affirmative Action? Do women who entered male-dominant occupations feel like first-class workers, as the equality side argues? Are women who got into nontraditional jobs through Affirmative Action confined to masculine, individual limits, as the difference side criticizes? Or do they go through other experiences? The answer might depend on the context, a situation where women interact with male coworkers or workplace practices. It means that we should see Affirmative Action in the contingent and specific text, not just from a theoretical perspective. It is the purpose of this paper to examine the Affirmative Action policy through the eyes of women in nontraditional jobs. This could be a step for “the contextual, situated analysis” (Rhode, 1990: 8) of policies towards women, shedding light on the real experiences from the beneficiaries.

III. Methods

While many scholars argue about who get most benefits from Affirmative Action, black men or white professional women, my focus is put on the lower-class (in job classification) women, who are rarely regarded as its beneficiaries. This focus can give insight to Affirmative Action’s deeper effects on the existing workplace gender structure and women most affected by it. Therefore, women in traditional male jobs are subjects of this study. A qualitative approach to identifying issues these women face at the workplaces and their reactions to the issues is employed, which provides text for grounded themes in the analysis.

The already published interviews of women in these nontraditional occupations are used as this study’s text. This includes Mary Lindenstien Walshok’s 3-year panel interviews with 86 women in nontraditional blue-collar jobs, which provide rich data on these women from their childhood to

relationships at nontraditional work (1981). Jean Reith Schroedel's book also shows the stories of 25 women in nontraditional blue-collar jobs in the Seattle area by topics like feminism, race, unions, etc (1985). Susan Ehrich Martin gives the cases of policewomen on patrol through her participant observation and interviews with 28 female and 27 male police officers, 13 sergeants, one lieutenant, and the district inspector in the Metropolitan Police Department of Washington D.C. (1980). Christine L. Williams provides the cases of women in the Marine Corps. Her work is based on 68 formal interviews with women in the military, six interviews with military men, and survey results from 52 participants (1989). From now on, women in nontraditional jobs refer to those studied by these authors.

There are explicit remarks by the authors or many of the women interviewed that equal employment policies, including Affirmative Action, played an important role in getting them into nontraditional jobs.

Most [of the women studies] were also employed as a result of equal employment requirements. (Walshok, 1981: 237)

I know I just got this job because they have government contracts so they have to hire a certain percentage of women, but I looked for a job for five weeks, you know, before I got this job, and nobody wanted to hire me. It was pretty clear, like I went into a lot of shops and since they don't have government contracts they can get around not hiring women - they certainly did. Also I was fresh out of welding school, I mean most of them probably wouldn't have hired a young man with, you know, no experience. [A woman in nontraditional job (Walshok, 1981: 241)]

Without this [anti-discrimination law] and subsequent laws, affirmative action, which allowed women to gain entry into non-traditional blue-collar work, would never have come into existence, and few of the women who tell their stories here could have obtained these jobs. (Schroedel, 1985: 5)

This was in nineteen seventy-four and I made the connection in my head;

this was when equal rights was beginning to be talked about, and I knew that people with federal contracts had to start hiring minorities. The blacks were beginning to tell a lot about not being hired to work on the Kingdome [Seattle's domed stadium]. With all the federal money on this project, they were discriminating still. And the same was true of women.

So I went down to a sand and gravel company that I knew had the Kingdome contract and also Freeway Park. That's two federally funded things, and I knew they needed a woman. So I walked in and said, "I'd like to learn to drive."

They said, "Yeah, fine, on your own time." [Mary Rathke, a steel hauler (Schroedel, 1985: 8-9)]

Another legal change benefitting policewomen was the passage of the Crime Control Act of 1973. Pursuant to the 1973 act and the LEAA (Law Enforcement Assistance Administration funds) established a new set of Equal Employment Opportunity guidelines that required major recipient agencies to assess their recruiting and hiring practices, analyze promotion and training procedures, formulate an equal employment opportunity program, and file it with the state planning agency through which most of its monies are disbursed. (Martin, 1980: 45-46)

Therefore, it is reasonable to suppose that most of these women are beneficiaries of Affirmative Action. These interviews were done in late 1970s and early 1980s, ten something years after the introduction of Affirmative Action in the U.S.. This period seems perfect for this study in that it is about time for people to detect its impact on workplace changes and formulate their opinions on Affirmative Action.

In using the interview contents, this study focuses on the following research questions. How do the women in nontraditional jobs perceive the work they do? Which women are attracted to nontraditional jobs? What difficulties do they face in male-dominated workplace? How do they react to these difficulties? Answering to these questions, this study tries to figure out common themes among women studied and identify and analyze representative remarks for each theme. The focuses of the original authors are different;

Schoredel (1985) accounts for personal techniques of dealing with the conflict between being a woman and being “one of the guys,” and Williams emphasizes the maintenance and reproduction of gender identity. None of the authors, however, analyzes their interviews with the equality/difference scheme. Furthermore, the authors don’t share similar interpretations on all issues. Therefore, this study interprets the text on its own within the equality/difference frame.

There could be some limitations to these methods. First, without first-hand interviews, all of the data were already selected by the authors, which might contain a danger of the authors’ not showing the whole contents of interviews. However, this possible selection bias could be reduced, at least partly, through triangulation from different authors, as employed by this study.

Second, since the units from which interview samples were drawn are different, possible influential variables on these women’s experiences such as a firm’s human resource policies, presence of unions, or presence of women’s support groups can not be included in the analysis. For example, Martin (1980) and Williams (1989) did interviews in one big organization, respectively, while others interviewed women in traditional male jobs across firms. This makes it impossible to include the firm’s human resource practices as an influential factor. All other authors except Schroedel (1985) rarely mention presence of unions or women’s support group.

Third, because of the very nature of qualitative methods, findings from this study could not be generalized to all women in nontraditional jobs. Nonetheless, at least, this study could lead to more comprehensive understanding of Affirmative Action.

