**Relations industrielles
Industrial Relations**

Gender-Based Wage Differences: The Effects of Occupation and Job Segregation in Israel

Urs E. Gattiker and Aaron Cohen

See table of contents

Explore this journal

Cite this article

Article abstract

This article reports on an analysis of gender differences in the process governing salary disparity between typically female occupations and typically male occupations. The research surveyed 771 white collar employees. The findings indicate that choice of occupation does affect income disparity. This study provides evidence of pay discrimination against men in predominantly female occupations and against women in female- and male-dominated positions. In contrast to North American studies, women did not experience a positive effect by being employed in the public sector, nor did either of the genders working in larger organizations. The implications of the findings for the generalizability of human capital, structural and institutional theories explaining wage disparity in a cross-national context are discussed.

Gender-Based Wage Differences

The Effects of Occupation and Job Segregation in Israel

URS E. GATTIKER
AARON COHEN

This article reports on an analysis of gender differences in the process governing salary disparity between typically female occupations and typically male occupations. The research surveyed 771 white collar employees. The findings indicate that choice of occupation does affect income disparity. This study provides evidence of pay discrimination against men in predominantly female occupations and against women in female- and male-dominated positions. In contrast to North American studies, women did not experience a positive effect by being employed in the public sector, nor did either of the genders working in larger organizations. The implications of the findings for the generalizability of human capital, structural and institutional theories explaining wage disparity in a cross-national context are discussed.

The existence of income disparity between genders is widely acknowledged (Boulet and Lavallée 1984; Kemp and Beck 1986; Sorensen 1987) and holds true for many countries (e.g., Effroni 1980; Kauppinen-Toropainen,

Kandolin and Haavio-Mannila 1988; Izraeli 1990; Kugler 1988; Wolkinson, Harel and Izraeli 1982; Toren and Kraus 1987). An important source of lower earnings of women relative to men is their differential placement in firms, occupation, and jobs. One explanation may be that women may choose occupations, such as support positions, where their skills and talents will depreciate less rapidly during spells of absence from the labour market.

An alternative explanation is that women's differential placement is the result of discrimination. Women may have had access to a limited number of occupations due to historical, cultural and religious reasons. Such "crowding" into an occupation would cause an oversupply of labour in these occupations, thereby driving down wages (Bergmann 1974). Additionally, it may also be that people employed in female-dominated jobs such as childcare receive lower returns on human capital (e.g., specific training), because "women's work" is undervalued (e.g., King 1995). Research suggests that the percentage of women's employment in an occupation is negatively associated with earnings (e.g., Sorensen 1987, 1989). Human capital theory argues that unequal returns for education, professional and organizational tenure (e.g., Becker 1975), as well as demographics such as marital status and age (e.g., England et al. 1988; Pfeffer and Ross 1982) and being an immigrant (e.g., Semyonov 1988), may in part explain the difference. Structural theory asserts that institutional/organizational and structural/industry sector factors (e.g., type of industry) lead to economic disparities between the genders (e.g., Bielby and Baron 1986; Semyonov 1988). Existing research provides evidence consistent with all of these explanations for gender-based wage differences.

This paper focuses on human capital as well as structural theory. It measures and addresses the question of how gender composition of occupations may help to explain earning differences between men and women. Moreover, the paper examines how the effect of structural and human capital on wage disparity may differ between male-dominated and female-dominated occupations and, most importantly, within each occupation between genders. The answers should prove useful for affirmative and comparable-worth pay policies. In this paper, we formulate a model which takes these issues into account. Clearly, the relationship of these issues to wage inequality for women requires more extensive study.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Recently, research has begun to assess the income disparity debate by studying occupations. Research has concentrated on assessing the applicability of social stratification and structural theories in explaining wage inequality for segregated occupations (e.g., Sorensen 1989). What has typically been

overlooked in studies of differential earnings across jobs with different gender compositions is how women may fare in typical "male" or "female" role-associated jobs (e.g., engineering and nursing).

Occupational Segregation, Choice and Compensation

Some occupations may receive high returns for human capital as training rapidly becomes obsolete. Differences in earnings across occupations may also be based on the characteristics of the occupation, or of the human capital used in an occupation. For example, human capital in the field of education may receive a lower return because of high demand for the shorter work year. However, there may be another major reason for differences in earnings across occupations: gender-based segregation.

Most studies have found that individuals working in a predominantly female occupation earned significantly less than those working in a predominantly male occupation (Izraeli and Gaier 1979). The typical finding, after controlling for productivity-related characteristics, is that workers in female-dominated jobs earn approximately 15% less than those in male-dominated jobs (e.g., Blau and Beller 1988).

Another concern is how women fare in male-dominated jobs. Often the reasons for gender stereotyping cannot be defined as natural or biological but, instead, are related to societal and cultural factors which are intertwined with tradition and prestige in different occupations (Toren and Kraus 1987; Sewell, Hauser and Wolf 1980). Women in male-dominated positions act against gender role-stereotypes by holding "male" positions (Morrison and Von Glinow 1990). Neoclassical theory suggests that women wanting to work in such occupations will do so at a lower wage to provide an incentive for employers to hire them (England et al. 1988). Based on this argument, two predictions could be made:

Hypothesis 1$_A$: Male-dominated occupations will pay higher wages than female-dominated ones; and

Hypothesis 2$_A$: Women will be paid lower wages than men in both male-dominated and female-dominated positions.

The "comparable worth" claim that discrimination creates uncompensated pay differentials between predominantly male and females jobs has two rationales that constitute anomalies for neoclassical theory. First, the hiring discrimination that keeps women out of male jobs leads to an excessive supply of labour in female jobs, and this "crowding" lowers pay (Bergmann 1974). Alternatively, employers may discriminate against female occupations by paying less than their contribution to the organization (England and Norris 1985). Neoclassical theory predicts that market forces will eventually eliminate both types of discrimination. In the case of hiring discrimination,

if some employers will not hire women for male-dominated jobs, women who want these jobs will offer to work at a lower wage. Eventually, wage discrimination against female-dominated occupations should erode as employers will stop paying more for male-dominated positions in order to fill them. Employers will also encourage women, who will accept lower wages, to enter the male-dominated occupations. This leads to the following two hypotheses:

> *Hypothesis 3.1ₐ: Women in male-dominated occupations will be paid more than women in female-dominated occupations; and*
>
> *Hypothesis 3.2ₐ: Men in male-dominated occupations will be paid more than men in female-dominated occupations.*

Although testing the above hypotheses addresses the issue of how occupational choice may exacerbate income disparity between genders, the factors leading to such an outcome must still be determined.

