

from Box 1
Folder S

"A UNIQUE COMPETENCE": A STUDY OF EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY IN THE BELL SYSTEM

(NOTE.—Charts and illustrations not included in the record.)

PREFACE

This paper is an attempt to summarize in a manageable form the results of an intensive investigation of the employment practices of the Bell System operating companies. The investigation was undertaken by the Equal Employment Commission pursuant to a Petition filed with the Federal Communications Commission, Docket No. 19143, alleging nationwide patterns of employment discrimination by the Bell System companies on the basis of sex, national origin, and race.

The paper is a distillation of only the most salient features of the patterns of employment discrimination revealed by the EEOC investigation and the policies and practices which are responsible for those patterns. It is intended to facilitate examination of the bulk of evidentiary materials which have been submitted to the FCC.

This paper was written and prepared primarily by David Copus, Lawrence Gartner, Randall Speck, William Wallace, Marjanette Feagan and Katherine Mazzaferri.

CHAPTER 1.—THE BELL SYSTEM

In America, the name Bell System is virtually synonymous with the telephone industry. The organization which Alexander Graham Bell founded in 1877 to market his invention has now grown into one of the largest privately-owned businesses in the world, one which dominates the telephone communications industry in the United States. The Bell companies account for at least 94 percent of all telephones, capital assets, and operating revenues of all telephone companies in the United States.¹

This chapter will provide a brief overview of the Bell System, its major departments, major jobs and their functions, wage rates, and characteristics. Against this background of the general employment structure, the position of women and minorities will be described in the following chapters.

The "federal" system. At the head of the nation's huge telephone communications system is the American Telephone and Telegraph Company. However, the actual provision of telephone services is accomplished through 22 subsidiary companies, also known as licensees, associated, or operating companies which are shown in Figure 1.

AT&T has potentially absolute legal control over these operating companies through its ownership of at least a majority of the capital stock in all of them and 100% of the stock in 16 of them. Thus, while each operating company on a day-to-day basis exercises autonomy in dealing with local telephone matters, it is acknowledged that "there are nonetheless a great many matters in which AT&T much exert guidance and control."²

Since, under this "federal" system, the operating companies provide the actual telephone services while AT&T provides general policy guidelines and supportive services, the operating companies employ virtually all of the Bell System workforce. At the end of 1970, for example, the operating companies employed a total of 732,450 persons, more than half of whom were concentrated in urban and surrounding areas.³ Consequently,

it is the employment practices of the operating companies, primarily in urban areas, which is the subject matter of this report.

Thirty SMSA's. Thirty of these urban areas have been selected for detailed analysis. The commonly used unit for measuring economic, employment, labor market and population trends of urban areas is the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA). The geographic limits of each SMSA have been established by the Bureau of the Budget.⁴

The 30 SMSA's chosen for study are those with the largest numbers of minorities and are listed in Table 1.⁵ Collectively, these SMSA's contain about half of the nation's entire workforce, half of the total black population, and half of the total Spanish-surnamed American population. At the end of 1970, the Bell workforce in these 30 SMSA's totaled 374,190, more than half of all persons employed by the operating companies.⁶

Each operating company is almost identical in structure, with the employees divided into five basic departments, each of which plays a particular role in the provision and maintenance of the telephone communications system. The distribution of employees in the 30 SMSA's within the five major departments is shown in Chart 1.

Plant department

The largest number of Bell employees are in the Plant Department, the function of which is to install, maintain, and operate the mechanical and electronic equipment which transmits telephone calls. As shown in Chart 1, the Plant Departments in the 30 selected SMSA's employed at the end of 1970 a total of 153,003 persons, or 40.9 percent of the total Bell operating company employment in those SMSA's.

Non-craft jobs. Plant employees are divided into craft and non-craft workers. The latter group consists of a very small number of service workers, who perform maintenance and service functions, and a larger number of clerical workers, who keep records concerning Plant Department activities such as installation of new telephones. The few service worker jobs, such as Janitor and Porter, are by definition unskilled and are the lowest paying jobs in the operating companies.