The fourth limitation can come from different schemes of Affirmative Action in the U.S. and Korea. In the U.S., the decision on under-representation of a protected group by an organization is made on the basis of the group’s ratio among a potential labor pool for a specific occupation. In contrast, the same

decision is on the basis of the group's ratio in other similar organizations in Korea. When considered from this study's focus, this difference can mean that, in Korea, the effect of Affirmative Action on getting more women in traditional male occupations is likely to be smaller than in the U.S.. Nonetheless, this effect is still an important focus for the Affirmative Action research, since reducing occupational sex segregation is one of the major goals of Affirmative Action in Korea, too.

IV. Masculine Workplace and the Lives of Women in Nontraditional Jobs

To see the possibilities and limitations of Affirmative Action, it would be a way to understand what women face in nontraditional jobs and how they react to them.

1. Masculinity in Male-dominated Occupations

How do women in nontraditional jobs perceive the characteristics of the work they do?

Um, it's important to me. I have to have a sense of accomplishment or a sense that I'm actually contributing. [An electronics mechanic (Walshok, 1981: 141)]

I've really learned a lot about how to solve problems I mean, that's like a lot of what fixing cars is about, is that you get the symptoms of a problem and you have to figure out where it comes from and what you can do to make it go away. Working with my hands, being able to see the results of my labors is the kind of satisfaction I need to keep doing it day after day. It's also never the same. I mean I could do a thousand tune-ups, but each one is

different…… It's not like being on the assembly line where you punch the same rivets day after day. [An auto mechanic (Walshok, 1981: 143-144)]

As a job, one of the good things about it is that I don't have anyone breathing down my neck all the time. I'm by myself all day and make my decisions about where I'm going to go next and what I'm going to next. [An office machine repairperson (Walshok, 1981: 148)]

The sense of accomplishment, continuous challenge, independence, and autonomy are almost common themes among many women in nontraditional occupations. As expected, these traits are terms usually linked to masculinity. These masculine traits are attached to male-dominated jobs even though these jobs are not providing such merits fully.

[People who become machinists, a lot of them] like, you know, to do things on their own. And do it their way and have it a certain way and …… it comes from that craft mentality of, like, making a part from beginning to end but what has happened is that they only now do a certain operation in the job so instead of it - robbed them of the …… satisfaction that they could take out of doing their work. And so, a lot of people just do it, what they have to do, and get out and some people still work very hard. [Sandra Wong, an engine lathe operator in a steel mill (Walshok, 1981: 27)]

Why, then, have occupational sex segregation and attachment of different connotations to male- and female- dominated jobs been maintained and cherished? First, as generally recognized, by identifying higher pay and status jobs with masculinity, men could exclude women, potential competitors, from male-dominated occupations. Just with the label of 'a man's job,' men can get an economic premium. This economic aspect is the most important reason pointed out by almost all women studied who held 'a man's job,' and, at the same time, a reason for the battle of who would get better-paid tasks between women and men on these jobs.

Good money. In fact, that's a big plus factor. When I get really discouraged,

I think where else am I gonna make this kind of money. Because even though it's not that skilled a job and essentially I'm outside being a janitor, I'm getting \$3.89 an hour.

That's very good. I look in the papers and what do they offer? - \$2.50. And I've worked sometimes at what I consider a skilled job - well, receptionist or secretary, and they start off at \$2.50. And I started at \$3.89 right off. That's not fair but that's because it's a man's job, too (Walshok, 1981: 138).

But the office never have us gals the opportunity, and we didn't realize it until we got to talking together. Then we women found out none of us had gone on some of the runs. Most of the runs they haven't sent us on are the higher-paying runs, because you get paid more in Alaska and the North Strait, and just because those runs consistently have more overtime, which is a big thing for us. And a lot of times it came down to working that run or not working for a month. [Beth Gedney, a tugboat mate (Schroedel, 1985: 241)]

The economic aspect, better pay and job security, however, is not all for this masculine identification of these jobs. As Williams mentions, "[j]ob segregation by sex allows men to maintain their masculinity in contradistinction to femininity. Men have historically used the occupational realm to establish and affirm their essential difference from - and personal sense of superiority over - women" (1989: 133). This sense of superiority over women might be more needed for men on lower-status jobs like blue-collar, police, or military jobs, because it could be the last fortress of superiority for most men at these jobs with few alternative social statuses available. This masculinity as superiority is stated by some men in these jobs and observed by many pioneering women.

War is man's work. Biological convergence on the battlefield would not only be dissatisfying in terms of what women could do, but it would be an enormous psychological distraction for the male who wants to think that he's fighting for that woman somewhere behind, not up there in the same foxhole with him. It tramples the male ego. When you get right down to it, you have to protect the manliness of war. [General William Barrows, former Marine

Corps commandant (Williams, 1989: 9-10)]

Why did the women choose this job? I don't know. I have respect for policewomen but they should do a less demanding job than they do here. Sure there's some stuff that women can do like type, but they shouldn't jump into fights or be on murders or cutting scenes with naked bodies and blood. I don't know how their husbands put up with it. It takes his masculinity away when a woman is trying to do a man's job. [A police officer (Martin, 1980: 93)]

For a woman to survive in the trades, you really have to know how to psych out men, know what's behind their thinking, why they react, why they're prejudiced, be somewhat sympathetic, yet stand your own ground. You have to be tactful, not be hostile, not alienate people. You really have to learn professional survival skills, because men's masculinity is threatened by you being there. Society recognizes construction workers as being very macho and virile. When a woman comes along who's five foot three and a hundred and twenty pound and can get in there and do their type of work, it's a blow to their ego, a real shock. So the men are threatened by it. [Elaine Canfield, a carpenter (Schroedel, 1985: 38)]

It is noticeable from above that getting into men's jobs by women means more than just a competition for more decent jobs. It's a challenge to masculinity, the very male ego. Then, which women are attracted to these male-dominated jobs beyond the social acceptance of gender-appropriate occupations?

2. The Women Who are Attracted to Male-dominated Jobs

As for pioneering women in nontraditional jobs, Walshok (1981) stresses the importance of these women's somewhat unique situations; their tomboyishness since childhood, independent experiences when young, the presence of strong woman role model, etc.