Human Capital Explanations for Income Disparity

The general theme pervading the human capital literature is that the financial remuneration of individuals is based on their productivity or job performance. These two factors are assumed to be positively influenced by formal schooling and/or special skills. Later developments in human capital theory also emphasize variation in postschooling investments, placing particular weight on tenure in a job or organization (Mincer 1974). Theoretically, greater variation in positional and organizational tenure among job incumbents will result in greater intraoccupational earnings dispersion. Human capital explanations for income disparity lead us to expect "unequal pay for equal work", with the male-female pay differential exceeding the corresponding productivity differential because of discrimination (Becker 1971; Kemp and Beck 1986).

The general assumption in human capital theory is that formal schooling provides the individual with general skills, which are assumed to be transferable to any job and/or employer. In contrast, organizational tenure provides the individual with firm-specific skills, through experience and on-the-job training. The limited transferability of firm-specific skills will reduce the employee's bargaining power over wages (e.g., Gattiker 1995). By definition, wages are market-driven after training and equal to marginal product, thus benefitting the employee with general skills (Hashimoto 1982). Human capital theory also suggests that one's tenure in a profession should increase skills and thus income. Discrimination would again imply that women are less rewarded for these skills than men. This leads to two predictions:

Hypothesis 4$_A$: Due to the employee's increased bargaining power, formal schooling will have a greater impact than organizational tenure on an individual's income and

Hypothesis 5$_A$: Organizational tenure will benefit women less than men in terms of compensation.

Demographic Variables and Pay Differentials

This category of individual-level variables has been used extensively to explain disparity in organizations. For example, some research reports that marriage can have a negative effect on women's income (England et al. 1988), while other research reports an insignificant effect (Roos 1983).

Sociological explanations of occupational segregation emphasize the reciprocal effect of gender-role socialization and discrimination by employers — producing in each generation employers who hold discriminatory values and beliefs. Consequently, women may hold attitudes and role preferences which reinforce discrimination (England et al. 1988; Gattiker 1994; Studd and Gattiker 1991; Thornton, Alwin and Camburn 1983). One outcome could be that, as suggested by economists, the lower income of female-dominated occupations may be "compensated" for by other advantages, such as better working conditions.

Based on the traditionally held complementary concept of marriage, the dominant belief is that the primary responsibility for childcare rests with the woman, whereas the household's economic needs must be met by the male's income (Ross, Mirowsky and Huber 1983). Research indicates that while marital status has a positive effect on men's wages, the opposite is true for women (e.g., Gerhart and El Cheikh 1991). Female-dominated occupations may exhibit discrimination based on traditional role-models, providing men with a higher reward for parental responsibilities than women (e.g., Miller 1987). These factors suggest the following two predictions:

Hypothesis 6$_A$: Having children is positively correlated with income in female-dominated occupations; and

Hypothesis 7$_A$: The effect of having children is greater for men than women in female-dominated occupations.

Institutional/Organizational Explanations of Pay Differentials

A third perspective addressing the causes of economic inequality emphasizes the importance of institutional or organizational determinants over the training and work-experience variables stressed by human capital theory (Lorence 1987). Institutional perspectives generally assume that wages are fixed by employers and are largely independent of the marginal productivity

of individual workers; that is, earnings depend more on the job than on the individual characteristics of the employee.

Wage differentials may also be due, in part, to the size of the firm. Pearce (1990) reported that salaries in large firms tend to be 7% to 20% higher than in small firms. Other research indicates that women experience discrimination mostly in non-managerial positions (Lazear and Rosen 1990), but through promotion along job ladders, discrimination becomes reduced in favour of women (Gattiker 1990). However, making gender-atypical choices (e.g., a male entering a female-dominated position) may result in the atypical gender being given a greater return for hierarchical level, as she/he represents a "token" to the public by the firm (Kanter 1977), therefore implying that the firm does not discriminate against one gender (see also the "crowding" hypothesis).

In addition, a private firm's drive to reduce costs may affect income levels negatively (Jacobs 1985), and increase income disparity between genders. Kemp and Beck (1986), using U.S. data, reported a positive effect on wage levels for women employed in the public sector. Recent Canadian data also indicate that, as a percentage of private sector wages, the gross public sector wage advantage for women is 27.2% (Shapiro and Stelcner 1989), suggesting cross-national applicability of this phenomenon. The hypotheses can be formulated as follows:

Hypothesis 8$_A$: Occupational-segregation results in hierarchical level having a greater positive effect on the income of the atypical gender;

Hypothesis 9$_A$: Organizational size has a positive effect on salary for both genders regardless of an occupation's gender composition; and

Hypothesis 10$_A$: Women's salaries will be affected positively by working in the public sector regardless of an occupation's gender composition.

In summary, this study seeks to clarify how occupational choice, occupational segregation, social stratification and structural theories help in explaining income disparity between genders. Other studies report that the variance accounted for in income disparity by social stratification and structural-theory based variables/measures is generally lower for women than men (Montgomery and Wascher 1987; Sorensen 1987). This study utilizes the relevant variables of the theoretical approaches described above and tests their applicability with a sample from Israel.

METHOD

Sample

The research sample consists of 771 employees in five white-collar occupations from across Israel. A team of interviewers surveyed 17 unionized

firms in industry and service sectors: public, private and union-owned. In Israel, unions are a major employer in their own right. The interviewers distributed and collected the questionnaires from each employee within about a week. The response rate obtained was approximately 80%, with 54.3% of the respondents female and 45.7% male.

Gender Composition

Male- and female-dominated jobs are generally defined as any occupation in which the majority of job-holders are male or female, respectively. In North America, the standard definition used in public sector comparable-worth studies is the "70 percent rule" (Smith 1988; Sorensen 1987). The typical male occupation is assumed to have no more than 26% women while the typical female occupation is assumed to have approximately 71% females (Gerhart and El Cheikh 1991).

Based on labour force statistics from the Israel Central Bureau of Statistics (1987: 370–377) and previous studies in Israel (e.g., Izraeli 1990; Izraeli and Gaier 1979), the sample used in this study contained two occupations which were considered to be male-dominated, namely engineers (13.8% female) and technicians (18.9% female). Female-dominated positions were biologists and biochemists (61.7% female), nurses (90.1% female) and X-ray technicians (78.7% female).