TABLE 1.—Bell employment in 30 SMSA's on December 31, 1970

Standard metropolitan statistical area:	Bell employment
New York	82,380
Los Angeles	35,344
Chicago	34,380
San Francisco	26,903
Philadelphia	19,844
Detroit	18,946
Washington, D.C.	17,046
Newark	12,818
Cleveland	11,081
St. Louis	10,015
Atlanta	10,010
Miami	9,458
Baltimore	8,867
Houston	8,147
Denver	8,129
Dallas	7,796
San Diego	7,358
Indianapolis	6,007
Phoenix	5,792
New Orleans	5,133
Kansas City	4,988
Birmingham	4,409
Richmond	4,008
Jacksonville	3,678
San Antonio	3,249
Norfolk	2,261
Memphis	2,135
Greensboro-Winston-Salem	1,759
Mobile	1,192
El Paso	1,058
Total (30 SMSA's)	374,190

Source: EEOC C-661—EEOC C-690.

Footnotes at end of article.

On December 31, 1970, clerical workers constituted approximately 15% of all Plant employees in the 30 SMSA's.⁷ Characteristic Plant clerical jobs are Repair Clerk and Plant Reports Clerk whose maximum annual salaries average about \$6000 in the 30 SMSA's.⁸

Craft jobs. However, most of the employees in the Plant Department—over 60 percent in fact—are in the much higher-paying craft jobs. At the end of 1970, more than 93,000 craft workers were employed in the 30 SMSA's, constituting 25% of all Bell System employees in those areas.⁹ These craft employees are essentially divided by function, those who work "inside" the physical plant, where the mechanical and electronic equipment for routing telephone calls is located, and those who work "outside" the physical plant, installing and maintaining telephones, cables, and telephone lines.

At the lowest level of both "inside" and "outside" craft jobs are the entry positions, into which persons are generally hired off-the-street and then trained. The major entry-level job for "inside" craft work is that of *Frameman*. All telephones in an area are connected by wire to routing equipment in central plant locations, and the Frameman's job is to change the connections of these individual telephone wires with the central routing equipment to reflect changes in service. Maximum annual wages for Frameman vary, of course, from SMSA to SMSA, but generally fall between \$7,500 and \$8,500, considerably higher than Plant clerical rates.¹⁰

For "outside" craft work, there are three major entry-level jobs: *Lineman*, *Cable Splicer's Helper*, and *Installer-Repairman*. The job of the Lineman is to place the lines and cables connecting the individual customer's telephone to the central plant routing or switching equipment. In doing so, the Lineman may raise or climb telephone poles or lay underground cables. The function of the Cable Splicer's Helper is to aid in making and changing individual wire connections within cables and sealing and insulating cable joints. The Installer-Repairman installs and maintains individual telephones located at a customer's premises.

The Cable Splicer's Helper is usually paid at the same rate as a Frameman, while maximum annual wages for Lineman and Installer-Repairman generally are about \$1,000 higher, ranging from \$8,500 to \$9,500.¹¹

Top crafts. In addition to these entry-level craft positions, there are four major top-rated craft jobs which encompass more complicated functions and which are filled almost exclusively through internal promotion from the lower-rated craft jobs. Two top craft jobs, *Switchman* (also known as Central Office Repairman) and *Test Boardman* (also known as Toll Test Deskman), are "inside" craft positions. The task of the Switchman is to maintain and repair the routing and switching equipment located at the central plant. Switchmen check switches and relays with special tools and repair trouble on customers' lines that occur in the central plant equipment. Test Boardmen sit at special switchboards comprised of electrical testing instruments and test for, locate, and analyze reported trouble in the telephone lines. They also make periodic checks of lines in order to prevent breakdowns.

The two top-rated "outside" craft positions are *Cable Splicer* and *PBX Installer-Repairman*. The Cable Splicer makes and changes individual wire connections within cables and seals and maintains cable joints. PBX Installer-Repairmen install and maintain private switching systems, known as Private Branch Exchanges, used by large businesses and hotels. They may also install and repair radio and television broadcasting equipment, mobile radio telephones, and teletypewriter equipment. These four top-rated craft jobs are generally paid at the same rate, usually between \$9,000 and \$10,000 a year maximum.¹² They are the highest paying non-management jobs in the system.

