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INTRODUCTION

What are the causes of the differential between male and female unemployment rates?

Female unemployment rates have been traditionally higher than male unemployment rates, but the difference narrows during recessions and grows during prosperity.

Many researchers have analyzed individual factors affecting the unemployment rates of males and females and the interaction of those rates, and it has been shown that a number of factors influence the differential. But the factors reinforce and negate each other in varying rates, as the labor market changes.

Discrimination has been found to be a major factor in forcing up female unemployment rates, and the lack of geographic and occupational mobility for females reinforces this effect. The cause of unemployment has also been shown to affect the unemployment rates of males and females differently. Occupational segregation has been researched as a factor in determining both the unemployment rate differential and the effect of cyclical activity on the differential. Other researchers have found that the increase in female labor force participation rates and the change in the type of female entering the labor force have had an effect on female unemployment rates and aggregate unemployment rates. Other factors affecting unemployment rates, special problems of the poor, and trends in the differential of unemployment rates are discussed. Several government programs, instituted to help alleviate the unemployment rates, have failed, and the problems these programs have caused have perpetuated the problems of unemployment, especially for females.
INTRODUCTION

These factors also seem to form a vicious circle, with causal relationships flowing to and from each factor. This is where the difficulty begins.

There is no clear cut cause for the differential between male and female unemployment rates. But an examination of several of the factors leading to the differential may help to sort out the myriad of effects.
DISCRIMINATION

Myths Causing Discrimination

Foxley (1976) discusses and attempts to dispel the eleven most pervasive myths employers and co-workers believe about females in the labor force:

1. Women quit their jobs more often than men.
2. Women are absent from work more than men.
3. Women do not really need to work.
4. Women always quit work to have children.
5. Women will not relocate.
6. Women are just not fit for some kinds of work.
7. Women are too emotional for positions with heavy responsibility.
8. Women do not make good bosses.
9. Women do not want to be promoted into management positions.
10. Women should not work in unpleasant or dangerous surroundings.
11. Women returning to the labor market are unskilled.

Discrimination in Hiring

Kane (1978) brings up the point that employers do not all hire all workers equally. Employers make their hiring decisions based on the skills and abilities of the applicants. When the employer examines the differences in the qualifications of the applicants, whether the differences are real or perceived, a bias is introduced such that certain groups are less likely to be hired.

Thus in many cases women (and blacks and teenagers) are passed over when white adult males are available for employment. Because of this,
DISCRIMINATION.

females (and blacks and teenagers) are more likely to be unemployed than white adult males.

Arrow (1971) argues that discrimination against females is based on an employer's perceptions of females as a group. He says that employers perceive females as inferior workers because females are believed to be only temporarily attached to the labor force, are more likely to be absent, have a higher turnover rate, and are less emotionally stable than males.

Because of these perceptions, employers are more likely to hire males than females, thus pushing up the female unemployment rate.

Almquist (1979) concludes that discrimination affects females as a class, and that individuals are rarely considered.

Employers treat females as a class without further discrimination against subgroups, although there were great differences in the treatment of males and females. She suggests that females are seen as a "secondary source of cheap labor" to be used only on a temporary basis.

Reagan (1979) argues that discrimination and the resulting occupational segregation force females into less desirable occupations. Females are concentrated in the lowest levels of industries, and the work done by females is valued less than that done by males.

Gendell (1968) found that the unemployment rate for married males was significantly lower than that for unmarried males, because married males were assumed by employers to be responsible for the support of their families. In addition, many employers who are aware of the family responsibility are more willing to hire married males than unmarried males.
DISCRIMINATION

Discrimination in Training

Sawhill (1973), in her analysis of the different types of training males and females receive, found that employers are less likely to hire females for positions requiring a lot of expensive on-the-job training because they believe females are unstable workers. Females are instead hired into occupations (e.g., secretarial) for which they have received their training before seeking the job.

Ferber and Lowry (1974) suggest that the lack of on-the-job training causes an increase in the female unemployment rate. This lack of training forces females into jobs with higher layoff and turnover rates.

Niemi (1974) found that the lack of adequate training has to some extent forced up female unemployment rates, but not by a great amount.

Females who expect to spend little time in the labor force invest little time or energy in training, because they expect little return on the investment. And even among those females who do intend permanent attachment to the labor force, their employers, acting on aggregate female data, discriminate against them by refusing to invest in on-the-job training, especially specific training.

But she argues that the lack of training has little effect, because females are traditionally employed in the less cyclically sensitive industries.

Social Discrimination and Effects

Gendell (1968) points out that married females are not expected
to work by society's standards.

Niemi (1974) adds that females are socially conditioned to spend the majority of their lives outside the labor force, and sex discrimination in the labor force helps to assure this result.

Bowers (1981) argues that sex discrimination is one factor that leads males and females to be employed in different sectors which are affected differently by cyclical fluctuations in the economy.

Niemi (1977) notes that this discrimination forces females into certain sectors of employment which experience an oversupply of labor, raising the female unemployment rate.

Reagan (1979) agrees, arguing that occupational segregation forces females into less desirable occupations. She stresses that the social welfare is lower with discrimination than it would be if males and females were given equal opportunities in the workplace.

Vickery, Bergmann and Swartz (1978) argue that if sex discrimination was decreased or eliminated, the female turnover rates would affect the differential between male and female unemployment rates, but the aggregate unemployment rates would be relatively unaffected.

Effects of Discrimination

It is clear that sex discrimination, whether blatant or social, is a key factor in forcing up female unemployment rates, widening the differential between male and female unemployment rates. Because the discriminatory barriers are in place in all phases of the employment process, females are more likely to be unemployed. Social discrimination
DISCRIMINATION

teaches females that they need not participate in the labor force. When the female decides that she does want or need to search for a job, the myths and aggregate data discourage employers from hiring her when males are available for work. And if the female is able to find employment, the employer thwarts her upward movement by denying her the adequate specific on-the-job training she needs to compete in the labor market. This lack of training forces her into occupations that require little training and are dominated by females. Because she is forced to compete with so many other untrained females in these industries, she is likely to remain unemployed.

Males are not subjected to these discrimination barriers, and they subsequently have a lower unemployment rate than females.

If social and blatant sex discrimination was decreased or eliminated, the male and female unemployment rates would show a reduction in the differential.
MOBILITY

Geographic Mobility

Niemi (1974) argues that females are less mobile occupationally and geographically than males, such that they are unable to accept available jobs, which increases the female unemployment rate.

Females are less likely than males to invest in mobility because the expected payoff is less than that for males. In addition, if the female is not the primary wage earner in the family, mobility that may benefit her may cause a greater loss to her spouse, and she will remain immobile.