Although these professions are a limited sample of all occupations in Israel, they represent gender-stereotyped occupations in many other countries besides Israel (e.g., see Kauppinen-Toropainen, Kandolin and Haavio-Mannila 1988; Sewell, Hauser and Wolf 1980; Smith 1988).

Empirical Model

Literature dealing with wage inequality between genders contends that both social stratification and structural theory help in explaining a person's income. It also suggests that occupational choice and job segregation exacerbate income disparity. Even though female-dominated jobs may have lower salaries than male-dominated ones, pay as a consequence of norms may devalue a particular profession (e.g., nursing) in comparison to another (e.g., X-ray technician). Thus, biased market pay structures can occur *backward*, through job evaluations producing devaluation of certain occupations. Consequently, occupational effects must be controlled when trying to determine the relationship between gender and income disparity in segregated occupations (e.g., dummy-variable coding for each occupation — Cohen and Cohen 1983: 183–185). Many studies report only *bivariate* linear correlations between variables measuring social stratification and structural theories.

Yet, without systematically controlling for occupational segregation and choice, it is not possible to evaluate the occupational segregation and choice effect on wage disparity. We used dummy-variable coding with O (occupations) — 1 dichotomies (Cohen and Cohen 1983: 183–185). This approach allows us to test if working in a particular gender-segregated occupation leads employers to discriminate against one gender by paying less than their contribution to the firm.[1] (A technical appendix outlining the regressions estimated is available from the first author.)

TABLE 1

Variable Definitions

DEPENDENT VARIABLES	
Log Earnings	The natural log of monthly earnings after tax and other deductions have been made
INDEPENDENT VARIABLES	
HUMAN CAPITAL VARIABLES	
B.A.	1 if completed a B.A. degree, zero otherwise
Tenorg	The natural log of number of years worked for current employer
Tenprf	The natural log of number of years worked in profession
DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES	
Mar	1 if married, zero otherwise
Born	1 if born in Israel, zero otherwise
Children	1 if yes, zero otherwise
Gender	0 = male, 1 = female
INSTITUTIONAL VARIABLES	
Level	1 if manager, zero otherwise
Size	The natural log of number of employees in the organization
Gov	1 if government employees, zero otherwise
OCCUPATIONAL VARIABLES	
Eng	1 if engineers, zero otherwise
Tech	1 if technicians, zero otherwise
BioChem	1 if biologists and biochemists, zero otherwise
Nurse	1 if nurses, zero otherwise
X-Ray	1 if X-Ray technicians, zero otherwise

---

1. As suggested by Cohen and Cohen (1983: 183–185), the models in Tables 4 and 5 use one occupation as a reference group when determining specific occupation-based effects on income disparity.

TABLE 2

Means and Standard Deviations of Research Variables

	MODEL 1 Overall DATA		MODEL 2 MALE		MODEL 3 FEMALE		MODEL 4 MALE-DOMINATED OCCUPATIONS		MODEL 5 FEMALE-DOMINATED OCCUPATIONS		MODEL 6 MALE-DOMINATED OCCUPATIONS MALE		MODEL 7 MALE-DOMINATED OCCUPATIONS FEMALE		MODEL 8 FEMALE-DOMINATED OCCUPATIONS MALE		MODEL 9 FEMALE-DOMINATED OCCUPATIONS FEMALE	
	MEAN	S.D.	MEAN	S.D.	MEAN	S.D.	MEAN	S.D.	MEAN	S.D.	MEAN	S.D.	MEAN	S.D.	MEAN	S.D.	MEAN	S.D.
HUMAN CAPITAL VARIABLES																		
B.A.	0.35	0.48	0.38	0.49	0.32	0.47	0.45	0.50	0.28	0.45	0.46	0.50	0.44	0.50	0.26	0.44	0.29	0.45
Tenorg	2.30	0.83	2.28	0.82	2.31	0.84	2.23	0.80	2.34	0.84	2.22	0.83	2.34	0.74	2.38	0.81	2.33	0.86
Tenprf	2.63	0.76	2.63	0.74	2.64	0.77	2.66	0.72	2.62	0.78	2.64	0.72	2.69	0.71	2.61	0.77	2.63	0.79
DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES																		
Mar	0.82	0.38	0.86	0.35	0.79	0.41	0.87	0.33	0.79	0.41	0.88	0.32	0.85	0.36	0.83	0.38	0.77	0.42
Born	0.37	0.48	0.36	0.48	0.38	0.49	0.33	0.47	0.40	0.49	0.33	0.47	0.32	0.47	0.40	0.49	0.40	0.49
Children	0.82	0.38	0.86	0.35	0.79	0.41	0.88	0.33	0.78	0.41	0.89	0.32	0.86	0.35	0.82	0.39	0.77	0.42
INSTITUTIONAL VARIABLES																		
Level	0.34	0.48	0.42	0.50	0.27	0.45	0.40	0.49	0.31	0.46	0.48	0.50	0.15	0.36	0.33	0.47	0.30	0.46
Size	7.07	0.84	6.89	0.89	7.23	0.76	6.62	0.98	7.36	0.58	6.56	0.92	6.78	1.14	7.41	0.54	7.34	0.60
Gov	0.48	0.50	0.38	0.49	0.58	0.50	0.31	0.46	0.59	0.49	0.26	0.44	0.42	0.50	0.55	0.50	0.61	0.49
OCCUPATIONAL VARIABLES																		
Eng	0.18	0.39	0.29	0.46	0.08	0.27	0.47	0.50			0.48	0.50	0.42	0.50				
Tech	0.21	0.41	0.32	0.47	0.11	0.31	0.53	0.50			0.52	0.50	0.58	0.50				
BioChem	0.25	0.43	0.11	0.32	0.37	0.48			0.41	0.49					0.29	0.46	0.46	0.50
Nurse	0.20	0.40	0.08	0.27	0.31	0.46			0.33	0.47					0.20	0.41	0.38	0.49
X-Ray	0.16	0.37	0.21	0.40	0.13	0.34			0.26	0.44					0.53	0.50	0.16	0.37
Income	7.05	0.32	7.21	0.29	6.92	0.28	7.19	0.31	6.96	0.29	7.28	0.27	6.96	0.27	7.09	0.28	6.91	0.28
Gender	0.53	0.50					0.26	0.44	0.70	0.46								
N	711–771		320–344		384–409		275–298		436–473		194–210		76–78		126–134		308–331	

Table 1 gives the variable definitions used in this study. Table 2 provides the means and standard deviations for the various models used in this study, as well as sample sizes.