Traffic Department

The second largest department is Traffic, whose purpose is to assist the flow of calls between telephones. As shown in Chart 1, as of December 31, 1970, over 28% of all employees in the 30 SMSA's were in this department. Most Traffic employees are *Operators*, who assist customers in placing calls, provide directory information, and record data for billing purposes. More persons are employed in the job of Operator than in any other single job in the Bell System. As of December 31, 1970, 73,333 Operators were employed in the 30 SMSA's, a figure which represented nearly 20% of all Bell employees in those SMSA's.¹³

Although roughly one out of every five Bell employees is an Operator, this is one of the least desirable jobs in terms of both pay and working conditions. The maximum annual salary for Operators in the 30 SMSA's at the end of 1970 ranged between \$5,000 and \$6,000,¹⁴ slightly less than the salary paid to Plant clericals and considerably less than even the lowest Plant craft wages. Chart 2 shows the dramatic difference in maximum wage rates in the Plant and Traffic Departments in the 30 SMSA's. Clearly, the wages in the Plant Department, boosted by the high pay in craft work, are considerably greater than in the Traffic Department, where the wage level is depressed by the low Operator salary.

Working conditions. The low pay is not, however, the only undesirable feature of the Operator job. Working conditions, apparently, are virtually intolerable. The job itself is "highly routine," and nothing but a "structured and repetitive task."¹⁵ A study prepared for Southwestern Bell by Dr. George Robinson of the Graduate School of Business, Washington University, concluded as follows:¹⁶

"There is a fairly general feeling among the operators, both those remaining and those resigning, that their job is dull and uninteresting. The most typical comment was that the job is highly regimented, affording little opportunity for self-expression or self-fulfillment."

In addition, the Bell System rigidly enforces "formal rules covering every aspect" of the Operator's job.¹⁷ There are stringent rules governing dress, conversation at the switchboard, phraseology, and clerical accuracy; but the most abrasive and particularly inflexible rules are those governing absenteeism and tardiness. A report prepared in August, 1970, by the Southwest Research Institute in Houston declared that, "Concern over attendance has grown beyond all proportion within the system. Attendance is so important that the Company has lost its perspective."¹⁸

The "authoritarian manner" in which the attendance and tardiness rules are enforced is exacerbated by the fact that low seniority Operators are required to work divided shifts, "unenviable schedules involving an early morning shift and a late evening shift, separated by a period long enough to require a return home in the middle of the working day."¹⁹ Moreover, most Operators are required to work staggered schedules, including many weekends.

The impact of all of these undesirable features of the Operator's job is cumulative. The 1970 Southwest Research Institute report described the overall results as follows:²⁰

"[Operators are quick to describe] the noxious demands of work that is too highly structured, their loss of personal identity, their lack of freedom to rely on their own judgement, their difficulty in becoming part of a cohesive social group, and the absence of any reasonable hope for future advancement. . . . They are necessary parts of a system designed by geniuses for execution by idiots."

Turnover. Under such circumstances, it is hardly surprising that turnover among Oper-

ators is very high. Chart 3 illustrates the staggering difference in turnover among Operators and Plant Department craft workers, another indication that craft jobs are considerably more attractive than Operator jobs. High as the turnover of Operators appears, Chart 3 significantly understates the problem. A much higher rate of turnover exists in large SMSA's among Operators with less than six months' service.

A 1969 AT&T report indicated that in 19 major metropolitan areas, turnover among Operators with less than six months' service had increased from 80% in 1964 to 120% in 1968.²¹ In fact, in many districts turnover among short-term Operators had reached 200% in 1968.²²

Commercial Department

After Plant and Traffic, the next largest department in the operating companies is the Commercial Department, which is the business contact between the customer and the telephone company for all private residence service and most business service. Chart 1 shows that at the end of 1970 in the 30 selected SMSA's, 9.4 percent of total employment was in the Commercial Department.

The primary job in this department is that of *Service Representative*. Nearly half of all Commercial Department employees in the 30 selected SMSA's at the end of 1970 were Service Representatives.²³ They handle billing and payment problems, schedule repair work, and sell ordinary telephone equipment and services. Basic to this job is a thorough understanding of Bell System billing practices, rate structures, service policies, and repair functions. Along with Operator and Installer-Repairman, the Service Representative is one of the jobs most highly associated by the public with the telephone company. As a widely-used Bell System recruiting brochure points out, "to most of our customers, [the Service Representative] is the telephone company."²⁴ At the end of 1970, the maximum yearly salary varied roughly between \$6,000 and \$7,000 in the 30 SMSA's, making the job higher paying than Operator or Plant clerical but lower paying than all craft jobs.²⁵

While the Service Representative handles customer inquiries and problems exclusively by phone without ever leaving the telephone company business office, customer contacts made outside the business office are the responsibility of the *Commercial Representative* (also known as the *Business Representative*). The number of Commercial Representatives employed by the Bell companies is small compared to the number of Service Representatives, but the maximum pay is much better, averaging about \$2,500 a year more than Service Representative.²⁶ Thus, Commercial Representatives earn almost as much as top-rated craft workers.