Hoyle (1969), however, points out that females are often forced into mobility because the family head takes a job in another community. Females are then forced to leave their jobs, and the unemployment rate for females is pushed up.

Ferber and Lowry (1974) suggest that female unemployment rates are pushed up further because they more often resist geographic mobility. If the females were less resistant, they would be more likely to find jobs in other communities, which would lower the female unemployment rate.

Barrett and Morgenstern (1974) argue that females search longer for jobs because they do not have the same flexibility in the type of job they can accept. Females are less likely to have mobility, so they experience longer periods of unemployment between jobs.

Occupational Mobility

Gilroy (1973) found that many females search for part-time and
MOBILITY

temporary jobs in the service-producing sector, and that they were more likely to be job leavers than males.

Niemi (1974) also found that unemployment due to job leaving was substantially higher for females than for males. But she argues that the lack of occupational mobility for females has led to their higher unemployment rate.

Gilroy and McIntyre (1974) found that job leavers' unemployment rates were not at all cyclically responsive. Workers did not tend to leave their jobs during the slowdowns any more or less than during the prosperous times.

Ferber and Lowry (1974) suggest that females have higher unemployment rates because of higher female turnover rates. Although females have a shorter duration of unemployment due to turnover than males, the higher frequency of turnover pushes up the female unemployment rate.

Niemi (1977) shows that males have more mobility between jobs, while females have more mobility into and out of the labor force.

Even if this mobility was at an equal rate between males and females, the female unemployment rate would be higher, because the search for a new job for those already employed usually takes place while the searcher is still working at the previous job. But those entering or reentering the labor force are not working at the time of the search and are counted as unemployed.

But the female mobility rate is much higher than that for males, so the female unemployment rate is much higher.

Niemi found, though, that the female job turnover rate is declining,
MOBILITY

signaling a more permanent attachment of females to the labor force, and again causing higher female unemployment rates.

Effects of Mobility

Mobility, or lack thereof, has been shown to have an effect on the female unemployment rate, forcing it higher and widening the gap between male and female unemployment rates.

Females are less often than males the heads of households, so their employment is less often the most important consideration in terms of the mobility decision. Females are less likely to move to a new community in order to make an improvement in their job searches than are males. But they are more likely to move to a new community to make an improvement in their spouses' job searches than are males. So whether they are forced to remain in a market where they cannot find a job or they are forced to leave their jobs due to a move to a new community, female unemployment rates are forced up relative to male unemployment rates.

Females are also more likely than males to move into and out of the labor force. When they reenter the labor force they are more likely to experience unemployment before finding a new job, so the female unemployment rate is again raised. But the females were less likely than males to move between jobs, which would eliminate the reentry unemployment, so the female unemployment rate was raised even higher.

If females were to become more geographically mobile, moving to new communities in an attempt to improve their chances of finding employment, and if females were to become more occupationally mobile,
MOBILITY

moving between occupations rather than out of the labor force, the male and female unemployment rates would show a reduction in the differential.
CAUSES OF UNEMPLOYMENT

Effect on Unemployment Rates

Gilroy (1973) breaks down the differences in the male and female unemployment rates by the reasons for unemployment.

Gilroy and McIntyre (1974) found that the cyclical effect and the duration of unemployment depend upon the reason for unemployment.

Entry

Hoyle (1969) reported that the rate of female entry into the labor force was 3 1/2 times the male entry rate, accounting for a significant amount of female unemployment. Half of the unemployed females were labor force entrants, while less than one-quarter of the unemployed males were labor force entrants.

Gendell (1968) agrees, noting that females experienced higher levels of unemployment than males during the 1950's and 1960's because more females than males were seeking work for the first time.

Gilroy (1973) found that females were more likely to be unemployed because of entry into the labor force than were males. He attributes this in part to the fact that many young males have held jobs before officially becoming part of the labor force at age 16.

Niemi (1974) found that males tend to have a longer duration of unemployment than females, no matter what the cause of the unemployment. This was especially true of the labor force entrants. Although the males tended to remain unemployed longer upon entrance into the labor force, the higher number of females participating in the labor force pushed the female unemployment rate higher than the male unemployment rate.
CAUSES OF UNEMPLOYMENT

Gilroy and McIntyre (1974) found that entrants showed some cyclical sensitivity, but not to the extent of job losers and reentrants.

They suggest that new entrants are motivated by factors other than cyclical swings in the economy. But in a deteriorating economy, the entrants will remain unemployed for the longest amount of time, and additional entrants will be much more likely to be unemployed than any other group.

Reentry

Gilroy (1973) reported that the unemployment rate for female reentrants in 1972 was twice as high as that for male reentrants.

Females are more likely to reenter the labor force because they have taken time off for child-rearing, because they have been separated or divorced, because of increasing employment opportunities, or because of the lessening of discrimination against females. Reentrants are the largest group of unemployed in the service sector.

Gilroy and McIntyre (1974) found that reentrants into the labor force showed some cyclical sensitivity to the changes in the economy.

The effect was distributed over several months, but the response was not immediate. Their unemployment rates remained high because of the wait until many job losers were rehired before the reentrants could be hired.

They also found that reentrants and entrants are more likely to be female. Because they will most likely be hired last, this pushes up the female unemployment rate.
CAUSES OF UNEMPLOYMENT

Jones (1983) found that not all female reentrants to the labor force experience immediate unemployment. In fact, she found that only one-third of female reentrants experience unemployment before finding work. In her 1972 study, 50% of young women and 40% of older women were unemployed for some length of time after reentry into the labor force. Because these percentages were higher than the one-third average, Jones concludes that unemployment due to layoff, turnover, and firings is experienced by reentrants who had no immediate unemployment as well as those who experienced immediate unemployment.

Jones found that the chances of unemployment after reentry into the labor force were reduced when the female had more education, had licensing or certification in a profession, had more work experience, was married, had few or no young children at home, had little family mobility, was willing to accept a low wage, was white, had no health limitations, and had made plans in advance to seek work.

Layoff

Gilroy (1973) found that unemployment due to layoff was more often experienced by males than by females; 60% of 1972 male unemployment was due to layoff, while 40% of female unemployment was due to layoff.

This occurs because construction and manufacturing industries, which males dominate, have high layoff rates. The service occupations females tend to fill have lower layoff rates because these sectors are expanding and are less sensitive to cyclical activity.

Bednarzik (1983) reports that of all unemployed males in 1982, 27% were on layoff; 17% of the unemployed females were on layoff. And of
CAUSES OF UNEMPLOYMENT

those who were unemployed because of layoff, 65% were male, 30% were female, and 5% were teenagers.

He argues that the higher layoff percentage for males is attributable to the type of industry in which males are traditionally employed. Because the goods-producing sector is much more cyclically sensitive than any other, Bednarzik argues that in a recession economy, male unemployment due to layoff will be much higher than female unemployment due to layoff.