I was - as they say - a tomboy. When I was little I was jus' like a tomboy - you could see me climb trees, play softball. That's what I mostly did, play softball, I love to play softball. I could play that all day long - all summer long as long as it was light. I would play that an' jacks, an' I like to run a lot. Oh, what do you call it - hide an' seek or run and go one, two three, red light - an' things like that - marbles. I used to play a lot of marbles. An' even in high school I wore pants. I wore a lot of pants, my brothers' pants because like it would snow, or if the weather was cold an' it would be snowing and you had to wear pants a lot - snow boot. I didn't date much - let me see - high school? No, not in high school, I might have had one boyfriend in high school, I'm the type of person that I - I consider myself mature. [Wnada Hellman, a welder (Walshok, 1981: 92)]

While we were growing up, my mother sort of took on a workingman's role, she went to work, came home and sacked out, and we worked to clean the house, make dinner. The three of kids really took on the role of a housewife, we cooked, cleaned the house. We did grocery shopping, laundry, and stuff like that.

I always felt incredibly independent. I only had one parent in some ways I didn't have any parents, it was like - it was clear to me that I had much more freedom and liberty than other kids did. If I wasn't going to be home until five I didn't have to call. I could go over to one of my friends and not call and none of my friends had that liberty. And I earned my own money. I got an allowance. But I had to do a lot of work pertaining to housework and if we didn't do that work we got our allowance docked. That was always the threat. [Polly Nichols (Walshok, 1981: 47)]

I always knew it was possible 'cause there were women around me who had done such things. You know, I was surrounded by, like, independent women when I was a youngster. There was a woman in my hometown who during World War II had been the president of the auto mechanics union - a friend of my folks - and um, other women in my family have been independent in different sorts of ways in more traditional ways but very strong and, ah, just I've always had the impression that if you want something you go after it, you work and you get it, you know, you don't take no for an answer you just do it till it's done and then you're largely responsible for your own reality - whatever it is. And that's what I wanted and so I went after it. [Jan Spencer, the chief mechanic (Walshok, 1981: 71)]

On the contrary, Schroedal (1985) has a finding that there wasn't any specific type of women, say a tomboy for example, who were most attracted to non-traditional blue-collar work. Martin (1980) about policewomen on patrol, and Williams (1989) about women in the Marine Corps, also describe their interviewees as ordinary women. They indicated, through the fact that many chose these jobs by chance or for better wages with which they can support themselves and their kids, that women in nontraditional jobs are just like others in women's jobs.

I didn't even know it existed. It was all by chance that I got into this particular thing. I had no idea what I'd be doing. I'd heard a lot about the chances for women to be able to advance and work in civil service jobs and the benefits that civil service offers, and the pay that the job started at was better than I had ever made before, so I decided to try an apprenticeship. [A woman in nontraditional job (Walshok, 1981: 138)]

I had no what I would call marketable skills and I realized that for the rest of my life, if I had no marketable skills, I'd be down on the bottom of the job market, making at the most three dollars an hour. This is not where it's at. So that was the major turning point as far as my career. Being pregnant was a big turning point. I had a job as a machinist and that kind of gave me a start on thinking about marketable skills and what I could do with my life and how I could support my kid. [A self-employed plumber (Walshok, 1981: 103-104)]

The only thing I really loved was working with the children, the relationship between you and the children. What *disliked* I was the pay, which was eighty dollars a month and room, and having to deal with the parents. [Laura Pfandler, a pipefitter (Schroedel, 1985: 19)]

Then, how can we interpret these different findings about the characteristics of women in nontraditional jobs? The difference can come from the authors having different ideas on these women; 'What are the factors for pioneering women to succeed on nontraditional jobs?' versus 'how does the work structure

reinforce gendering in a certain way?’ This paper sees it in another way, the instability of gender identity of women in nontraditional occupations. In this regard, instability means neither that these women are genderless, nor that they have both gender identities equally. What it really means in this study is that the form of their existence as women in men's jobs doesn't fit into the social norms of femininity and masculinity. This lack-of-fit feeling might make these women emphasize ‘masculine terms’ in some times, and ‘femininity’ in others. In the next section, it is examined how instability in gender identity is structured and strengthened among women in nontraditional jobs.

3. Sufferings and Reactions of Women in Nontraditional Jobs

How did women meet all masculine work culture at men's jobs? Here are some typical situations women experience on these jobs.

It's a form of harassment every time I pick up a sledgehammer and that prick laughs at me, you know. It's a form of harassment when a journeyman is supposed to be training me and it's real clear to me that he does not want to give me any information whatsoever. He does not want me to be there at all, and you know, like that happened like my first thirty days. They put me with this one who is a lunatic - I mean, he's really a case and he's the one who drilled the hole in my arm and he did not want to work with me at all. It's a form of harassment to me when the working foreman puts me in a dangerous situation and tells me to do something in an improper way and then tells me, Oh, you can't do that! It's a form of harassment to me when someone takes a tool out of my hand and said, Oh, I'm going to show you. I'll show you how to do this, and he grabs the sledgehammer from my hand and he proceeded to try to show me how to do this thing you know, straighten up a post it's nothing to it, you just bang it and it gets straight and he lost the sledgehammer. It's a form of harassment to me when they call me honey and I have to tell them every day, don't call me that, you know, I have a name printed right on my thing. I stopped talking to them. They don't call me by my name I don't talk to them. Ah, you know. It's

all a form of harassment to me. It's not right. They don't treat each other that way. They shouldn't treat me that way. It's a form of harassment to me when this one asks me to go out with him all the time. You know, all this kind of stuff. It's terrible. [A welder (Walshok, 1981: 221-222)]

I guess the supervisor decided he was not getting rid of the women fast enough, so he asked us to do more and more. The lead man tried to intimidate us by saying that we had to do more, we had to hurry up, we had to speed up even though I was working as fast as I could. To him it was never good enough. Then they started giving me much heavier jobs. After awhile I began to have physical problems, especially when I was lifting heavier objects. Many of the parts I could barely move, let alone be lifting all day. Because of that I ended up have surgery on my right hand. [Lydia Vasquez, a machine operator (Schroedel, 1985: 106)]

I tried to get promoted, to get moved, but they'd give it to someone else. I was training guys who get the better jobs I'd been denied! So I wrote this lengthy letter. This lengthy letter explaining exactly my perception of what had happened over the past thirteen months. And I sent it to the General and I sent a few copies around. And I quit. I just left there. It was just I was, I felt, entirely invisible and I felt lonely, real lonely at that job. [Ann Baker (Walshok, 1981: 202)]