Marketing Department

Closely associated with the Commercial Department is the Marketing Department, whose function is to analyze the need for and sell complex telecommunications equipment to business organizations. Chart 1 indicates its relatively small size. Where selling involves direct, outside contact with the business customer, it is handled by a *Commercial Representative*, whose maximum annual salary varies around \$10,000, or by a *Communications Consultant*, whose maximum annual salary varies around \$14,000.²⁷ There are also a variety of inside salespersons whose function is to handle contacts with customers by telephone and to sell communications services to medium-sized businesses. The maximum annual pay rate of these inside positions average about half that of the two outside selling jobs.

Accounting Department

The fifth major department in the Bell companies, containing seven percent of all

employees in the 30 SMSA's, is the Accounting Department, whose functions are to prepare and issue bills to the company's customers, to prepare payrolls, keep the company's books, and prepare necessary financial statements. Aside from managers and professionals, almost all of the employees in this department perform various types of clerical functions and are paid rates comparable to plant clericals.

Low Skill Requirements

Significance for equal employment opportunity. Most, if not all, of the over 200,000 non-management persons hired by the Bell System each year have little or no job-related skills when hired.²⁸ Telephone communications in the United States is for all practical purposes a monopoly which requires certain specialized skills not generally required by other industries. Thus, very few persons learn the skills of Framemen, Cable Splicers, Installer-Repairmen, Operators or Service Representatives before working for the telephone company.

As a result, each Bell company "has developed thorough training programs for most jobs. Because telephone work is specialized, it is necessary to train new employees before they can become fully proficient. For this reason previous business experience is not a requisite for most telephone employment."²⁹

The fact that the Bell System hires primarily unskilled workers has important implications. The impact that Bell System hiring practices could have on female and minority employment opportunities is readily apparent and has been repeatedly acknowledged at the highest levels in the Bell System.

AT&T Vice President Walter Straley succinctly stated the proposition this way in 1968:³⁰

"We think our experience as an employer hiring some 200,000 persons each year, provides us with a unique competence to play a leading role in the improvement of employment opportunity."

Therefore, as will be emphasized throughout this report, any substantial underrepresentation of women or minorities in certain job categories manifestly cannot be attributed to their lack of skill. Absent discrimination, one would expect a nearly random distribution of women and minorities in all jobs.

Cost of recruiting and hiring. Another direct result of the large number of inexperienced new hires is the very high cost of recruiting, screening and training so many persons. Projections to 1980 indicate that the Bell System plans to increase its total employment by 280 thousand employees. But due to fantastic turnover the System will have to hire, during the next ten years, more than 2½ million people, about half of whom will be Operators.³¹ To recruit, screen, and train so many employees will cost \$3 billion.³²

In October, 1969, AT&T Vice President Walter Straley estimated that a mere one percent reduction in turnover among Operators would save the System \$2 million a year.³³ Comparable reduction in turnover among craft workers and Service Representatives would save the Bell System an additional \$3 million a year.³⁴

TABLE 2.—SUMMARY OF MAJOR JOBS AND DEPARTMENTS

Department and job classification	Estimated number of persons in 30 SMSA's	Maximum salary range (thousands)
Plant.....	153,000	
Craft workers.....	93,000	
Inside Crafts.....	38,000	
Switchman (central office repairman).....		\$9 to \$10.

Department and job classification	Estimated number of persons in 30 SMSA's	Maximum salary range (thousands)
Test boardman (toll test deskman).....		\$9 to \$10.
Entry level: Frameman.....		\$7.5 to \$8.5.
Outside crafts.....	55,000	
Cable splicer.....		\$9 to \$10.
PBX installer-repairman.....		\$9 to \$10.
Entry level: Cable splicer's helper.....		\$7.5 to \$8.5.
Installer-repairman.....		\$8.5 to \$9.5.
Lineman.....		\$8.5 to \$9.5.
Clerical workers.....		\$6.
Service workers.....		\$5.5.
Traffic.....	105,000	
Operator.....		\$5 to \$6.
Clerical workers.....		\$6.
Commercial.....	35,000	
Service representative.....		\$6 to \$7.
Commercial representative.....		\$8.5 to \$9.5.
Marketing.....	20,000	
Communications representative and consultant.....		\$10 to \$14.
Inside sales.....		\$6.
Accounting.....	27,000	

Management

The discussion above has been concerned with non-management jobs. As shown in Table 3, 23% of all Bell employees in the 30 SMSA's are in management positions. These jobs are stratified into six levels, levels one and two being primarily concerned with direct supervision of non-management employees and routine staff functions, and levels three (District Manager level) and above with the formulation and implementation of company policy.