He also shows that the duration of unemployment for laid-off males is slightly higher than that for females. This could also increase the male unemployment rate somewhat.

Within industries, Bednarzik found essentially no difference in the unemployment rates between males and females; females were no more likely to be laid off in a particular occupation than males. Among blue collar workers, both males and females reported an unemployment rate due to layoff of 35%, and Bednarzik reported similar results in other socioeconomic groups and industries.

Niemi (1974) found that males tend to have a longer duration of unemployment than females. But the duration is very similar for those who have lost jobs; more females are unemployed for 15-26 weeks, while more males are unemployed for longer periods.

Bowers (1981) points out that because females penetrating the male-dominated industries have held the positions for a relatively short amount of time, the "last hired, first fired" philosophy dictates that they will be the first to be unemployed during a recession. Thus a
CAUSES OF UNEMPLOYMENT

disproportionate number of females will become unemployed during a recession.

Flaim and Gellner (1972) found that in addition to being higher, the unemployment rate for female heads of households was not as deeply affected by cyclical activity as was the rate for male heads of households. They point out that unemployment among female heads of households did not fall as quickly as unemployment among male heads of households.

Gilroy and McIntyre (1974) found that job losers, those laid off from their jobs, composed 40% of those unemployed between October 1973 and July 1974. The unemployment in this group was an immediate response to cyclical changes in the economy, and the effects were distributed over several months.

Flaim, Bradshaw and Gilroy (1975) found that during the 1973-74 recession, the number of full-time workers declined, while the number of part-time workers increased. But those added to the part-time workforce were either victims of cut hours or had taken the part-time job after being unable to find a full-time job.

Frictional

Barrett and Morgenstern (1974) argue that female unemployment rates are higher than male unemployment rates because females are unemployed for a longer period of time between jobs than are males.

Gendell (1968) found that the unemployment rate for married males is lower because they tended to spend less time between jobs, accepting any job offer in order to support the family.
CAUSES OF UNEMPLOYMENT

Barrett and Morgenstern (1974) note that females are more likely to have household duties that would restrict the job opportunities they could accept.

Females with families are also more likely to search for a longer time because with children at home they have less time to search during the average day; although they may search the same number of hours as others, those hours must be stretched over more days, weeks, and months.

Sandell (1980), in his empirical research, found that the individuals asking for higher wages are more likely to be unemployed for longer periods of time than those who are willing to accept lower wages. In particular, he found that unemployed females who held out for higher wages were usually rewarded with higher-paying jobs.

He found that the "typical" married female would do better to wait for a higher wage, but that these females were content to settle for less pay in order to have a shorter period of unemployment.

He suggests that married females tend to end their unemployment before the optimal employment opportunity presents itself because they are risk-averse, they are under financial-capital constraints which limit the job search, they see other nonpecuniary job search benefits and costs, or they expect the new job to be temporary and not worth the effort of extending the job search.

He claims that because females do not adequately complete the job search, their unemployment rates are too low in comparison to male unemployment rates.
CAUSES OF UNEMPLOYMENT

Effects of the Causes of Unemployment

The causes of unemployment are reflected in the relative unemployment rates of males and females, some of them widening the gap between them, and others narrowing the gap.

Labor force entrants, who were predominantly female, have some of the highest unemployment rates. The number of females competing for jobs for the first time is increasing, and that competition forces the female unemployment rate up. Although male entrants tend to be unemployed for longer periods of time than females, the numbers of females entering push the female entrant unemployment rate above the male entrant unemployment rate, and the differential in unemployment rates is widened.

Labor force reentrants, who again were predominantly female, are also plagued by higher unemployment rates. Reentrants tend to be unemployed for long periods of time because they are not hired until job losers have been rehired after recessions. And because the reentrants are overwhelmingly female, the female unemployment rate is further increased, and the differential in the unemployment rates is widened.

Layoff was found to be the cause of more male unemployment than female unemployment during recessions. Because males are concentrated in more cyclically sensitive industries, the male unemployment rises much more quickly than the female unemployment rate during recessions. But in recovery, the male unemployment rate falls much more quickly than the female unemployment rate. And as females move more and more into the male-dominated industries, their unemployment rates will become more cyclically sensitive. So during recessions the male unemployment
rises and the gap between male and female unemployment rates narrows. But during recovery the male unemployment rate falls relatively faster than the female unemployment rate, so the unemployment differential grows.

Frictional unemployment for females was higher because they are unemployed longer between jobs. They have less time to search and are restricted in the jobs they can accept. But they still tend to cut the job search shorter than the optimal length of time. Married males instead have lower frictional unemployment because they must support families. The higher female frictional unemployment boosts the female unemployment rate higher.

If the number of labor force entrants and reentrants could be lowered in relation to the number of available jobs for them, and if the frictional duration for females could be lowered, the male and female unemployment rates would show a reduction in the differential.
Cyclical Sensitivity of Male-Dominated Occupations

Bednarzik (1983) argues that the difference between male and female unemployment rates is caused by the difference in the type of occupations they have and the impact of cyclical economic activity on those respective occupations. He reports that in 1982, 70% of the workers in the goods-producing industries were males.

Ryscavage (1970), recalling past experience in recessions, says that goods-producing industries are the most severely hit by economic recessions. And because such industries are dominated by male employees, unemployment among males rises significantly during recessions.

He argues that an increase in aggregate unemployment rates during a recession reflects a higher male unemployment rate than female unemployment rate.

Gilroy and McIntyre (1974) point out that males are more likely to be unemployed because of layoff than females because of the cyclically sensitive nature of the industries in which they are predominantly employed. But they are also more likely to be rehired more quickly during an economic recovery. So male unemployment rates are expected to be higher during recessions and lower during times of prosperity.

Niemi (1977) also notes that during expansion, male unemployment rates fall more quickly than female unemployment rates because males are employed in more cyclically sensitive industries.

The demand for males for military service also forced a decline in male unemployment rates. And as the remaining males in the labor force filled the jobs left by those joining the military, the male unemployment rate fell even more.
Leon and Rones (1980) found that as a result of the only slight increase in male employment and an increase in the number of layoffs in the manufacturing and construction sectors in the late 1970's, the male unemployment rate rose somewhat.

Although there was little increase in employment in the male-dominated manufacturing sector, the construction and mining industries, which traditionally employ males, increased employment nearly enough to offset the unemployment in the manufacturing sector, leaving males with only a slightly higher unemployment rate.

Cyclical Sensitivity of Female-Dominated Occupations

Barrett and Morgenstern (1974) point out that the turnover rate and the unemployment duration of females are not as cyclically sensitive as those for males, because females are employed in industries which are less cyclically sensitive.