RESULTS

Occupational Segregation, Choice and Wage Inequality

Hypothesis 1_A stated that male-dominated positions will pay higher wages, whereas Hypothesis 2_A stated that women will receive lower wages than men in either type of gender-composition. Table 3A indicates that we can accept Hypothesis 1_A, as male-dominated occupations offer higher salaries than female ones (Mean = 1391.35). The data also indicate that Hypothesis 2_A can be accepted, as women receive lower wages than men regardless of the occupation's gender-composition.

TABLE 3A

T-Tests Comparing Income

	Mean	S.D.	T-Test
OCCUPATIONS			
Male-dominated	1391.35	415.99	10.37*
Female-dominated	1100.04	328.46	
OCCUPATIONS BY GENDER			
Female-Dominated Occupations			
Male	1247.06	358.76	6.25*
Female	1038.60	295.77	
Male-Dominated Occupations			
Male	1498.05	397.90	8.06*
Female	1093.43	291.22	
GENDER BY OCCUPATION			
Male			
Female-Dominated Occupations	1247.06	358.76	5.73*
Male-Dominated Occupations	1498.05	397.90	
Female			
Female-Dominated Occupations	1038.60	295.77	1.45
Male-Dominated Occupations	1093.43	291.22	

* $p < .05$

Hypothesis 3.1_A asserted that women in male-dominated occupations will earn higher salaries than will women in female-dominated ones. The data in Table 3A indicate that this difference is not statistically significant,

hence we fail to reject the null hypothesis. Hypothesis 3.2_A stated that men in male-dominated positions will earn higher salaries than men in female-dominated ones. The data in Table 3 demonstrate that this difference is significant, thereby supporting this hypothesis.

TABLE 3B

Summary of Analysis of Variance on Salary between Genders and Professions

Source	df	SS	F
		Salary levels	
Gender (A)	1	22254932	114.23***
Gender-Dominated			
Profession (B)	1	3937127	34.34***
A × B	1	1401062	12.22***
Error	707	81064263	
Total	710	108657383	

*** $p < .001$

Moderating Effects

We used a 2 × 2 (Gender x Gender-Dominated Profession) ANOVA, with salary as the dependent measure, to assess the moderating effect of gender. Gender does moderate the effects of salary as does gender-domination of a profession. Both also have significant interaction (cf. Table 3B).

The above data are further supported by data given in Table 4 (see Models 4 and 5) which show that being a woman has a negative effect on income even after controlling for human capital, demographic, institutional and occupational variables. Hence, the data demonstrate discrimination against women in male- *and* female-dominated occupations.

Human Capital Explanations for Income Disparity

Hypothesis 4_A stated that education will have a greater impact than organizational tenure on an individual's income. Table 4 indicates that we can accept Hypothesis 4_A in part only. For instance, while education is a significant predictor of salary for women (Model 3), it fails to be significant for men (Model 2). Neither is it significant for male-dominated occupations (Model 4) unless the gender variable is added into the equation (Model 4B). For female-dominated occupations (see Models 5 and 5A) schooling is a significant predictor.

TABLE 4

Factors Affecting Log Earnings: Gender Effects for Overall Model and Male/Female-Dominated Professions

(t-ratio in parentheses)

	Overall Data Set Model 1	Gender Model 1A	Overall Men Model 2	Overall Women Model 3	Male-Dominated Occupations Model 4	Gender Model 4A	Female-Dominated Occupations Model 5	Gender Model 5A
Constant	6.56 (56.64*)	6.63 (61.46*)	6.67 (39.52*)	6.73 (39.75*)	6.35 (33.26*)	6.38 (36.70*)	6.63 (37.95*)	6.78* (40.69*)
HUMAN CAPITAL VARIABLES								
B.A.	.13 (4.21*)	.13 (4.32*)	.05 (.83)	.16 (4.97*)	.11 (.17)	.17 (2.02*)	.16 (4.60*)	.14 (4.29*)
TENORG	.06 (3.07*)	.05 (3.25*)	.03 (1.19)	.08 (3.14*)	.04 (1.45)	.04 (1.52)	.06 (2.38*)	.06 (2.51*)
TENPRF	.04 (1.66)	.04 (2.22*)	.02 (.80)	.06 (2.80*)	.04 (1.19)	.05 (2.00*)	.04 (1.21)	.04 (1.35)
DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES								
MAR	.01 (.27)	-.00 (-.06)	.05 (.95)	-.02 (-.54)	.00 (.07)	.00 (.07)	.00 (.00)	.01 (-.29)
Born	.00 (.06)	.00 (.19)	.00 (.01)	-.00 (-.18)	.01 (.45)	.01 (.34)	-.01 (-.39)	-.01 (-.30)
Children	.09 (2.73*)	.08 (2.80*)	.12 (2.27*)	.03 (.74)	.11 (1.85)	.09 (1.77)	.07 (1.82)	.07 (1.82)
STRUCTURAL VARIABLES								
Level	.19 (8.59*)	.15 (7.31*)	.17 (5.61*)	.14 (5.00*)	.25 (7.41*)	.17 (5.36*)	.15 (5.05*)	.13 (4.79*)

TABLE 4 (Continued)

	Overall Data Set Model 1	Gender Model 1A	Overall Men Model 2	Overall Women Model 3	Male-Dominated Occupations Model 4	Gender Model 4A	Female-Dominated Occupations Model 5	Gender Model 5A
Size	.01	.01	.02	.01	.07	.07	.00	-.00
	(1.01)	(1.17)	(1.09)	(.64)	(2.54*)	(2.84*)	(.18)	(-.23)
Government	-.11	-.12	-.17	-.09	-.30	-.26	-.10	-.10
	(-4.54*)	(-5.43*)	(-4.59*)	(-3.45*)	(-4.85*)	(-4.68*)	(-3.97*)	(-4.05*)
OCCUPATIONAL VARIABLES								
Engineer	.17	.15	.19	.16	.05	.00		
	(3.07*)	(3.56*)	(2.88*)	(2.52*)	(.56)	(.00)		
BioChemist	-.08	.00	.03	.01			-.10	-.02
	(-2.28*)	(.03)	(.42)	(.18)			(-2.64*)	(-.43)
Technician	.12	.10	.09	.08	a	a		
	(3.73*)	(3.22*)	(2.21)	(1.67)				
Nurse	.03	.13	.04	.18			.04	.12
	(1.05)	(4.07*)	(.63)	(4.58*)			(1.22)	(3.56*)
X-Ray Technician	a	a	a	a			a	a
Gender		-.21				-.24		-.19
		(-10.47*)				(-7.42*)		(-7.09*)
Adjusted R^2	.40*	.48*	.38*	.37*	.39*	.49*	.28*	.36*
Standard Error	.25	.23	.23	.22	.24	.22	.25	.23
N of Cases	708	708	326	382	275	275	433	433

* $p < .05$

If we further analyse the occupations and compare women to men (see Table 5, Models 6–9), the data indicate that while schooling has a greater effect on income than organizational tenure, it is significant for women in female-dominated occupations only (Model 9).