TABLE 3.—TOTAL DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYEES IN 30 SMSA'S

	Amount	Percent
Nonmanagement.....	287,575	76.9
Total management.....	86,601	23.1
1st level.....	59,318	15.9
2d level.....	19,277	5.2
3d level.....	5,353	1.4
Above 3d level.....	2,653	.7

Source: EEOC C-661—EEOC C-690, as annotated.

Management employees are not evenly distributed through all departments, however, and a major difference exists between the two largest departments. In the 30 SMSA's, one out of every five Plant Department employees is in management while only one in ten Traffic Department employees holds a management job.³⁵ In terms of chances for advancement, therefore the Plant Department is twice as attractive as Traffic.

Up from the ranks. This two to one difference in the percentage of employees who are managers actually underestimates the management opportunities for Plant employees. Approximately 50% of all managers at the third level (District level) and above in all departments have been promoted from non-management jobs, primarily from craft jobs in the Plant Department.³⁶ In other words, many of the third level and above managers in the Traffic Department were actually promoted up through the craft jobs in the Plant Department.

College graduates. The other prime source of middle and upper management personnel is college graduates. For many years, the Bell System has had three management programs for college graduates. One, a very small program, hired specialists for certain highly technical staff jobs—lawyers, doctors, etc.³⁷ A second program, the Initial Management Development Program (IMDP),

hired college graduates who were not specialists in any field but who were to be trained for general middle and upper level management jobs in an accelerated, highly structured program.²⁸ The third program, also fairly large, was not nearly as ambitious as the IMDP. Its participants were hired into first level management jobs and were not given any special training to assist them to progress to District Level.²⁹

It is also worth noting that many of the first level management jobs in the Bell System are positions either not normally associated with management or paid at rates unusually low for management jobs. Included as management, for example, is the job of Secretary, which is paid at a maximum annual rate varying from \$8,900 in El Paso to \$10,750 in New York City.⁴⁰ Other jobs in New York City, for example, that are rated first level management include: Administrative Clerk, paid a maximum annual salary of \$8,470; Clerical Supervisor at a rate of \$8,470; Employment Representative at \$7,830; Passenger Car Chauffeur at \$9,920; Secretarial Stenographer at \$7,230; and Supervisory Assistant at \$9,170.⁴¹ Thus, many first level management positions pay no better than, or even less than, typical craft pay rates.

Summary

The foregoing distillation of the Bell System's employment structure has highlighted several salient points:

The Bell System is the largest private employer in the world with over half its work force located in 30 major SMSA's.

Bell employees are divided into five major departments, the largest of which are Plant and Traffic. More than two-thirds of all Bell employees are in these two departments.

There are four major types of non-management jobs in the Bell System: (1) craft workers in the Plant Department; (2) clerical workers in the Plant and Accounting Departments; (3) Operators in the Traffic Department; and (4) Service Representatives in the Commercial Department.

Operator is the lowest paying major job in the Bell System, closely followed by the clerical positions. Service Representatives are moderately well paid, but the highest paying non-management jobs are craft jobs in the Plant Department. In fact, craft wages exceed the pay of many first level management jobs.

The Operator's job is the least desirable major job in the System, largely because of the extremely undesirable working conditions. Consequently, turnover rates among Operators are quite high.

Virtually all of the 200,000 persons hired each year possess little or no skills and are completely trained within the System. The high turnover significantly magnifies recruiting and training costs.

Nearly one-fourth of all Bell employees are classified as management. A very large share of these are in the Plant Department.

Management personnel for third level and above in all departments are drawn primarily from craft employees or from college graduates hired into the IMDP program. Other college graduates are hired into first level management jobs.

Each of these factors has relevance to the employment opportunities of women and minorities in the Bell System. How each of them affects those opportunities is the subject of the following chapters.

