humanistic management were more central to the profession. The British story begins to resemble the United States beginning in the 1960s. In the context of turbulent labor relations and increasing government regulation of industrial relations, health and safety, and antidiscrimination, personnel experts took roles in managing labor relations, in promoting occupational psychology, and in developing practices for selection, motivation, work satisfaction, and job design. The economic, technological, and political changes of the 1980s and 1990s have also promoted human resources management rhetoric and practices. Yet this transition was accompanied by criticism from practitioners and academicians more so than in the United States. Indeed, while the American Society for Personnel Administration (ASPA) changed its name to the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM), in Britain the Institute for Personnel Management continued its activity and growth and in 2000 was granted a royal charter.

Across Europe, the historical development of the personnel profession varied, relative to Britain and the United States. As Jean-Marie Hiltrop, Charles Despres and Paul Sparrow argue in their review, varying institutional, cultural, economic, and political contexts have led to different configurations of the personnel profession. For example, personnel experts were more likely to have a financial background in Italy or the Netherlands, which led to an early focus on cost control; in Germany, having a legal background was more common in personnel, while in the United States, personnel advice often contradicted the advice of legal experts. Work/life issues, another centerpiece of contemporary HRM in England and the United States, receive little attention in Europe, partially due to the more elaborate welfare state. In contrast, collective bargaining remains high on the agenda of HRM in many European countries. While patterns of convergence in the personnel profession across the continents are observed, especially in the last two decades with the transition to HRM, as Chris Brewster has shown, the European perspective on personnel remains significantly distinct from the U.S. one.

Alexandra Kalev
Moran Levy
Tel Aviv University

See Also: Bureaucracy; Career Ladders; Collective Bargaining; Control, Workplace; Discrimination, Employment; Diversity Programs; Employee Participation; Family-Responsive Corporations; Germany; Human Relations Theory; Human Resources; Internal Labor Markets; Job Satisfaction; Labor Law; Management, Scientific; Restructuring, Corporate; Professionalization; Seniority; Work Ethic; Work Redesign.

Further Readings

Baron, Jim and David Kreps. *Strategic Human Resources: Frameworks for General Managers*. New York: John Wiley, 1999.

Brewster, Chris. "European Perspectives on Human Resource Management." *Human Resource Management Review*, v.14/4 (2004).

Dobbin, Frank. *Inventing Equal Opportunity.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2009.

Edelman, Lauren B., Sally Riggs Fuller, and Iona Mara-Drita. "Diversity Rhetoric and the Managerialization of the Law." *American Journal of Sociology*, v.106 (2001).

Eilbirt, Henry. "The Development of Personnel Management in the United States." *Business History Review*, v.33 (1959).

Hiltrop, Jean-Marie, Charles Despres and Paul Sparrow. "The Changing Role of HR Managers in Europe." *European Management Journal*, v.13/1 (1995).

Jacoby, Sanford. *Employing Bureaucracy: Managers, Unions, and the Transformation of Work in American Industry, 1900–1945*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1985.

Kochan, Thomas A., Harry C. Katz, and Robert B. McKersie. *The Transformation of American Industrial Relations*. New York: Basic Books, 1986.

Pink Collar

Dress has been a marker of occupational stratification. Factory work involving manual labor has been metaphorically tagged as "blue collar" for its blue work shirts and jumpsuits. Office work, involving higher education and managerial skills, has been referred to as "white collar" for the white business shirts employees wear. Both types of jobs, at the beginning of the 20th century at least, were dominated by men.

"Pink collar" refers to developments in the mid-century when women entered jobs as secretaries, typists, phone operators, waitresses, child care providers, etc., in large numbers. This entry explains how and why the term *pink collar* came to symbolize jobs that absorbed the expanding female labor force. It notes the rise and persistence of pink collar jobs. It also explores contradictions in the technology and globalization that has facilitated women's employment, yet has also resulted in the devaluation and the feminization of such occupations.

Emergence of Pink Collar Work

In the early 1900s, only a minority of women were working in the formal labor force. Clerical work, for instance, was seen as a route to advancement for young men, who learned managerial skills as they worked closely in the office with their boss, usually the owner-employer.