Hypothesis 5_A stated that organizational tenure will benefit women *less* than men in terms of compensation. Table 5 illustrates that organizational tenure has a significant effect on women's income levels in *both* male- and female-dominated occupations, while this variable is an insignificant factor for men regardless of occupational gender-composition. Based on these data, we cannot accept Hypothesis 5_A, and conclude that organizational tenure does effect women's income significantly regardless of type of gender-dominated occupation group.

The data also indicate that human capital variables are not a significant predictor set for income for men (Model 2) in contrast to women (Model 3); organizational tenure is significant in male- and female-dominated occupation for women only, if analysing men and women separately for male- and female-dominated jobs (i.e., regression coefficients for Model 7 = .11 and Model 8 = .07 in Table 5).

Demographic Explanations for Income Disparity

Hypothesis 6_A stated that having children is positively correlated with income in female-dominated occupations, whereas Hypothesis 7_A asserted that men will experience a greater positive effect on their incomes than women if they have children. The data for the overall sample in Table 4 (Models 1 and 1A) indicate that having children has a positive effect on income. When looking at Models 2 and 3, the data demonstrate that this effect is not significant for women, but is significant for men, thereby supporting Hypothesis 6_A. Moreover, when looking at each gender in male- and female-dominated occupations, raising children has a significant effect for men in female-dominated occupations only. Men receive a higher reward for parental responsibilities than women in female-dominated positions, thereby suggesting discrimination based on traditional role-models. Based on these findings, Hypothesis 7_A can be accepted as well.

More generally, demographic variables do not appear to explain a substantial portion of the income inequality experienced by women or men. Neither being married nor being born in the country has a significant effect on income levels in any of the models in Tables 4 and 5.

Institutional/Organizational Explanations of Pay Differentials

Hypothesis 8_A stated that hierarchical position will have a greater positive effect on the income of the atypical gender, while Hypothesis 9_A asserted

TABLE 5

Factors Affecting Log Earnings: Gender Effects for Men and Women in Male/Female-Dominated Professions (t-ratio in parentheses)

	Male-Dominated Occupations Men Model 6	Male-Dominated Occupations Women Model 7	Female-Dominated Occupations Men Model 8	Female-Dominated Occupation Women Model 9
Constant	6.54	5.88	7.14	6.53*
	(30.66*)	(19.86*)	(18.99*)	(35.60*)
HUMAN CAPITAL VARIABLES				
B.A.	.12	.26	.03	.17
	(1.05)	(1.11)	(.35)	(4.81*)
TENORG	.02	.11	.02	.07
	(.91)	(2.10*)	(.49)	(2.56*)
TENPRF	.04	.08	−.00	.06
	(1.10)	(1.50)	(−.06)	(1.78)
DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES				
MAR	.07	−.03	.02	−.02
	(1.00)	(−.43)	(.30)	(−.54)
Born	.01	.01	−.04	−.01
	(.39)	(.10)	(−.78)	(−.29)
Children	.06	.06	.16	.03
	(.88)	(.67)	(2.01*)	(.82)
STRUCTURAL VARIABLES				
Level	.17	.23	.17	.13
	(4.65*)	(3.18*)	(3.05*)	(4.00*)
Size	.06	.08	−.03	−.01
	(1.87)	(1.81)	(−.67)	(−.39)
Government	−.26	−.24	−.12	−.09
	(−3.89*)	(−2.32*)	(−2.51*)	(−3.04*)
OCCUPATIONAL VARIABLES				
Engineer	.04	−.01		
	(.43)	(−.05)		
BioChemist			.03	.02
			(.40)	(.35)
Technician	a	a		
Nurse			−.01	.19
			(−.10)	(4.60*)
X-Ray Technician			a	a
Adjusted R2	.34*	.45*	.26*	.35*
Standard Error	.22	.20	.24	.23
N of Cases	199	76	127	306

* $p < .05$

that organizational size will affect income positively for both genders, regardless of an occupation's gender composition. Table 5 demonstrates that while women enjoy a greater positive effect on their income when working in a male-dominated profession, this effect also applies to men working in a female-dominated profession. Moreover, as predicted in Hypothesis 8_A the atypical gender enjoys a greater effect on income based on her/his hierarchical level. Data in Tables 4 and 5 also illustrate that the size of organization does not have a significant effect on income for any of the regression models tested. Thus we fail to reject the null hypothesis (Hypothesis 9_0).

Hypothesis 10_A predicted that regardless of an occupation's gender composition, working in the public sector would have a positive effect on income for women. Table 4 demonstrates that working in the public sector does have a significant effect on income for women and men. In both cases, the effect is negative. The data in Table 5 show that while men enjoy a negative effect of the GOV variable on income if working in a male-dominated occupation (–.26), the same is true for women (–.24). Negative effects are also reported in female-dominated occupations (–.12 for men and –.09 for women). Thus, we cannot accept Hypothesis 10_A since the effect is not in the predicted positive direction for women.

Occupational Variables and Wage Disparity

Since past research has usually not tested specific occupations' potential effect on income disparity, no specific hypotheses were tested. Nonetheless, data in Table 4 suggest that the gender variable has an important mediating influence on the effect of occupational variable the individual's salary level. In contrast to Model 1, after adding the dummy-variable gender to the equation in Model 1A, BioChemist no longer has a significant effect whereas the Nurse variable does. If we look at Model 4A, working in engineering does not have a significant effect on salary levels. Adding the gender variable in Model 5A results in a positive effect on income of the nursing occupation, while the negative effect of being a BioChemist is no longer significant. This indicates that gender effects may overshadow occupational effects if no dummy variable is used to separate and control for specific gender effects.

Interestingly enough, none of the occupational effects are significant for men in female-dominated positions (Model 8) in contrast to women in female-dominated occupations (see Model 9, Table 5). Working as a nurse increases a woman's salary by 19% for each additional dollar in wages earned, in comparison to a BioChemist or an X-Ray technician, even after controlling for human capital, demographic and institutional variables.