When I first made fitter, the helpers were really pissed and angry that they were going to have to work with me. There was a lot of talk about having to work for a woman, to take orders from a woman. Some of them came right out in saying I didn't know what I was doing. One guy said, "You can't tell me 'cause you don't know what you're doing." I was told they didn't wanna take orders from a woman. And there was one man marching around telling everybody that he wasn't gonna have to work with me because he was too important to have to work for a woman. At the beginning I used my supervisor to back me up with the helpers. Depending on my mood, I sometimes told 'em it was too bad if they didn't wanna work with a woman because I didn't want to work with them either. Others I told to sit in the truck while I did the job. [Laura Pfandler, a pepfitter (Schroedel, 1985: 23)]

In the engine room I worked under the first assistant engineer. He was a bright, energetic man who had a thing about women - liked them socially,

but basically, I think to be very honest, did not like them at all as people. He was extraordinarily offensive to me and used to make comments about my breasts being small. At one point he said to me that he didn't know I had a hysterectomy. Somebody, I guess, had told him about that, and he then proceeded to go into great detail about how he had noticed most women walk a little funny a few days out of the month, and he had noticed that I didn't walk funny. Then he started talking about how amazing it was that some women could fit two Tampaxes, one right on top of the other, in there and wasn't that an extraordinary thing. I replied that I was not in the least interested in discussing female genitalia with him in any way, shape, or form. He later approached me to come up to his room and play my fiddle for him and asked me to give him a kiss. I ignored him. There were comments like that going on all of the time on the ship. [Teresa Selfe, a sailor (Schroedel, 1985: 84)]

And when I would walk up the aisles they would make wise cracks about what they would like to do. I just kept on walkin' and pretended I didn't hear 'em. It made me feel trampy. That's because I was a black girl. I'm sure you've never experienced this before, but the white men think that they can take advantage of a black woman. They think that she'd be proud to be with a white man. That's true. But I don't want no white man. I love my own black people. That's what I feel. [Katie Murray, a sheet metal worker (Schroedel, 1985: 134-135)]

From being totally ignorant of how to interact with women to rejecting to train women trainees, discriminating against women in job assignment and promotion, refusing to be supervised by women, and harassing women at work, there are lots of means used by men (coworkers and supervisors) to discourage women from nontraditional jobs. As all of the authors say, a man is accepted as a fellow if he does not prove otherwise. But women have to prove themselves competent to be accepted in a work society. Acceptance in a work group is very important especially in blue-collar, police, and military jobs where the traditional journeyman-apprentice relationship and inner-group bond are still quite strong.

Then, facing the horrible experiences, how are women reacting to survive in nontraditional occupations? From the interviews of these women, some seem to take an equality-side approach and others a difference-side approach. This, sometimes, results in the conflict among women around the survival strategy on these jobs.

Equality side

These guys are big, heavy, burly construction guys, you know, they're machismos, they're not delicate. Look at my physique. I can do it. It's not a big male-female thing, it's really just a question of who's big and heavy and strong. I mean, the beef runs it. You know, if you've got a female beef they can do it. But there ain't too many of 'em I can put out the amount of work as one of those smaller gentlemen do. You know. But, I'm smart, and I'm crafty, so I've carried my weight as one of the heavier gentlemen do. [Ardath Hoover in a utility company (Walshok, 1981: 224-225)]

When I first started, guys were always saying, "May I help you? I'll give you a hand," so that is what I would call a little special treatment. I'd say no way. Then they'd go, "What are you, some type of woman's libber or something?" I'd say, "No - I don't need any help - I can do it - this is my job - I don't want people to play favorites or anything else. It's my job - I can handle it." They go, "You must really be a woman's libber" - I'm not a woman's libber - I just kind of let them know it's my job and I didn't want guys ganging around waiting to help me do something. It was important to let them see I could handle the job. Sometimes you wish they would treat you a little more equal and not so helpless sometimes. [A women in production control (Walshok, 1981: 217)]

I believe that women cannot handle themselves under that much stress. If they allowed us to go in [to combat], all they'd be doing is killing half our population. I believe that only one out of five or six women will be able to shoot back if someone is shooting at them. They would just freeze under pressure and forget how to pull the trigger, forget how to load the weapon.

How about yourself?

I believe I could handle it. I love shooting weapons. I've always been

a real tough go-getter. I myself could handle it because I've always been really good under stress. And I could pretty much outdo any other guy in the same situation. [A woman marine (Williams, 1989: 84-85)]

In p.t. women got off easier but four women in my class refused to accept different standards for women. We proved we could keep up with the standards they expected for the men. We refused to hang back in running. The recruits had to run a mile a day. The women pretended they couldn't run it, that they were feeble. They said they couldn't keep the pace so they were allowed to run behind. We thought, "that's a bunch of crap." I felt that if I could do it, and I was smoking a pack a day, there was no reason any other women couldn't keep up with me Every one of them should have been able to. [a policewoman (Martin, 1980: 119)]

In some ways the ERA had ruined it because there's a lot of women out there that bitch and bitch that they're not getting paid as much as the guys, or they wanna do a guy's job. A lot of these women ruin it for the women who really deserve it. When they get the job, they turn around and say, "Well, I can't do this. Will you do this for me?" That infuriates the guys and I can't blame them, but everybody deserves a chance. That's all I want - if I can do the job, why not give it to me?" [Laura Sarvis, a sawyer/bench worker (Schroedel, 1985: 179)]

Difference side

Why can't we be a little different from the guy? Just because we look a little neater out there doesn't mean it takes away from our job or what we do. The men say, "they want everything around here" when women asked for some changes in the uniform but everything now is for the men. We wear men's shirts, hats, and ties. It won't take away from our job performance to have a neat-looking uniform. [A police woman (Martin, 1980: 133)]

The fact, being a woman, I don't know whether it would have been as easy for a younger woman than at my age. Because, see, I have the motherly image, you know, and they want Mom to make good Every once in a while when they came up with "The woman's place is in the home" type thing, and then they just egg me on because they know that I'll take the female part, I'll have

to defend womanhood (Walshok, 1981: 213)