However, the introduction of new types of technologies increased the demand for clerical and office workers. Tasks previously undertaken by one person were split up into many small components, making it easy to train individuals for the specific tasks. This created flexibility, increasing part-time work, which particularly suited married women with family responsibilities. These changes in the work arena coincided with the spread of secondary education. Women graduating from high school wanted jobs that offered a "respectable" working environment. This assured employers of a potential supply of educated and perhaps skilled female labor.

Thus in the 1950s, women entered office work as secretaries and clerks, replacing men. Taking care of the needs of the boss or the organization was linked to their household responsibilities as care providers and budget managers. Clerical work gradually transformed from an upwardly mobile apprenticeship for potential managerial positions to dead-end secretarial work suitable for women who were expected to leave, once married.

The 1960s and 1970s brought additional opportunities for women in the labor force. One was the rise of the service economy, which pulled women into work as waitresses, secretaries, clerks, child care providers, beauticians, etc.

Servers prepare a dessert table in the Iowa Memorial Union at the University of Iowa, circa 1956. It was during this era when a great deal of women entered jobs as secretaries, typists, waitresses, and the like, earning the title of "pink collar" worker.

This converged with what is known as a "feminization" of certain occupations, where the majority of workers—two-thirds or more—are women. "Female occupations" are flexible in terms of hours and labor turnover, because women prefer them, or because employers prefer to hire women.

This was also the era of the second wave of feminism that heralded the entry of women into nontraditional work, in a range of occupations hitherto closed to them. It spurred the introduction of legislation barring discriminatory hiring practices, and it raised expectations of ending gender segregation within and across occupations.

Louise Kapp Howe, a writer specializing in social issues, is credited with having coined the term *pink collar* in her 1977 book *Pink Collar Workers: Inside the World of Women's Work*. The term harks back to the 1950s when women were entering the formal work force in significant numbers, often wearing pink shirts, as in the uniforms of waitresses.

While it was a nod to the achievements of women in the labor force, Howe's use of the term *pink collar* was also a lament on the lack of progress, drawing attention to the funneling of women into "female" occupations, notwithstanding the active rhetoric of the women's movement exhorting women to break convention and join the higher-paying and higher-status occupations traditionally considered men's work. Yet, despite the new opportunities, the majority of women continued to hold pink collar jobs in occupations with a predominantly female workforce and characterized by low pay, long hours, and little prospects of career advancement.

Segregation and Pink Collar Ghettos

Research since then has explored the dynamics and impacts of pink collar work. A critical problem, for instance, is segregation and ghettoization. Karin Stallard, Barbara Ehrenreich, and Holly Sklar, in their seminal 1983 book on women, children, and poverty in the United States, observed structural inequities women face in the occupational sectors into which they are segregated. Taking up the terminology, they called these sites "pink collar ghettos."

Another implication is devaluation. Scholars of labor have noted that the prestige, importance, and wages of such occupations declined as more women "crowded" into them and as men moved out. Many scholars question whether it is the effect of gender that leads to a devaluation of the job. This is also one of the reasons why the wage gap between men and women persists even in 2012. Within feminized occupations, men are better paid and better placed in organizational hierarchies. Further, as Evelyn Nakano Glenn points out, these male, and less commonly female, supervisors are likely to be white. Occupational segregation thus has intersecting gendered and racial dimensions.

Research at the end of the 20th century has highlighted a third implication: the declining real wages and degradation of pink collar work. In her 2001 book *Nickel and Dimed*, Ehrenreich shows the near impossibility of getting by on the minimum wage that most pink collar workers earn, as they are trapped in jobs without recourse to occupational ladders that would lead them into higher positions.

Thus, there is a contradictory positionality of pink collar work in the spectrum of collar colors: women's jobs fit neither the blue- nor white-collar domains. The origin of the term may have been rooted in the white-collar sector, reflecting the move of women into office settings for clerical work. In this sense, pink collar work has at times shared features with its white-collar cousins: mental tasks, professional status, office location, and salaried (versus hourly wage) pay systems. Pink collar workers have also, like many professionals, lacked union representation, despite the noble efforts of associations like 9to5, the National Organization of Working Women.

However, the meaning of pink collar has changed over time, expanding to service domains in the retail sector, as restaurant waitresses and sales clerks, and in care work, as maids, nannies, home/elder care workers, an so forth. Therefore, it has also approximated blue-collar work in its routinization, low pay, and dead ends.