Usefulness of Social Stratification, Structural Theories and Occupational Variables for Explaining Income Disparity

Probably the most interesting finding is that both approaches, in combination with occupational variables, account for .48% of the population variance in a person's income level (see Model 1A, Table 4). The equation also demonstrates that X-Ray technicians, followed by BioChemists receive the lowest salaries — both are female-dominated occupations. The greatest positive effect by an occupation on the individual's income level is in engineering (regression coefficient = .19, see Model 2), while for women it is nursing (.18) followed by engineering (.16 in Model 3, Table 4). However, if we study male- and female-dominated occupations separately according to gender (cf. Table 5), the data indicate that the Nurse variable is the only occupation having a positive effect on income for women (19 cents on every dollar = .19).

Models 4 and 6 (Table 4) indicate that, after adding the gender variable to the equation, the adjusted variance explained for male-dominated occupations (Adjusted R^2 = .49) is about 13% higher than the one explained for female-dominated positions (Adjusted R^2 = .36). The variance accounted for in both male- and female-dominated positions is higher for women than for men (Model 7, Adjusted R^2 = .45; Model 9, Adjusted R^2 = .35).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The results of this study have theoretical and practical implications for three main issues, namely, how human capital, social stratification and structural variables may affect income disparity in Israel; how gender may exacerbate income disparity based on the gender composition of an occupation; and how human capital, structural and institutional theories apply to the Israeli work context while controlling for possible occupational effects. Without systematically controlling for occupational segregation and choice, it is not possible to evaluate the occupation and choice effect on wage disparity. Additionally, generalizing from these theories requires their application and testing in different cultural contexts (e.g., Nowak 1989).

In sum, being a woman has a negative effect on income even after controlling for human capital, demographic, institutional and occupational variables in both male- and female-dominated occupations. In fact, gender may explain why women earn up to 24 cents less on ever dollar compared to men.

An interesting finding is that, contrary to human capital theory, women do benefit from schooling in contrast to men, although ultimately the positive effect is limited to female-dominated positions only. However, women also

benefit significantly from organizational tenure in both male- and female-dominated positions in contrast to men, where the variable is insignificant. This finding challenges traditional thinking based on human capital theory. One explanation may be the political situation in Israel, where national defense policy requires that men, but not women, remain part of the army reserve for most of their working lives, at irregular time intervals, and often on several occasions during one year. As a result, firms face the challenge of planning production based on working hours that can change at short notice. Here, human capital theory would suggest that the firm benefits more from the organizational tenure of women as their absenteeism due to external forces is reduced (e.g., because of increasing firm-specific skills through experience and on-the-job training). Consequently, women's tenure may become crucial in sustaining production levels during a national defense emergency. Thus, other things being constant, the unique situation may occur in which women's return on investment in organizational tenure is higher than men's, indicating the reverse discrimination suggested by our data.

If we look at institutional/organizational explanations of pay differentials, working in the public sector reduces one's salary in Israel regardless of gender. This again contrasts with North America where women tend to benefit from working in the public sector, indicating that governments have undertaken some steps to reduce pay inequity (e.g., Kemp and Beck 1986; Shapiro and Stelcner 1989). However, the explanation for this difference in our findings compared to North American studies may be that the Israeli government has been criticized for being slow in reducing employment discrimination (e.g., Wolkinson, Harel and Izraeli 1982). Our data affirms this and suggests that the Israeli government is still slow in reducing pay disparity amongst its employees; nevertheless, it is in the government's favour that public sector pay, although low, is similar regardless of gender. A further interesting difference with North American studies is that firm size has no effect on salary levels (e.g., Pearce 1990). One explanation may simply be the limited size of Israeli firms in comparison to Europe and the United States, in part reflecting the size of the economy.

Also of interest is the finding that both men and women may be "tokens" if they work in opposite gender-dominated positions (e.g., Kanter 1977). Additionally, both genders experience a positive effect on their salary based on managerial level in the organizational hierarchy higher than the gender-dominant group in the occupation. Moreover, our findings suggest that while occupational variables help in explaining income disparity, these effects are no longer significant (except for women working as nurses) if we analyse women and men separately in male- and female-dominated occupations. While our study supports Izraeli and Gaier (1979) who reported

that occupational effects are important, our findings add a new twist; specifically, occupational effects overshadow gender effects if dummy-variables are used to separate and control for specific gender and occupational effects and, most importantly, occupational effects are not the same within either group of female- and male-dominated positions used in this study. Accordingly, while earning discrimination exists, the most likely culprit appears to be unequal treatment based on individual, *not necessarily occupational characteristics and factors.*

Potential Limitations of the Research

One limitation of this research is that cross-sectional data and longitudinal data are lacking. It would be of considerable interest to know how wage levels, by various occupational groups and according to gender, develop over the long term. The sample used in this study consisted of workers from five occupations. The use of additional occupations might help in further explaining the relationships found here. Finally, the sample did not include all sectors of the economy (e.g., tourism) and the distinction between part-time and full-time as well as contract workers was not made. Some research suggests that women employed on a part-time basis may be more affected as far as job security and wage levels are concerned than men (cf. Tilly 1992).

Implications for Research

Perhaps the important finding is that our data do not confirm findings from previous studies undertaken that used North American data. While this may be of little surprise to many, it does question the generalizability of human capital, institutional and social stratification theory beyond the North American context (Nowak 1989). Our findings would suggest that additional work is needed to address and control for unique economic and/or political effects (e.g., compulsory army and reserve service in Israel) which may increase our ability to explain income disparity between genders and groups.

Demographic variables, including being Israeli born versus somewhere else, have no effect on wage disparity. We also looked at age, but multicollinearity problems with tenure in profession and organization made it impossible to use this variable. Future research should further investigate the effect of having children on wage disparity. For instance, it is possible that the child-rearing effect for men in female-dominated professions differs according to the number of children and their age(s). Other factors influencing this variable's effect on wages might also be single-parents versus other (cf. Gattiker 1994).

Future research should also further investigate whether the findings reported here can be repeated with different and/or additional occupational groups. What is important is that our findings indicate that occupational effects must be controlled for and they are not the same across occupations as far as wage discrimination is concerned. One factor which might help in better understanding this issue is how national labour contracts between unions and employers may affect income disparity differently compared to occupations without such contracts.