Niemi (1974) notes that more highly educated individuals are less susceptible to unemployment because individuals with more education tend to work in less cyclically sensitive industries.

Ferber and Lowry (1974) claim that because of male-dominated industry unemployment being more cyclically sensitive than female-dominated industry unemployment, the differential between male and female unemployment rates narrows during recessions and widens in prosperity.

Ryscavage (1970) notes that service industries, in which most females work, are affected later in recessions as adjustment occurs in the economy.

Bowers (1981) concludes that because female unemployment as a whole has become much more cyclically sensitive than in earlier years due to
the increased participation of females in male-dominated industries, patterns of recession unemployment are changing.

Crowding of Females into Female-Dominated Occupations

Vickery, Bergmann and Swartz (1978) argue that unemployment is higher for females than for males because the "supply-demand balance" in the female-dominated occupations is less favorable than that for the male-dominated occupations.

Ferber and Lowry (1974) suggest that females have higher unemployment rates because of occupational segregation. They attribute the relative increase in the female unemployment rate to crowding in the female-dominated occupations.

Flaim and Gellner (1972) found that the proportion of unemployment by working wives fell during the 1970-71 recession, while their unemployment rate rose more slowly than that of the male heads of households. They claim that this is because females are concentrated more heavily in service industries, which are not as cyclically sensitive as the male-dominated goods-producing industries.

Ray (1976) argues that because the labor force participation rate of females is increasing, the increased supply of labor forces the unemployment rates for the female-dominated occupations up.

With the higher unemployment rate among those occupations in which females dominate, it follows that the unemployment rate for females must rise. He argues that this trend, along with the falling rate of unemployment in the male-dominated industries, will continue until the
unemployment rates between the male-dominated occupations and the female-dominated occupations (and therefore the rates of males and females) converge.

**Employment Gains in Female-Dominated Occupations**

Flaim, Bradshaw and Gilroy (1975) found that in 1974, males showed little growth in employment, while females showed some growth in spite of the recession.

White collar workers had greater employment opportunities despite the recession, while blue collar workers experienced a decline in the number of employment opportunities.

The greatest proportion of part-time workers are concentrated in the service-producing sector, and the greatest gain has been among clerical workers in this sector.

Leon and Rones (1980) note that females accounted for half of the employment gains in 1976-78 and two-thirds of the increase in 1979, while males made up the other half of the employment increase in 1976-78 and only one-third of the increase in 1979.

They demonstrate how the rapidly expanding employment opportunities in female-dominated occupations allowed the economy to absorb the increase in female labor force participation rates while not increasing the female unemployment rate.

The unemployment rate for females held steady while the male unemployment rate rose during recessions. Even though the female labor force participation rate rose significantly, the increase was offset
by a surge of employment opportunities in the female-dominated service-producing sector.

Three-quarters of all employment gains were in the service-producing sector. Thus the unemployment rate for females changed little.

DeBoer and Seeborg (1984) argue that the differential between male and female unemployment rates is closing because female-dominated service industries are growing more rapidly than male-dominated goods-producing industries.

Vickery, Bergmann and Swartz (1978) suggest that although more job openings in the female-dominated occupations would help to alleviate the high female unemployment rate, it would lead to an even greater differential in the male and female wage rates.

**Migration of Females into Male-Dominated Occupations**

Reagan (1979) found that occupational segregation crowds females into female-dominated occupations, and the females are discouraged from moving out of these traditional occupations.

Flaim, Bradshaw and Gilroy (1975) point out that more modern females are entering white collar occupations than service-producing occupations, although more females are still more often employed in the service sector.

Vickery, Bergmann and Swartz (1978) suggest that opening up opportunities in the professional, technical, managerial, administrative and craft occupations that have been closed to females could help to reduce unemployment rates. In the past several years, females have begun to
infiltrate the professional occupations, but they have made little progress in blue-collar occupations.

Barrett and Morgenstern (1974) suggest that if experienced females in 1969 had had the same occupational distribution as males, the female unemployment rate would have been as much as five percent higher.

The authors explain that the higher unemployment rate would be caused by females searching for work in occupations in which they have higher turnover rates and longer terms of unemployment between jobs. They conclude that if a great number of females change from female-dominated occupations, they will have less job stability than they currently possess.

The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (1976) suggests that the rising female participation rates have allowed females to enter more male-dominated occupations. But because they have accumulated too little seniority in these occupations, recessions restrict the increase of female employment in the male-dominated occupations.

Bowers (1981) agrees, arguing that a greater proportion of females are becoming unemployed during recessions because in recent years, many more females than ever before have become employed in the male-dominated cyclically sensitive industries.

DeBoer and Seeborg (1984) note that the differential between male and female unemployment rates is closing because to some extent females are becoming more able to break the barriers into the male-dominated occupations.
Effects of Occupational Segregation

Occupational segregation has an effect on both the male and female unemployment rates, with some factors widening the gap between them and others narrowing the gap.

Occupations dominated by males are more cyclically sensitive than those dominated by females. Thus during recessions, the unemployment differential narrows, and it widens during recovery and prosperity.

But unemployment rates for the female-dominated service industries adjust later in the recession than those for males, so during the recovery, the gap is widened even further than at any other point.

The relatively higher unemployment rate for females is also attributed in part to the crowding of females into the oversupplied female-dominated occupations. As the female participation rate rises, unemployment in these industries rises even higher, forcing up the female unemployment rate and widening the differential even more.

The greatest number of employment gains have been made in the female-dominated sectors, somewhat alleviating the female unemployment rate and causing some narrowing of the differential.

But as females migrate more into the male industries, their unemployment rates become more and more cyclically sensitive, reducing the effect of the narrowing and widening of the differential, and causing the male and female unemployment rates to run in a more parallel direction together.

If females could increase their migration into the male-dominated occupations, their unemployment rates would indeed become more cyclically
sensitive, but the oversupply of females in the female sectors would be alleviated and the male and female unemployment rates would show a reduction in the differential.
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Factors Encouraging Female Participation

Leon and Rones (1980) cite a number of reasons for the dramatic increase in female labor force participation rates, from just above 30% in the 1940's to more than 50% in the 1970's.

They include "a lowering of the birth rate; increases in age at first marriage; a desire to maintain or increase the household's standard of living and the effect of inflation on a family's buying power; growth in those industries (particularly the service sector) and occupations which traditionally employ women; and, of course, the growing social acceptance of work for women" [p. 9].

Older women, especially those between the ages of 35 and 44, also posted a marked increase in their participation rates. The authors attribute this in part to the economic uncertainty which leads females to seek work for security and to the amendments to the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, as well as the increased social acceptance of females in the labor force.

Stolzenberg and Waite (1981) argue that the labor force participation rates are dependent upon the availability and cost of child care and the "convenience" of the job.