Dan, who was my boss for a long time in the second cook's station, is a very funny man because not a lot of people get along with him. He's an Englishman - and he doesn't approve of women in the kitchen and he's very open about it. He doesn't necessarily think they should be home, you know He has sort of taken this father image with me. And he protects me like when this guy out in the Dutch kitchen gives me a hard time - Dan is always there to take care of it if I can't. [Erin Kelly, a chef's apprentice (Walshok, 1981: 218)]

I like being around men 'cause, if nothing else, it sharpens your feminine skills. When you're around a man, you may be aggressive to a certain pint, but there will also be times when you're going to turn on the charm to get what you want. If you need help doing something, if you need a favor, it's easier to get a favor from a man than a woman. It's not necessarily taking something from them. It's just using a bit of feminine charm. Not all women can do it. [A drill instructor in the Marine Corps (Williams, 1989: 77)]

Anyway, it was wintertime and I had just discovered I was pregnant, and I was already four months along and feeling very sorry for myself, when my boss sent me out on that job. And I stomped upstairs, up to the big boss, and I said, "Well, I'm not doing that job anymore, blah, blah, blah, because I'm pregnant. Aid if I lose this baby it's gonna be your fault!" In fact, they practiced reverse discrimination and put me on an easier job than I had been doing. They didn't create the job for me. Hauling scrap, which is a bit easier, had to be done anyway. And nobody got bent out of shape about my doing it steadily. The guy I bumped from the job didn't care. They're all nice guys, real understanding. They did tease me about working so far into my pregnancy. [Mary Rathke, a steel hauler (Schroedel, 1985: 16-17)]

Then, which women, on the equality side or the difference side, could be said to follow the male norms at the workplace? I think none. This is because of the inconsistent perception and requirement of male norms towards women in nontraditional jobs. The male norms, on the one hand, insist on women's equal competence at work, including physical requirements. However, at the

same time, they don't want to recognize women's competence for men's masculine ego. Men want women to remain as inferior, subordinate beings in the name of femininity. In this situation, women who take equality strategy suffer from having to prove their competence with more efforts than men make to be accepted on equal basis. Because this challenges the very male ego of superiority, however, they are ignored or, if accepted, labeled as non-feminine, thus as failing women. On the other hand, women who take difference strategy are blamed for not being competent and subjected to contempt and teasing as a trade-off of being treated as women. In short, because the existence of women in nontraditional jobs itself is a challenge to masculinity, these women, regardless of which strategy they take, could not fit the male norms.

The inconsistent male norms in male-dominated jobs cause instability of gender identity among women on these jobs. Almost none of these women deny their female identity. However, they have difficulties in finding the balance point between masculinity and femininity in their lives. Only some find it in the workplace.

My dad works over at Bangor in the ammunition depot, so I asked him what it would be like working with all men. The only thing he told me was if I was gonna work with a lot of men, that I would have to listen to swear words and some of the obscene things, but still act like a lady, or I'd never fit in. You can still be treated like a lady and *act* like a lady and work like a man. So just tried to fit in. It's worked, too. The guys come up and they'll tell me jokes and tease me and a lot of them told me that I'm just like one of the guys. Yet they like to have me around because I wear make-up and I do curl my hair, and I try to wear not really frilly blouses, see-through stuff, but nice blouses. [Nora Quealey, a truck assembly line worker (Schroedel, 1985: 92)]

Although I was a tomboy as a little girl, when I reached maturity, the most important thing was to be a lady, first and above all and this job drains you of that because you have to come up aggressive and take command in situations. Some women naturally can fluctuate between that and femininity, others have to make themselves be aggressive when they put on the uniform. It is *not*

a womanly feeling to strap a gun on my hip. It's an everyday battle to be feminine. You can't be feminine on this job and be effective. …… That's why it is important to me to wear make-up and earrings. …… I don't want to be looked at as a man but as a woman. I like being a woman. Many people think the women in positions like this are staunch women's libbers but that is not the case with the majority of us. [A policewoman (Martin, 1980: 197)]

Others find a way by setting aside their femininity for outside the workplace.

It took a long time to think of myself as a woman and as a truck driver. The two did not combine for a long time. At home you want to be able to do beautiful things, you want to look pretty, and to have clean nails. You want to be able to sew beautiful things and have pretty flowers in your house. You want to feel like a woman. You want to feel like you can be in a relationship and be a normal woman in a relationship. The job makes you feel sort of hardened. You gotta have your guts up to par, you've gotta go for it, you gotta go fast. It's a real grind-it-out type of thing. At home I want just the opposite type of thing - things that have always been part of my life. But they've kinda slid away. I feel like this job takes away my creativity, zaps it away. I need a week off before I can even think of making something pretty. [Marge Kirk, a concrete-truck driver (Schroedel, 1985: 161)]

But sometimes I miss being able to look like a woman. There's a purpose behind the way I dress. I don't dress to work at a fashion show, but I mean it isn't glamorous and there are times I'd like to dress up. That would be the one thing about work that I don't like. It's hard to relate to other women about what I do. I get tired of getting stared at in department stores when I go in with my grubby jeans and my flannel shirt and my steel-toed shoes. They kind of look at you like, "What in the world?" It's a whole different attitude.

As soon as I walk in the door at work it's like I'm not any sex at all. It's no sex at all. It doesn't matter if I'm a man or a woman. I'm a machinist. I can do the work. The guys look at me, not because I'm a woman, but because I'm a machinist. And that feels real good. [Amy Kelley, a machinist (Schroedel, 1985: 130)]

Any way they take, it is sure that they're suffering from the instability of their gender identity. The situation seems more difficult for homosexual

women.

This whole situation was very difficult for me for many reasons. Until I came out I had a terrifically hard time dealing with my own conscience because I was not being honest about my sexuality, and that was difficult because I had been an active, functioning homosexual for a while. It was hard for me to be in a situation where I had to shut up about it. …… After the first time out I decided to come out. It was easier to live with myself. Then I was ignored - hostilely ignored, but ignored. That wasn't such a difficult situation because I am moderately accustomed to negative reactions from people. [Teresa Selfe, a sailor (Schroedel, 1985: 85-86)]

There are also some women who advance from suffering to trying to change the masculine work culture itself with success in some cases, others in vain.