Implications for Policy and Decision-Makers

The data suggest that public sector employers discriminate against both men and women compared to private employers as far as salary levels are concerned. Our findings also indicate that the generalizability of American findings may be of limited use in other countries. Accordingly, the effectiveness of affirmative action and comparable worth policies on pay outside the United States may require additional work in determining exactly which factors affect the levels of pay for women and men. This study suggests that policy instruments may be affected by economic, social and political factors unique to a particular environment. Moreover, the influence of labour on the success or failure of efforts to reduce wage disparity cannot be underestimated, especially in Israel where, in contrast to most countries, unions are large employers themselves.

In contrast to neoclassical theory's prediction that market forces will eventually eliminate discrimination in female occupations and crowding of women in those jobs thereby further lowering their income (e.g., Bergmann 1974; England and Noriss 1985), the data here would suggest that this may apply in Israel only to a limited extent. Moreover, the positive effect of organizational tenure would suggest that the country's economy may be hurting due to frequent requirement for male employees to do terms of army service of various time intervals. Current peace negotiations may spell relief for many employers and employees by reducing these security-related absences for men, thereby facilitating labour and production planning.

CONCLUSION

Some researchers have suggested that gender-based discrimination in Israel (e.g., Ben Porath and Gronau 1984; Haberfeld 1990) and Switzerland (e.g., Kugler 1988) would be lower for employees with education beyond the high school level. We found, however, that gender-based discrimination is not reduced in comparison to samples of "less" formally educated individuals in Israel. Our findings that being an immigrant has no effect on

salary levels is also quite encouraging because it suggests that Israel has managed to avoid discrimination against this large group of its workforce. However, discrimination may manifest itself between ethnic groups, instead of being based on birthplace (e.g., Semyonov 1988). In conclusion, this study can be viewed as a small, albeit important step, to further clarify how human capital, demographics, institutional and occupational variables can be used to explain income disparity in Israel. As we pursue this issue further, elaborations of the existing theory are likely to be suggested. Moreover, analyses looking at these phenomena outside the North American context are still in the early stages, and such cross-national comparisons are needed to advance our understanding and to account for wage disparity.

■ REFERENCES

BECKER, G.S. 1971. *Economics of Discrimination*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

BECKER, G.S. 1975. *Human Capital*. 2nd ed. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

BEN PORATH, Y., and R. GRONAU. 1984. *"Jewish Mother Goes to Work — Trends in the Labor Force Participation of Women in Israel, 1955-1980."* Discussion paper No. 83.10. Jerusalem: Maurice Falk Institute for Economic Research.

BERGMANN, B.R. 1974. "Occupational Segregation, Wages and Profits when Employers Discriminate by Race and Sex." *Eastern Economic Journal,* Vol. 1, 103–110.

BIELBY, W.T., and J.N. BARON. 1986. "Men and Women at Work: Sex Segregation and Statistical Discrimination." *American Journal of Sociology,* Vol. 91, 759–799.

BLAU, F.D., and A.H. BELLER. 1988. "Trends in Earnings Differentials by Gender, 1971-1981." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review,* Vol. 41, 513–529.

BOULET, J.A., and L. LAVALLÉE. 1984. *The Changing Economic Status of Women.* Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services.

COHEN, J., and P. COHEN. 1983. *Applied Multiple Regression/Correlation Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences.* 2nd ed. Hillsdale, NJ.: Lawrence Erlbaum.

EFFRONI, L. 1980. *Promotion and Earnings in the Government Service in Israel — Are Women Being Discriminated? (in Hebrew).* Jerusalem: The Research Institute of Work and Welfare, The Hebrew University.

ENGLAND, P., and B. NORRIS. 1985. "Comparable Worth: A New Doctrine of Sex Discrimination." *Social Science Quarterly,* Vol. 66, 627–643.

ENGLAND, P., B.S. KILBOURNE, G. FARKAS, and T. DOU. 1988. "Explaining Occupational Sex Segregation and Wages: Findings from a Model with Fixed Effects." *American Sociological Review,* Vol. 53, 544–558.

GATTIKER, U.E. 1990. "Gender Income Disparity and Perceived Wage Inequality: Comparing Respondents from Western Canada and the Western USA." Working paper. University of Lethbridge.

GATTIKER, U.E. 1994. "Where Do We Go from Here? Directions for Future Research and Managers." *Studies in Technological Innovation and Human Resources — Women and Technology.* U.E. Gattiker, ed. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, Vol. 4, 245–286.

GATTIKER, U.E. 1995. "Firm and Taxpayer Returns from Training of Semiskilled Employees." *Academy of Management Journal,* Vol. 38, 1152–1173.

GERHART, B., and N. EL CHEIKH. 1991. "Earnings and Percentage Female: A Longitudinal Study." *Industrial Relations,* Vol. 30, 62–78.

HABERFELD, Y. 1990. "Gender Pay Discrimination in Israel: Conceptual Framework, Research Methods, Findings and Trends." *Human Resources and Industrial Relations in Israel — New Horizons.* A. Globerson, A. Galin and E. Rosenstein, eds. Tel Aviv University: Ramot Publishing House, 313–325.

HASHIMOTO, M. 1982. "Minimum Wage Effects on Training on the Job." *American Economic Review,* Vol. 72, 1070–1087.

IZRAELI, D.N. 1990. "Women, Work, Family and Public Policy." *Human Resources and Industrial Relations in Israel — New Horizons (in Hebrew).* A. Globerson, A. Galin and E. Rosenstein, eds. Tel Aviv University: Ramot Publishing House, 327–343.

IZRAELI, D.N., and K. GAIER. 1979. "Sex and Interoccupational Wage Differences in Israel." *Industrial Relations,* Vol. 18, 227–232.

JACOBS, D. 1985. "Unequal Organizations or Unequal Attainments? An Empirical Comparison of Sectoral and Individualistic Explanations for Aggregate Inequality." *American Sociological Review,* Vol. 50, 166–180.

KANTER, R.M. 1977. *Men and Women of the Corporation.* New York: Basic Books.

KAUPPINEN-TOROPAINEN, K., J. KANDOLIN, and E. HAAVIO-MANNILA. 1988. "Sex Segregation of Work in Finland and the Quality of Women's Work." *Journal of Organizational Behavior,* Vol. 9, 15–27.

KEMP, A.A., and E.M. BECK. 1986. "Equal Work, Unequal Pay." *Work and Occupations,* Vol. 13, 324–347.

KING, M.C. 1995. "Human Capital and Black Women's Occupational Mobility." *Industrial Relations,* Vol. 34, 282–298.

KUGLER, P. 1988. *Lohndiskriminierung in der Schweiz (Wage Discrimination in Switzerland).* Berne: Eidgenössisches Justiz- und Polizeidepartement — Arbeitsgruppe "Lohngleichheit", Forschungsbericht Nr. 1.