The greater the amount of child care available, the more likely a female is to participate in the labor force. When the child care is unavailable, the mother is expected to stay at home with the child, and the mother is thus unable to enter the labor force.

The lower the cost of child care, the more likely a female is to participate in the labor force. When child care costs are high, mothers
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The "discouraged worker" effect indicates that in times of prosperity, females will increase their participation in the labor force without significantly lowering the unemployment rate.

Time-series studies instead show that local unemployment rates have a counter-cyclical effect on female labor force participation rates. They show that females enter the labor force during periods of high unemployment and leave during periods of declining unemployment. This indicates that policies enacted to create economic growth will be more effective at reducing the aggregate unemployment rate than they were expected to be.

The author found through regression analysis that local unemployment rates higher than the long-term average induced females to increase their labor force participation, which is consistent with the "added worker" effect.

Because this relationship was significant whether or not city-specific intercepts were included, the author suggests that long-term trends, rather than current unemployment rates, better predict the female response to cyclical activity.

New Style of Entrant

Niemi (1977) found that the increase in female labor force participation rates was most predominant among young females who were more likely to move into and out of the labor force more often, thereby increasing the female unemployment rate.

Ferber and Lowry (1974), however, attribute the relative increase in the female unemployment rate to the increasing attachment of females to the labor force.
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Flaim, Bradshaw and Gilroy (1975) claimed that the type of female entering and participating in the labor force in 1974 was much different than females in earlier decades. The modern females were younger, better educated, and more often college graduates.

Vickery, Bergmann and Swartz (1978) also show that the younger females entering the labor force intend permanent, full-time attachment to the labor force, meaning that female frictional unemployment will decrease. But females will be less likely to work as "buffers" during cyclical changes in the economy.

**Effects of Cyclical Activity on Female Participation**

Ferber and Lowry (1974) claim that the differential between male and female unemployment rates narrows during recessions in part because females tend to enter the labor force during times of prosperity.

Morgenstern and Barrett (1974) cite evidence that the elasticity of labor force participation for females is much higher than that for males. And because of the changes in the economy and the given difference in the elasticity, females more often experience periods of unemployment than males.

Flaim and Gellner (1972) found that working wives' unemployment rates tended to remain more stable because of the difference in their elasticity of labor force participation. Their participation rates increased markedly when the labor demand was high and rapidly declined when the demand for labor fell.

Gendell (1968) found that married females are not likely to enter
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the labor force when unemployment is rising, except when their husbands are among the unemployed.

Ray (1976) suggests that the increased labor force participation rate of females and the decreased participation rate of males explains the narrowing of occupational unemployment rates.

Because of the relative decrease of participation among males, the resulting decrease in the labor supply leads to a decrease in the unemployment rate of the male-dominated occupations. Because the unemployment rate is declining in male-dominated occupations, the unemployment rate for males must fall.

Effect on Female Unemployment Rates

Hoyle (1969) argues that females have higher unemployment rates than males because females tend to enter, leave, and reenter the labor force more often than males.

Bednarzik (1983) also notes that the greatest proportion of female unemployment rates is caused by labor force entry and reentry.

Vickery, Bergmann and Swartz (1978) point out that the influx of the "baby boom" generation into the labor force, at the same time as the rise in labor force participation rates of females under 30, has made an impact on raising permanent participation rates.

Effect on Aggregate Unemployment Rates

Flaim and Gellner (1972) found that the proportion of aggregate unemployment attributable to working wives rose during the 1962-69
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economic recovery. They argue that the rise was caused by a slower decline in the working wives' unemployment rate than that of male heads of households, and because of an increase in the female labor force participation rate.

Flaim, Bradshaw and Gilroy (1975) found that in the 1974 recession, females accounted for a greater proportion of the aggregate unemployment rate than they had in any previous similar recession.

The authors attribute this to the higher labor force participation rate of females and the widening of the gap between higher female unemployment rates and the lower male unemployment rates.

The authors also argue that the female unemployment rate is kept high because the rise in the female participation rate is greatest among those aged 20-24, the ages of individuals who most often are unemployed.

Kane (1978) points out that even though their unemployment rates are higher than those of white males, females are making up an increasing proportion of the labor force.

He argues that because the female unemployment rate was double the rate for males, each time a male leaves the labor force and is replaced by a female entering the labor force, the aggregate unemployment rate rises.

Flaim (1979) argues that the dramatic increase in female labor force participation rates does not have much effect on the rise of the aggregate unemployment rate. He argues that because the female unemployment rate is slightly lower than the aggregate unemployment rate,
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the increased participation of females in the labor force would not force the aggregate unemployment rate up.

He instead proposes that the change in the aggregate unemployment rate is due to the entry of the "baby boom" generation into the labor force.

Bowers (1981) points out that male unemployment rates are always lower than female unemployment rates, and that the rise in the unemployment percentage for males during recessions is always higher than that for females.

Because of this, he argues that the high aggregate unemployment rate during recessions is not caused by a tremendous rise in the labor force participation rate of females. He cites evidence from the 1973-75 recession to support his position. In that recession, 90% of unemployed males and 68% of unemployed females were job losers.

He argues that because the unemployment rates of males rise at a higher percentage than those of females, and because of the very high percentage of unemployment due to job loss, the aggregate unemployment rates during recessions are not being pushed up by higher participation rates of females in response to the recession. Bowers instead argues that the higher female participation rate during the 1973-75 recession was only a continuation of the rising participation trend.

Female Withdrawal

Gilroy and McIntyre (1974) suggest that because entrants and reentrants are likely to be female and the last hired, their unemployment
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rate is expected to be higher than that of males unless they instead simply withdraw from the labor force.

The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (1976) found that females are more likely to become discouraged workers in recessions than males.

Using historical data, the organization projected what the male and female labor force participation rates would have been without the effects of the 1973-75 recession, and they compared these rates to the actual rates during the recession.

The difference is the discouraged worker group, of which males and females had roughly equal numbers. But as a percentage of their labor force participation rates, females were much more likely to become discouraged workers and withdraw from the labor force than males.

Barth (1967), in his study of the response of the Michigan labor force to economic change, found that the relationship between unemployment rates and male labor force participation rates was not significant.

But the sign of the coefficient of the unemployment variable was negative for five of the six age classifications studied, adding little evidence to the discouraged worker hypothesis.

But among females in age groups other than 14-17 and 65-and-over, labor force participation rates were significantly and inversely correlated to unemployment rates, supporting the discouraged worker hypothesis.

This analysis suggests that females are more likely than males to withdraw from the labor force, leaving fewer unemployed females in the
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labor force. It is because of this, he argues, that the female unemployment rate was lower than the male unemployment rate.

Ferber and Lowry (1974) argue that the unemployment rate reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics is incorrect.