Distinct from either white or blue collar, finally, are other features of pink collar work: requirements of emotional and intimate labor, and special vulnerabilities to part-time status, contract work, and lack of a living wage. The feminized label itself has also become a marker for its occupants, undercutting worker power and social image.

Information Technology and Globalization

Information and communication technologies have globalized factory and service labor, creating pink collar ghettos around the world. Business process outsourcing is widely used by employers to transfer a range of jobs to countries where an inexpensive supply of educated and skilled labor is available. Carla Freeman, noting this development in the 1990s in her book *High Tech and High Heels*, revealed how multinational employers in the Caribbean exploited the computerization and professional status of data entry work to encourage feminized dress (for example, high-heeled shoes, makeup, business suits, etc.) obscuring the less-than-favorable working conditions and rewards for women.

International call centers are another example of pink collar ghettos, where customers in the United States or Europe interact with phone service agents in, say, India or the Philippines. A number of authors have written extensively on the identity and class dilemmas as well as the opportunities that such work poses for women.

When pink collar work moves to conservative political contexts like Pakistan, the benefits in terms of income and computerized office settings for women are offset by the stigmas against working with men. As Yasmin Zaidi has shown, women use extensive gender performances to display "virtuous" behavior as good daughters and family earners by dressing conservatively, covering their heads, and restricting contact with male colleagues.

Legacies of the Pink Collar

The term *pink collar* falls and rises in use by scholars, perhaps because of the stereotypical connotations of the color itself, and the implied denigration of women's work. However, even today, approximately half of all women working outside the home are thought to be in often low-paid, dead-end, and nonunionized pink collar jobs. Proponents of pay equity suggest that if wages for pink collar jobs rose, sex segregation would decrease as men would seek higher wages in those traditionally "female" occupations.

Yasmin Zaidi
Brandeis University
Winifred Poster
Washington University, St. Louis

See Also: Blue-Collar Jobs; Feminization of Work; Globalization; Occupational Segregation by Gender and Race; Service Work; White Collar.

Further Readings

Acker, Joan. "Hierarchies, Jobs, Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organizations." *Gender and Society*, v.4 (1990).

Ehrenreich, Barbara. *Nickel and Dimed: On (Not) Getting By in America*. New York: Metropolitan Books, 2001.

Freeman, Carla. *High Tech and High Heels in the Global Economy: Women, Work, and Pink Collar Identities in the Caribbean*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2000.

Glenn, Evelyn Nakano. "From Servitude to Service Work: Historical Continuities in the Racial Division of Paid Reproductive Labor." *Signs*, v.18/1 (1992).

Goldin, Claudia. "The Rising (and then Declining) Significance of Gender." NBER Working Paper No. 8915. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research, April 2002.

Howe, Louie Kapp. *Pink Collar Workers: Inside the World of Women's Work*. New York: Putnam, 1977.

Poster, Winifred. "Global Circuits of Gender: Women and High-Tech Work in India and the U.S." In *Women in Engineering and Technology Research: The Prometea Conference Proceedings*, Godfroy-Genin, A., ed. Berlin, Germany: Lit Verlag, 2010.

Reskin, Barbara F. and Patricia A. Roos. *Job Queues, Gender Queues: Explaining Women's Inroads Into Male Occupations*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1990.

Stallard, Karin, Barbara Ehrenreich, and Holly Sklar. *Poverty in the American Dream: Women and Children First*. Boston: South End, 1982.

Zaidi, Yasmin. "Chaddars and Pink Collars in Pakistan: Gender, Work, and the Global Economy." Unpublished Ph.D. thesis. Waltham, MA: Brandeis University, 2012.

Polarized Workforce

Job polarization describes a linked set of changes to employment structures in advanced capitalist economies associated with the transition from a manufacturing to a service base. Economic restructuring has polarized the workforce along several dimensions, including in levels of job growth, compensation, job security, and job quality. While capitalist workforces have long been divided between good jobs and bad jobs, these changes appear to have deepened the divide and reduced the number of middling jobs and the opportunities for job mobility. Job polarization emerged mainly in the 1990s and 2000s and has been most pronounced in the United States, but it has affected a number of European countries as well. Scholars disagree about the causes of job polarization, but key factors include institutional change, technological change, global competition, and the nature of demand in a service economy.