LAZEAR, E.P., and S. ROSEN. 1990. "Male-Female Wage Differentials in Job Ladders." *Journal of Labor Economics,* Vol. 8, No. 1, Part 2, S106-S123.

LORENCE, J. 1987. "Intraoccupational Earnings Inequality: Human-Capital and Institutional Determinants." *Work and Occupations,* Vol. 14, 236–260.

MILLER, P.W. 1987. "Gender Differences in Observed and Offered Wages in Canada." *Canadian Journal of Economics,* Vol. 20, 225–244.

MINCER, J. 1974. *Schooling, Experience, and Earnings.* New York: National Bureau of Economic Research.

MONTGOMERY, E., and W. WASCHER. 1987. "Race and Gender Wage Inequality in Services and Manufacturing." *Industrial Relations,* Vol. 26, 284–290.

MORRISON, A.M., and M.A. VON GLINOW. 1990. "Women and Minorities in Management." *American Psychologist,* Vol. 45, 200–208.

NOWAK, S. 1989. "Comparative Studies and Social Theory". *Cross-national Research in Sociology.* M.L. Kohn, ed. Newbury Park: Sage Publications, 34–56.

PEARCE, J.E. 1990. "Tenure, Unions, and the Relationship between Employer Size and Wages." *Journal of Labor Economics,* Vol. 8, 251–269.

PFEFFER, J., and J. ROSS. 1982. "The Effects of Marriage and a Working Wife on Occupational and Wage Success." *Administrative Science Quarterly,* Vol. 27, 66–80.

ROOS, P. 1983. "Marriage and Women's Occupational Attainment in Cross-Cultural Perspective." *American Sociological Review,* Vol. 48, 852–864.

ROSS, C.E., J. MIROWSKY, and J. HUBER. 1983. "Dividing Work, Sharing Work, and In-between: Marriage Patterns and Depression." *American Sociological Review,* Vol. 48, 809–823.

SEMYONOV, M. 1988. "Bi-Ethnic Labor Markets, Non-Ethnic Labor Markets, and Socioeconomic Inequality." *American Sociological Review,* Vol. 53, 256–266.

SEWELL, W.H., R.M. HAUSER, and W.C. WOLF. 1980. "Sex, Schooling, and Occupational Status." *American Journal of Sociology,* Vol. 86, 551–583.

SHAPIRO, D.M., and M. STELCNER. 1989. "Canadian Public-Private Sector Earnings Differentials, 1970-1980." *Industrial Relations,* Vol. 28, 72–81.

SMITH, R.S. 1988. "Comparable Worth: Limited Coverage and the Exacerbation of Inequality." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review,* Vol. 41, 227–239.

SORENSEN, E. 1987. "Effect of Comparable Worth Policies on Earnings." *Industrial Relations,* Vol. 26, 227–239.

SORENSEN, E. 1989. "Measuring the Pay Disparity between Typically Female Occupations and Other Jobs: A Bivariate Selectivity Approach." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review,* Vol. 42, 624–639.

STATE OF ISRAEL CENTRAL BUREAU OF STATISTICS. 1987. *Labour Force Census of Population and Housing Publications.* No. 13, Jerusalem.

STUDD, M.V., and U.E. GATTIKER. 1991. "The Evolutionary Psychology of Sexual Harassment in Organizations." *Ethology and Sociobiology,* Vol. 12, 249–290.

THORNTON, A., D.F. ALWIN and D. CAMBURN. 1983. "Causes and Consequences of Sex-Role Attitudes and Attitude Change." *American Sociological Review,* Vol. 48, 211–227.

TILLY, C. 1992. "Dualism in Part-Time Employment." *Industrial Relations,* Vol. 31, 330–347.

TOREN, N., and V. KRAUS. 1987. "The Effects of Minority Size on Women's Position in Academia." *Social Forces,* Vol. 65, 1090–1100.

WOLKINSON, B.W., G.H. HAREL, and D.N. IZRAELI. 1982. "Employment Discrimination Against Women: The Israeli Experience." *Employee Relations Law Journal,* Vol. 7, 466–489.

RÉSUMÉ

Les effets de l'occupation sur les différences salariales entre sexes en Israël

Il s'agit ici d'une analyse des différences entre sexes dans les disparités salariales entre occupations typiquement féminines et celles typiquement masculines. Nous référons tant à la théorie du capital humain qu'à la théorie structurelle. Nous cherchons à comprendre comment la composition sexuelle des occupations peut expliquer les différences de gains entre hommes et femmes. De plus, nous nous intéressons à ces variables structurelles et de capital humain qui ont un effet sur la disparité salariale entre ces occupations à domination masculine et ces occupations surtout féminines.

Pour se faire, nous avons procédé à une enquête par échantillons auprès de 771 employés dans cinq occupations de cols blancs à travers Israël. Une équipe d'enterviewers a enquêté auprès de 17 entreprises syndiquées dans les secteurs industriel et des services publics. Le taux de réponses total a été de quelque 80 % dont 54,3 % de répondants féminines et 45,7 % de répondants masculins.

Notre échantillon contenait deux occupations considérées en Israël comme dominées par les hommes à savoir les ingénieurs (13,8 % de femmes) et les techniciens (18,9 % de femmes). Les occupations à prédominance féminine étaient les biologistes et biochimistes (61,7 % de femmes) et les radiologistes (78,7 % de femmes).

Nos résultats indiquent que le choix de l'occupation influence la disparité des revenus. En effet, il y a ici preuve de discrimination salariale d'une part contre les hommes dans les occupations à dominante féminine et d'autre part, contre les femmes dans ces occupations à dominante masculine et féminine. Contrairement aux études nord-américaines, les femmes ne profitent pas ici positivement de leur emploi dans le secteur public ni aucun des deux sexes vu leur travail dans de grandes organisations. De même, contrairement à ce que prévoit la théorie du capital humain, l'éducation et la titularisation dans l'organisation profitent aux femmes dans ces emplois à dominante féminine. De plus, les effets occupationnels sur les salaires sont significatifs en ce que les hommes en profitent dans les emplois à dominante masculine et les femmes dans les emplois à dominante féminine. Finalement, notre étude indique que le sexe peut expliquer pourquoi les femmes gagnent jusqu'à 24 sous de moins pour chaque dollar comparées aux hommes.

De telles analyses en dehors du contexte nord-américain sont embryonnaires. D'autres analyses nationales comparatives sont nécessaires pour mieux comprendre le phénomène des disparités salariales.