The number of female entrants and reentrants pushes up the female unemployment rate. But the number of discouraged workers leaving the labor force is even higher, and because these non-employed individuals are not counted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics as unemployed, the female unemployment rate is reduced by even a greater amount, leaving the reported female unemployment rate lower than the actual unemployment rate.

Niemi (1974) found that a female's decision to remain in the labor force during unemployment depends upon family income and her education.

Females in low-income families are more likely to remain in the labor force after they have become unemployed. Females with higher levels of education tend to remain in the labor force after they become unemployed because they are much more productive in the labor force than in a non-market activity.

She also found that the duration of unemployment for males and females was closest when the unemployment was caused by layoff. She suggests that this occurs because females remain in the labor force only as long as they can receive unemployment compensation. They then leave the labor force completely, because there are more opportunities available for females outside the labor force than for males.

Gendell (1968) found that while unemployment for married females
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was lower than that for unmarried females, the difference was not as
great as that between married males and unmarried males.

He claims that this is due to the wives' ability to fall back on
their husbands' incomes during unemployment. So when married females
are faced with unemployment, they are more likely to withdraw from the
labor force than are unmarried females who are the sole source of
support for their families.

Morgenstern and Barrett (1974) found that females tend to discount
their unemployment experiences more than males.

In their study, they asked males and females to recall their
unemployment experiences over the past year. They argue that using
the recall method of determining the unemployment rate is more accurate
because factors which would artificially raise the unemployment rate
as it is first reported (such as attempting to meet criteria for
unemployment compensation) are eliminated.

Women (and teenagers), a considerable number of whom are part-time
or secondary workers, do not view labor force participation as their
primary social role. So when females do experience periods of
unemployment, they tend to shrug off those periods, later claiming that
they had left the labor force during those periods.

Thus when asked to recall their unemployment experiences, females
more than males tend to underreport their unemployment rate, meaning
the actual female unemployment rates are lower than the rates reported
at the time.
Effects of Labor Force Participation Rates

Labor force participation rates have an effect on the female unemployment rate, with some factors forcing the female unemployment rate up and widening the unemployment differential, and with other factors helping to reduce the female unemployment and narrow the unemployment differential.

Several factors have had an effect on encouraging female participation in the labor force, the most notable of these a reduction in discrimination barriers.

The type of female entering the labor force has changed dramatically over the last several years, and the increasing attachment of females to the permanent labor force has pushed up the female unemployment rate, widening the gap.

The elasticity of female labor force participation is much higher for females than for males, so that when unemployment rises, females tend not to enter the labor force, and they remain out until recovery. Thus female unemployment rates tend to remain more steady, and the gap narrows during recessions and widens during recovery and prosperity.

Because females tend to enter, leave, and reenter the labor force more often than males, females have higher unemployment rates, and the gap is widened.

Because female unemployment rates are higher than male unemployment rates and because females are composing a larger percentage of the labor force over time, the higher female participation rate forces up the aggregate unemployment rate.
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Because females have higher withdrawal rates and are more likely to become discouraged workers, their unemployment rate is lower than it would be if they remained in the labor force after unemployment, so the gap is narrower than it would otherwise be.

If females could continue to overcome discrimination barriers to participate equally in the labor force with males, and if females could form more permanent attachment to the labor force, lowering the entry and reentry rates, the female unemployment rate would fall and the male and female unemployment rates would show a reduction in the differential.
OTHER FACTORS AFFECTING UNEMPLOYMENT RATES

Ferber and Lowry (1974) found that the relative increase in the female unemployment rate was in part due to the 1967 change in the unemployment definition.

Gendell (1968) found that unemployment rates of females decline as their age increases, but male unemployment rates fall until age 40, rise until retirement age, and fall again.

He suggests that the young of both sexes experience the highest levels of unemployment because they have little work experience, inadequate training, less education, and little seniority. The unemployment rates for females seeking employment were higher because the females were younger than the males and faced these problems more often.

He also points out that married individuals tend to be older than unmarried individuals and are thus able to avoid some of the problems of younger job seekers.

Niemi (1974) found that more highly educated individuals are less susceptible to unemployment because they receive more specialized training and because they are more knowledgeable about labor markets and are able to make a more efficient job search.

Effects of Other Factors Affecting Unemployment Rates

Other factors have raised the female unemployment rate relative to the male unemployment, widening the unemployment differential.

The change in the unemployment definition, implemented to more accurately measure unemployment, caused the female unemployment rate to rise, only as a statistical adjustment.
OTHER FACTORS AFFECTING UNEMPLOYMENT RATES

The younger females seeking jobs tended to have fewer of the qualities necessary for employment than the older males and older individuals in general seeking employment, so the female unemployment was higher, and the unemployment gap was widened.

Females who were less educated were also more likely to be unemployed because they had less specialized training and little knowledge of the labor market. So the female unemployment rate was again raised, and the unemployment gap widened further.

If females could increase the amount and quality of education and training they receive before entering the labor force, the female unemployment rate would fall and the male and female unemployment rates would show a reduction in the differential.
Berryman (1978) argues that because of occupational segregation, females are forced into jobs that pay substantially less than male-dominated occupations.

Willacy and Hilaski (1970) found that females living in poverty neighborhoods, even though they had a stronger economic need to work and they were more often the heads of households than females living in non-poverty areas, had no higher labor force participation rates than females living in non-poverty areas.

They suggest that younger females living in poverty neighborhoods were in the labor force at a lower rate than expected because of household responsibilities, larger families with young children, a lower level of educational attainment, and child care costs that would amount to more than the potential income to be gained. But they were less likely than other females to be outside the labor force because of continuing education.

But females of prime working age (25-54) living in poverty neighborhoods were more likely to be in the labor force than other females because these females are likely to be the heads of households (and the sole source of income) and because black females, who are concentrated in poverty neighborhoods, are more likely to participate in the labor force than white females.

In addition, the authors claim that the unemployment rate for females in poverty neighborhoods was pushed up because they held low-skill, low-paying jobs with little stability. They were more likely to be unemployed and unemployed more often than other females. They were far
less likely than other females to hold professional jobs, and thus their unemployment rates were higher.

Bogan (1969) argues that females have higher levels of unemployment because of their socioeconomic status.

A higher proportion of females living in poor urban neighborhoods were heads of households than were females living in non-poverty neighborhoods. And because residents of poor urban neighborhoods had a much higher unemployment rate than those living in non-poverty neighborhoods, it follows that females have a higher unemployment rate than males.

And he points out that although those living in poor urban neighborhoods prefer work to leisure, job turnover among residents of these areas is very high. He suggests that these people leave their jobs because they are dissatisfied with the work or the working conditions.