As a helper you don't have a whole lot of power, but some things have to be dealt with. I used to try and explain how abusive dirty magazines were to women. Finally one day we were workin' out in the middle of Rainier Avenue and this young man, who had been hassling me ever since I started, was standing around with the other guys looking at a dirty magazine. I think it might have been Playboy because it had a center foldout. They were all giggling and brought it over to me. I said, "I've had enough of this shit," and pulled the centerfold out of the magazine and burnt it up with a cigarette lighter. That kind of stopped that, and as new people would come in they would get the story, so I didn't have to deal with a lot of that afterwards. [Laura Pfandler, a pipefitter (Schroedel, 1985: 20)]

The union hasn't been much better. They didn't want me in and the big-wigs haven't given me support since I got in. One time I ripped some porno off a wall, a poster-size crotch shot of a woman, and the apprenticeship coordinator said I should have called him in, but that I had to understand I was in a man's trade, and that the men shouldn't have to live by my rules. So I showed him the crotch shot and asked him if he found it objectionable. He said, well, he guessed so. Some other pornographic things have disappeared, and I've been told I could be in trouble and sued by the union for taking personal property, although nobody has seen me take personal

property. [Angela Summer, a plumber (Schoredel, 1985: 60)]

I mean I really like the people I work with, but I'm not sure I wanna put energy out in their directions. I try to change the way they think, but it doesn't work, I mean overall most of those men see women as a class of subhumans, right, an' that They have their individual exceptions, of course, and that scares me 'cause I'm not sure what makes me different. I don't like to be separated from other women. There's still a lotta tits-an'-ass locker room bullshit that goes on, I mean after the first month or two, when I was outrageous, right, I just sorta gave up fighting them and a few weeks ago one of the mechanics asked me what did he say something about how whether I was becoming less radical in my older age or you know, some sorta joke, but he was somewhat serious 'cause I just don't come down on people the way I used to any more 'cause it doesn't get me anywhere. I expend all this energy and everything stays the same. [Sandy Harold (Walshok, 1981: 173)]

These women's efforts, in some cases, help to change work culture or to change the work image itself in a feminine way.

I love to hug people, but at one base I got I trouble for it once. When my friends come to the window at the base, I would give them a hug, and I'd usually pick out two or three older drivers that had been there thirty years - they were the drivers that would come to work, sign in, not talk to anybody, and they'd go to work, and then all of a sudden they retired, and nobody knew who they were. It was sad to me, so I started hugging them every day. I just felt that they probably needed it, and then they would start talking to people. They'd come in the morning and smile. I just felt they needed physical contact. It doesn't have to be sexual. It can be just a "I'm glad you're here today," and a big hug. Anyway, my boss told me I had to stop hugging people. I quit for a week and everybody thought something was wrong with me, so I thought, "Piss on him. That's not me." I started hugging again, and told my boss, "I'm sorry, I tried it, but I don't think it's influencing my work. I just can't go around not hugging people." He never said anything again. He realized that was just the way I was. [Arlene Tupper, a transit supervisor (Schroedel, 1985: 212-213)]

I like the good parts of the job. It makes you feel good when you can make

someone believe in the police. There's a lot of negative stuff out there but the positive is much more important. I'd rather go in a store and have the owner say, "It's sure nice to have you come through here every day." That makes me happy. Locking people up doesn't. I feel strongly about the role police should play in the community. I guess I should have been a social worker. [A policewoman (Martin, 1980: 195)]

In summary, women in male-dominated jobs are suffering from the instability of their gender identity, fluctuating between femininity and masculinity. However, their effort to balance the two is a process of deconstructing the given masculinity and femininity and reconstructing them according to their concrete situations. Even though there could not be ultimate definition of masculinity and femininity, they are trying to find new meanings of femininity and masculinity, thus a new ground for their demand for equality *and* difference.

4. The Effect on the Lives of Women at Nontraditional Jobs

The following experiences of these women show that their struggle for survival in male-dominated jobs has personal importance.

I always lacked self-confidence in myself, and this [job] is helping a lot because it is something that I want real bad. I'm pushing myself a lot on it and I'm showing myself I can do things that I didn't think I could do. I'm starting to think fantasies that I've had all my life are attainable. [A cable spicer at the telephone company (Walshok, 1981: 151)]

Having a good-paying job has made me a lot more independent finally I got to the point one day that I told my husband that I was going to buy a new car. And that's the way it was, because I made enough money that I felt that I could afford to buy a new car in my name. It's my car. My husband was very angry He still gets very angry when I say it's my car. He says it's our car. It's not, as far as I'm concerned. It's my car and ha should ask permission to drive my car I was equal to him. I wasn't below him.

[Michelle Sanborn, a label printer (Schroedel, 1985: 232)]

I guess I'm just an activist at heart. It's the politics of it, I think; I like to have a hand in the decision-making process of things which affect my life. I can't turn a deaf ear to politics. [Sylvia Lange, a gillnetter (Schroedel, 1985: 251)]

The self-support, independence, and self-confidence are strengthened in these women. An interesting thing is that these characteristics are ones that have been linked to 'masculinity.' How could this be interpreted? It does not seem that these women learn masculine traits, thus being masculinized. Rather, it could mean that these women are breaking the stereotypes falsely linked to masculinity and femininity, thus deconstructing the traditional dichotomy between masculinity and femininity. Even though women in nontraditional jobs suffer from instability in the given gender identity, these women, going through the struggle to survive as women in nontraditional occupations, continuously re-find themselves positively, denying to be classified by the existing gender norms.

Their efforts to re-find themselves don't end at an individual level. The suffering of loneliness at the individual level and the feeling of unfit both to traditional women's and men's groups, seem to provide them an opportunity to overcome the individuality, somewhat ironically.

When I'm in a fire camp I look around and try to find a woman who's forty years old or thirty-five or fifty, like all the men I see. I want to see a woman who's walking around not just in a fire camp, but on the fire line. I've never seen her. And that really *bothers* me because I *want* to see her. I realize the role model has to be myself. *I'm* going to be the role model for other people, and that's one of the reasons why, even when my job was less than I wanted, I decided to stick it out. I want to be that woman on the fire line. [Diane Clarke, a fire fighter (Schroedel, 1985: 33)]

I belong to a group called Women in the Trades and the reason I belong

is because I need their support. I need that sympathy, that understanding, and to share the feelings of accomplishment. But mostly the support. [Elaine Canfield, a carpenter (Schroedel, 1985: 40)]

The union, in theory, treats women equally with men. At most positions, even shop steward, you'll find women, but when you get to the thirteen business reps, they're all men. Women in the union recently formed a women's committee to help women with work problems. We are having a workshop next week to get women's input on priorities to be working on. We think that day care and job training will probably emerge as priorities. Most women are in the lower-paid grades and don't know about any upper-level jobs or what training they might take. [Jo Ann Johnson, a painter (Schroedel, 1985: 147)]

As shown above, these women try to overcome the individuality of the given situation by positioning themselves as a role model in these jobs or by organizing with similar women in nontraditional women. Talking about self-support, independence, and self-confidence (associated with masculinity and individualism) and, at the same time, organizing women's support group (for collective voices based on differences) don't match the dichotomy of the existing gender identity or the equality/difference debate. They are pioneers in transforming gender structure of the society.

V. Conclusions : The possibilities and limitations of Affirmative Action

Even though Affirmative Action is one of the equality-side approaches to eliminate occupational sex segregation and sex wage gap, it does not automatically guarantee the equal workplace status between women and men even on the same jobs. The masculine work norms, as shown in the above experiences of women in nontraditional jobs, still give these women sufferings

as second-class workers. Thus, Affirmative Action does not meet the expectation of the equality side, that integration of occupations would make the workplaces equal between the sexes. However, the difference side's criticism of Affirmative Action as reinforcing male workplace norms seems short-sighted. Instead of all being acculturated into the male norms, women in male-dominant jobs try different strategies, equality or difference, to survive in these occupations. Some of the difference strategies used by these women include changing the existing masculine work culture, a very challenge to male workplace norms. The important finding, however, is that, in the process, these women suffer a lot in defining their gender identity, regardless of which strategy they choose. This is also an indication of the failure of the existing feminist approaches, both equality and difference sides. This failure seems to come from the fact that both the previous equality and difference approaches in feminism are mainly based on the given definition of femininity and masculinity. The reality from the experiences of women in nontraditional jobs show the following: the existence of women in nontraditional jobs itself challenges the given definitions of masculinity and femininity. The struggle of these women to survive in these jobs is a process of deconstructing the masculine and feminine identities and reconstructing them, having potential to break down the patriarchal workplace structure.

I think it's a good thing for women to work in non-traditional work because it breaks down the mysticism [on gender]. [Barbara Shaman, an outside machinist (Schroedel, 1985: 175)]

This is a potential of the Affirmative Action policy. By giving opportunities for women to enter the previously excluded, masculine occupations, Affirmative Action opens up a chance to challenge the traditional gender norms at the workplaces. Even though it might be a policy based on liberalism, it could have some transformational potential when, as shown above, women in

nontraditional jobs overcome individuality by organizing themselves, thus challenging the male norms collectively. A possible reconstruction of gender identity as a result of these efforts and challenges is that women find a new ground for their 'equal and different' status at workplace, having a possibility of transcending the equality/difference debate.

At its inception stage, Affirmative Action in Korea has an advantage of utilizing others' experiences. From this study, some implications for the success of Affirmative Action in Korea can be mentioned. First, some complaints against Affirmative Action should be anticipated and prepared for. "It would be reverse discrimination to hire women over men for the Affirmative Action purpose," "Affirmative Action makes hired women seen as non-qualified," "Affirmative Action encourages talented women to get traditional male jobs, thus 'ghettoizing' traditional female jobs more," or "Affirmative Action forces women to follow male norms." In winning over these complaints, the findings from this study will help. Affirmative Action did get more women into traditional male occupations and these women try to perform at the expected level on the job, and, at the same time, voice women's concerns at the workplaces. In this regard, stricter monitoring of Equal Employment Law can reduce possible negative attitudes towards Affirmative Action since it can lessen burdens on Affirmative Action by eliminating discrimination at the first place, in recruiting, selecting, training, compensating, and promoting.

Second, like most equal-opportunity policies, Affirmative Action focused more on putting women into male-dominated occupations, not accommodating women's specific needs for the integration. This is shown everywhere, from the lack of restroom facility to long-hours, to physically demanding work which makes it difficult to balance the work life and the family life especially for women with family and/or kids. These limitations, for some women, result in disappointment in and giving up of working in nontraditional jobs.

One time a directive came down from on high: “You’re spending too much time in the restrooms.” The restroom was a couple blocks away so it took a few minutes to go there. But the poor foremen had to give us the word, and then take our flak. ‘Oh,’ we’d say, “Jimmy, I’ve got my pants unbuttoned. Can I go now?” “Jimmy, can we use your hat?” Well, that directive didn’t last too long. [Irene Hull, a shipwright/bindery worker (Schroedel, 1985: 44)]

I get up usually at a quarter to five or five in the morning, take a shower, and wash my hair. …… And I usually get to work about forty-five minutes early and they have a cafeteria right in the building and I usually eat breakfast there so I don’t have dirty breakfast dishes to do when I get home. I’ll read the paper. Then just regular working, depending on where I’m working, like I said I move every three or four months to a different shop, to different duties. But now I’m out climbing on airplanes and I usually get home about four-thirty or a quarter till five and I pick up my son from my mom’s and let the animals in or out or wherever and cook dinner, clean up, and he sits glued to the TV and I yell, ‘Dinner,’ and he says, ‘oh, no.’ It’s tough - it really gets hard to come home.

You leave the house at six and get home at five - that’s eleven hours. And then to have to try to figure out something to eat and then have to do the dishes - it just gets to be a drag. I think that’s mainly why I get tired of getting up for work, because of what I know I have to come home to after. Like just - simple things like having to remember to put the trash out for Wednesday and that type of thing. It just makes me so mad - I’m on my way out to work on Wednesday mornings and I think, “Goddamn, I forgot to put the trash out last night,” and then I have to go back and take it out. Just little things like that. It’s tough, it’s hard to do. [An electronics mechanic apprentice (Walshok, 1981: 253-254)]

Some of these problems can be resolved by accommodating to women’s special needs or improving general working conditions of all workers, women and men. Thus, Affirmative Action should be accompanied by work-life balance policies such as childcare and flexible work schedule. However, these policies should not be confined to benefit women only. It should be expanded to be applied to all the workers on the needs basis, regardless of their sexes.