He also suggests that the unemployment rates of poor urban neighborhood residents are affected by a lack of labor market information, education, training, and transportation.

Flaim and Gellner (1972) show that the anatomy of unemployment is different between female heads of households and working wives.

The data indicate that the unemployment rate for female heads of households was consistently higher than the rate for male heads of households. The unemployment rate for female heads of households also did not rise as quickly as that for males during the 1970-71 recession. The unemployment rate for female heads of households tended instead to remain fairly steady.
SPECIAL PROBLEMS OF THE POOR

Over time, though, the unemployment rate for female heads of households has slowly climbed as the rate for male heads of households has leveled off, widening the gap between the unemployment rates of the two groups.

Effects of Special Problems of the Poor

Because so many of the unemployed urban poor are females, the female unemployment rate relative to the male unemployment rate is higher, widening the unemployment differential.

Occupational segregation forces females into the lower-paying jobs, causing more females to be counted among the poor.

Younger females in poverty areas are more likely to remain outside the labor force because family responsibilities will not permit them to work. This keeps the female unemployment rate lower than it would otherwise be. But the older females in poverty neighborhoods are more likely to be in the labor force because they are the sole source of income for their families. This pushes the female unemployment rate back up. Depending on the varying strengths of these two effects, the gap between male and female unemployment rates could be widened or narrowed.

Females in poverty neighborhoods are also more likely to be unemployed and unemployed more often because of the type of jobs they are forced to accept, which are unstable and often temporary. The higher resulting female unemployment rate widens the gap between male and female unemployment rates.
SPECIAL PROBLEMS OF THE POOR

If females could overcome occupational segregation to increase their employment in the male-dominated higher-wage industries, fewer females would be restricted to life in poverty neighborhoods. And if poor females were able to get the better-paying, full-time, stable jobs that the non-poor overwhelmingly occupy, the female unemployment rate would fall and the male and female unemployment rates would show a reduction in the differential.
DeBoer and Seeborg (1984) suggest that future trends for the differential between male and female unemployment rates include a narrowing of the gap and a lower female unemployment rate.

The male unemployment rate in 1982 exceeded the female unemployment rate for the first time. The authors attribute this to the narrowing trend that began at least four years before, and they argue that the change occurred because male unemployment rates were much higher than they usually are during recessions, as compared to female unemployment rates.

During the 1981-82 recession, the extremely high male unemployment rate was high enough to push it above the already high female unemployment rate.

After controlling for the effects of cyclical activity, the authors found that the differential between male and female unemployment rates was decreasing at an average rate of 0.2 percentage points annually.

In addition, the female unemployment rate would fall two percentage points relative to the male unemployment rate between 1980 and 1990, and by 2.4 percentage points between 1982 and 1995, the authors predicted.
FAILURE OF GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS

Comprehensive Employment Training Act and Work Incentive Program

Barrett (1979) argues that national policies and programs designed to aid the unemployed have only perpetuated the problems of unemployed females.

The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973 (CETA) and the Work Incentive Program (WIN) were intended to serve the poor unemployed by creating work for them.

But females attempting to participate in these programs were victims of discrimination; males were given priority in these programs because they were assumed to "need" the jobs more than females, due to the assumption that the males were heads of households and the females were not.

In addition, the jobs females were given were the traditional female-dominated jobs. And because the program goal was permanent placement in the private sector, the placement of these females into the female-dominated occupations only worsened the plight of the other females attempting to get those jobs.

She argues that the programs which intended to reduce unemployment are instead flooding an already oversupplied market, raising the female unemployment rate.

Aid to Families with Dependent Children

Berryman (1978) argues that most occupations in which females dominate pay so little that female-headed families cannot remain above the poverty line.
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Females facing this prospect often find that Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) compensation is higher than the income that could be earned. So females, especially female heads of households, are more likely to voluntarily withdraw from the labor force to receive the AFDC payments. With the high withdrawal rate, the rate of female unemployment is somewhat reduced.

Durbin (1975) notes that Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), by far the most often utilized form of public welfare, requires that no male be present for the family to be eligible for the benefits. Durbin argues that this program will even worsen the plight of the poor.

In general, the traditional method for the poor to climb out of poverty was for both the male and the female of the husband-wife team to work to earn the income necessary. But the AFDC program requires that there be no male present, so the traditional family structure is being destroyed, and poverty is perpetuated.

Females are even more becoming heads of households, and because they can receive much more income from AFDC than by working, they remain unemployed at higher rates than the males, who cannot receive these payments.

Fair Labor Standards Act

Niemi (1977) also suggests that females had even higher unemployment rates in the early 1960's because of the passage of the Fair Labor Standards Act.
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The act, which raised the minimum wage and extended coverage to many female-dominated industries, increased the female unemployment rate and increased the gap between male and female unemployment rates.

Unemployment Insurance

Lloyd and Niemi (1979) note that biases in federal policies designed to aid unemployed workers cause females to be unemployed without the benefit of unemployment insurance.

Although a female’s income may be essential to the maintenance of the family’s standard of living, if she earns less than her husband, she is ineligible to receive unemployment benefits. In this situation, the government has assumed that the male is providing the family’s main means of support.

And part-time workers, most of whom are female, can be declared ineligible for aid if they are unable to accept full-time work. This is in spite of the fact that the part-time worker has had unemployment taxes deducted from paychecks.

And in some states, individuals who have had to leave jobs for personal reasons (such as a spouse taking a job in a different location) are ineligible for unemployment benefits. Because this situation is more often encountered by females than males, females are left more often without benefits.

Effects of Failure of Government Programs

The failure of government programs to aid the unemployed has done much to instead raise female unemployment rates relative to male
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unemployment rates, widening the unemployment differential.

Discrimination in the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) and Work Incentive Program (WIN) programs limits the number of females that are served, boosting the female unemployment rate. And the females that are served by the programs are placed in occupations where competition is already tight, forcing females not in the government programs to compete for even fewer job openings, again pushing up the female unemployment rate and widening the gap.

The low wages paid to females for their services are exceeded by the benefits paid through Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), so females withdraw from the labor force to receive the payments. This tends to slightly lower the female unemployment rate and narrow the gap.

The Fair Labor Standards Act extended coverage to female-dominated occupations and raised the minimum wage, creating lower demand for female labor, resulting in a higher unemployment rate for females and a widening of the gap.

Unemployment insurance discriminates against females by denying them benefits that males are more likely to be entitled to.

If government programs could be changed to reduce or eliminate the discrimination against females, and if placement services could end the overwhelming placement of females into female-dominated industries, the female unemployment rate would fall and the male and female unemployment rates would show a reduction in the differential.
"Do the lower earnings, higher unemployment, and occupational segregation of women result from their higher turnover and lack of continuous job experience? Or are discontinuous work histories and high turnover the inevitable result of being restricted to secondary occupations, characterized by low earnings, unstable employment, and little or no opportunity for advancement? The answer to both questions is yes." [p. 13].

Lloyd and Niemi (1979) seem to have summed up the problem quite well. Solutions to reduce the higher female unemployment rate and narrow the differential cannot be developed until the problem itself is defined.

The many government programs designed to reduce female unemployment rates have in most cases had little effect; or worse, they have been detrimental, making the problems worse. And until the magnitudes of the different factors affecting female unemployment rates can be more narrowly defined, government programs will continue to be ineffective.

So what is the cause of the differential between male and female unemployment rates?

Almost certainly discrimination plays the most vital role. Discrimination, blatant and social, discourages employers from hiring females and giving them the training they need to compete in the labor market. Social discrimination encourages the female to place more importance on the male's occupation than her own, reducing her geographic mobility. And social discrimination discourages the female from attempting to move out of the traditionally female jobs, reducing her occupational mobility.
CONCLUSION

Discrimination also plays a part in ensuring that females will be the last to be hired, whether the cause of unemployment is entry, reentry, layoff, or frictional.

The segregation of males and females into specific occupations is also caused by discrimination. Social discrimination pressures females to only seek work in those occupations which are socially acceptable for females. And blatant discrimination by employers helps to ensure that they will remain in these occupations.

The labor force participation rates of females are increasing, but occupational segregation helps to ensure that their unemployment rates remain high. Females entering the labor force still tend to flock to female-dominated industries, and employers continue to discriminate by not hiring female applicants for male-dominated positions.

Recent legislation has helped to reduce the blatant discrimination, but even stronger legislation, stiffer penalties, and stricter enforcement of discrimination laws should help to alleviate the female unemployment rate.

Social discrimination is much more difficult to overcome, because long-standing beliefs and assumptions must be disproved and changed. The change has already begun. Females are better accepted in the labor force now than ever before, and they are beginning to infiltrate the male-dominated industries. Female wage rates are rising somewhat, helping to keep females off the welfare rolls, although the goal is still a long way off. And females are finally beginning to believe in the equal importance of their jobs to those of their husbands.
CONCLUSION

But there is still much discrimination to be overcome. And until this discrimination is reduced or eliminated, the differential between male and female unemployment rates will remain.
### Male and Female Unemployment Rates

#### Table: Employment Status of the Civilian Noninstitutional Population by Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin: 1960 to 1984

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>117,245</td>
<td>89,628</td>
<td>206,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>122,513</td>
<td>74,455</td>
<td>196,968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>137,085</td>
<td>82,771</td>
<td>219,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>153,152</td>
<td>93,775</td>
<td>246,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>161,910</td>
<td>102,251</td>
<td>264,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>164,953</td>
<td>104,962</td>
<td>269,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>173,745</td>
<td>126,940</td>
<td>290,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>177,271</td>
<td>120,294</td>
<td>297,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>176,294</td>
<td>113,877</td>
<td>280,171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1. Civilian employed as a percent of the noninstitutional population.
2. Seasonally adjusted, except unadjusted population figures.
3. Persons of Hispanic origin may be of any race.

**Source:** U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Employment and Earnings, monthly.

---


---

**In 105th ed. (Washington, D.C.), p. 391.**
### UNEMPLOYMENT RATES BY CAUSE


[Ch!efian persons 16 years old and over. Rate represents unemployment as a percent of labor force in each specified group. Annual averages of monthly figures. Data for 1983 not strictly comparable with earlier years due to changes in industrial classification.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All unemployed a</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and public utilities</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale and retail trade</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, insurance, and real estate</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service industries</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Includes the self-employed, unpaid family workers, and persons with no previous work experience, not shown separately.
2 Covers unemployed wage and salary workers.


---

### Employment Growth by Industry


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82,809</td>
<td>103,939</td>
<td>103,175</td>
<td>110,315</td>
<td>116,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>3,420</td>
<td>2,860</td>
<td>2,852</td>
<td>2,550</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy and poultry products</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>-5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>-8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air transportation</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication equipment</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft manufacturing</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>4,387</td>
<td>5,665</td>
<td>5,491</td>
<td>6,983</td>
<td>7,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>19,665</td>
<td>20,673</td>
<td>21,671</td>
<td>22,216</td>
<td>23,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durable goods</td>
<td>11,399</td>
<td>12,423</td>
<td>13,128</td>
<td>13,550</td>
<td>14,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-durable goods</td>
<td>8,266</td>
<td>8,250</td>
<td>7,908</td>
<td>8,668</td>
<td>8,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation equipment</td>
<td>2,687</td>
<td>2,350</td>
<td>3,103</td>
<td>3,452</td>
<td>2,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-metallic mineral products</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary metals</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital equipment</td>
<td>1,225</td>
<td>1,497</td>
<td>1,454</td>
<td>1,701</td>
<td>1,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio and television broadcasting</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications equipment</td>
<td>1,132</td>
<td>1,362</td>
<td>1,420</td>
<td>1,697</td>
<td>1,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and sewage systems</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric power and gas utilities</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, scientific, and technical services</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>5,899</td>
<td>7,112</td>
<td>7,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale trade</td>
<td>17,060</td>
<td>22,493</td>
<td>22,536</td>
<td>26,355</td>
<td>28,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>14,059</td>
<td>21,097</td>
<td>22,617</td>
<td>27,863</td>
<td>31,290</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Figures are in thousands, except percent. Employment includes wage and salary workers in nonagricultural establishments, the self-employed, and family workers, private household workers and farm workers. Due to estimation procedures and classification of components of industries, data not comparable to those in other tables. Minus sign (-) indicates decrease.


---


#### FEMALE MIGRATION INTO MALE-DOMINATED INDUSTRIES


[In thousands, except percent. As of April 1. Based on sample data from the census of population; subsample of 1970 data reclassified to the 1980 occupation classification system. The experienced civilian labor force includes the employed and the unemployed who have worked any time in the past. See text, p. 368 and source, for details]
### MALE AND FEMALE LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION RATES


(Persons 16 years old and over. Labor force data are annual averages of monthly figures. Rates are based on annual average civilian noninstitutional population of each specified group and represent proportion of each specified group in the civilian labor force. See also Historical Statistics, Colonial Times to 1970, series D 42-48)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE (MILLIONS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>110.9</td>
<td>111.6</td>
<td>111.8</td>
<td>125.0</td>
<td>131.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>153.6</td>
<td>185.6</td>
<td>222.8</td>
<td>223.4</td>
<td>223.5</td>
<td>250.0</td>
<td>262.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Source:
BIBLIOGRAPHY


Jones, Ethel B. Determinants of Female Reentrant Unemployment (Kalamazoo: W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, 1983).
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