Third, efforts to change male-dominant work norms should go side by side

with Affirmative Action. Without changing these norms, women in traditional male jobs suffer from workplace harassment and are discouraged from keeping the jobs. If getting more women into non-traditional occupations is one thing, keeping them on those jobs is another. Without keeping them on those jobs, Affirmative Action cannot achieve its goal at all. Getting social consensus and organizing campaigns on workplace harassment can be a way to do this.

Success of Affirmative Action depends not just on the policy itself, but on collective will of the society. Especially labor unions can play a pivotal role. In Korea, it seems that union leaders, male leaders in particular, don't pay attention to Affirmative Action issues. However, without full support from labor unions, even union women cannot get benefits from Affirmative Action, which would result in the weakening supports for unions eventually. The government's will for Affirmative Action is another critical factor. The status of a developed country can not be achieved just by economic means. It definitely requires upgrading citizens' life quality, especially for the historically disadvantaged, of which women workers are a part. Can the success of Affirmative Action be an index for the status of a developed country?

References

- Ackelsbery, Martha A. and Shanley, Mary Lyndon. "Privacy, Publicity, and Power: A Feminist Rethinking of the Public-Private Distinction." Nancy J. Hirschman, Alison Jaggar, and Christine Di Stefano eds. *Revisioning the Political: Feminist Reconstructions of Traditional Concepts in Western Political Theory* (1997): 213~233.
- Bergmann, Barbara. "Fighting Discrimination through Affirmative Action," *The Economic Emergence of Women*. New York: Basic, 1986.

- Eisenstein, Zillah R. *The Radical Future of Liberal Feminism*. Longman: New York & London, 1981.
- Gilligan, Carol. *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development*. London, England, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1982.
- Hartmann, Heide, Jean Ross, Ronnie Steinberg, Barbara Bergmann, and Anna Padia. "Roundtable on Pay Equity and Affirmative Action." in Dorothy Sue Cobble ed. *Women and Unions*. Ithaca, New York: ILR Press, 1993, pp.43~68.
- Jaggar, Alison M. "Sexual Difference and Sexual Equality." Deborah L. Rhode ed. *Theoretical Perspectives on Sexual Difference*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1990, pp.239~254.
- Kessler-Harris, Alice. "The Debate Over Equality for Women in the Workplace: Recognizing Differences," Naomi Gerstel and Harriet Engel Gross eds. *Families and Work*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1987, pp.520~539.
- Kessler-Harris, Alice. *Out to Work: A History of Wage-Earning Women in the United States*. Oxford University Press, 1982.
- Kim, Marlene. "Comments," in Dorothy Sue Cobble ed. *Women and Unions*. Ithaca, New York: ILR Press, 1993, pp.85~92.
- Martin, Susan Ehrlich. *Breaking and Entering: Policewomen on Patrol*. Berkeley/Los Angeles/London: University of California Press, 1980.
- McCann, Michael W. *Rights at Work: Pay Equity Reform and the Politics of Legal Mobilization*. Illinois and London, England: The University of Chicago Press: Chicago, 1994.
- Mill, John Stuart. *The Subjection of Women*. Amherst, New York: Prometheus Books, 1986.
- Reskin, Barbara F. and Roos, Patricia A. eds. *Job Queues, Gender Queues: Explaining Women's Inroads into Male Occupations*. Philadelphia:

- Temple University Press, 1990.
- Rhode, Deborah L. "Theoretical Perspectives on Sexual Difference."
Deborah L. Rhode ed. *Theoretical Perspectives on Sexual Difference*.
New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1990, pp.1~9.
- Schroedel, Jean Reith. *Alone in a Crowd: Women in the Trades Tell Their
Stories*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1985.
- Simon, Sharon. "The Survival of Affirmative Action in the 1980s." *Labor
Studies Journal* 10(3) (1986): 261~277.
- Walshok, Mary Lindenstien. *Blue-Collar Women: Pioneers on the Male
Frontier*. Garden City, New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1981.
- Williams, Christine L. *Gender Differences at Work: Women and Men in
Nontraditional Occupations*. Berkeley/Los Angeles/London: University
of California Press, 1989.
- Wollstonecraft, Mary. *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman, Inc.*: New
York, New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1988.

적극적 고용조치에 관한 일고찰 : 미국 수혜자들의 목소리

김 혜 진

적극적 고용조치는 평등의 개념을 ‘기회의 평등’에서 ‘결과의 평등’으로 확장하는 주요 정책의 하나로 설계되었다. 여성을 둘러싼 평등 대 차이 논쟁에 비추어 볼 때, 이 정책은 평등주의적 접근에 기반하고 있다. 적극적 고용조치가 비전통적 직업에 보다 많은 여성을 합류시켰다는 점에서는 긍정적으로 평가받고 있지만, 한편으로는 여성의 특성을 무시하고 남성 규범을 따르도록 했다는 비판도 받고 있다. 미국에서 적극적 고용조치를 통해 남성 중심 직업에서 일하게 된 여성들의 경험담을 통해, 이 논문은 다음과 같은 결론을 이끌어낸다. 비전통적 직업에의 여성의 존재 자체가 이들의 평등한 지위를 보장해 주지는 않는다. 그러나 이들 여성들이 모두 남성 규범을 따르는 것도 아니다. 이 여성들은 다양한 생존전략을 구사하는데, 그 중 일부는 남성성과 여성성이라는 기존 질서에 도전한다. 이들 여성들이 어떤 생존전략을 구사하는가에 관계없이 이들은 기존의 성 정체성을 해체하고 재구성하는 과정을 겪는다. 이들의 경험담은 한국에서도 적극적 고용조치가 평등하면서도 차이를 인정하는 노동 현장을 건설하는데 일조할 수 있다는 가능성을 제시한다.

핵심용어 : 적극적 고용조치, 평등론, 차이론, 비전통적 직업에서의 여성, 남성성, 여성성.