CHAPTER 2.—WOMEN IN THE BELL SYSTEM: A STUDY IN SEX SEGREGATION

Introduction

Not only is the Bell System the nation's largest private employer, it is far and away the largest employer of women. Females,

moreover, are employed in the Bell System at a much greater rate than industry in general.¹ It has become a cliché that the telephone company is "a good place" for a young girl to get a job.²

In this chapter we will see the total sex segregation of the telephone company jobs and the resulting lower pay, poor working conditions, and fewer opportunities afforded to females. The next chapter will elaborate on the company policies and rationalizations which have produced and continue to perpetuate this sexist structure.

In 1968, when AT&T Vice President Walter Straley spoke of the Bell System's "unique competence to play a leading role in the improvement of employment opportunity," he referred, myopically, only to "disadvantaged minorities."³ If such a unique competence did in fact exist, it ought to apply with even greater force to women. But in 1971 it must be said that the System has failed to meet the challenge; the Bell companies must be characterized as uniquely incompetent. Although women continue to be employed in very large numbers, they are confined to the most stifling and repetitive jobs. Their compensation is so meager as to make them doubt their own self worth. Their prospects for promotion are in the distant future, if at all. It is little wonder, therefore, that many women flee from telephone jobs almost as quickly as they are attracted to them.

Emma Nutt to the Present—Not a very long way

The infant Bell companies, like most of their contemporaries in the 19th century, employed only males. Male operators, however, were considered to be "noisy, boisterous and often rude to subscribers." As a bold experiment, the Telephone Dispatch Company (the predecessor of New England Tel.) employed Emma Nutt as the first female Operator in September, 1878.⁴

The experiment proved to be quite a "success." Women very quickly took over the Operator's job and began to expand their areas of interest into what were then considered strictly male jobs. Female secretaries were employed "because girls would work for a third of the going \$30-a-week salary for a male secretary."⁵ Ms. Nutt, having pioneered in the Operator's job, set the pace for telephone women by advancing to Chief Operator, the first supervisory job for women, in 1883, and retiring after 33 years of service.⁶

The number of female employees grew with the rapid expansion of the telephone industry in the 20th century. They were limited, however, to a narrow spectrum of positions in the male dominated world of work. The jobs available to women remained those which were opened experimentally over 90 years ago. Operator and clerical jobs, together with their immediate supervisors, came to be reserved exclusively for females. Whole sections of the Bell System became the women's domain, "where men are managers, customers or husbands."⁷ By 1971 more than 400,000 women worked in the Bell System, thus constituting more than half of all operating company employees.⁸

The segregation of jobs

By way of introduction to sex segregation in the Bell System, it is instructive to examine the myriad of official company documents which deal with employment and employees. A total sex segregation of jobs is reflected in virtually all such Bell System documents. Through pictures of males or females, pronoun reference or through straightforward identification, all jobs are strictly classified as either male or female.

This sex denotation of jobs is carried consistently throughout company personnel manuals,⁹ collective bargaining agreements,¹⁰ job descriptions,¹¹ company publications,¹²

general company advertisements,¹³ requisitions for employees,¹⁴ forms relating to employment,¹⁵ memoranda and letters,¹⁶ speeches,¹⁷ bill inserts,¹⁸ turn-over studies,¹⁹ testing studies,²⁰ orientation materials,²¹ interviewer's aids,²² training manuals,²³ community wage studies,²⁴ award programs,²⁵ annual reports,²⁶ and even reports on affirmative action efforts to improve employment of minorities.²⁷

These documents unequivocally identify the following jobs as female: Operator, Plant and Accounting Department clerical jobs, Service Representative, inside sales jobs in the Commercial and Marketing Departments, and first level management jobs in the Traffic and Commercial Departments. Craft jobs, outside sales jobs, and middle and upper level management jobs are always identified as male jobs.

Public image. The rigid differentiation between the sexes in employment at Bell has become a trade mark of the System.²⁸ The Operator's job in particular has come to be recognized by almost everyone as especially suited to women. The telephone company has been described in the press as "the great historical bastion of feminine employment"²⁹ and the Operator's job as "a female stronghold" of long standing.³⁰ A newspaper article in February, 1971, reported that, "The idea that Telephone Operators are—must be—women is firmly planted into the public mind."³¹ Similarly, the public conceives of all craft workers and all managers as being male.³² The public's close identification of females with Operators and males with craft workers and management is no accident. It is the direct result of a calculated Systemwide sex segregation.

Only when one sex is totally unavailable for work has Bell resorted to "opposite sex" employment.³³ During World War II women replaced men on most inside craft jobs, particularly Frameman.³⁴ During strikes and service emergencies men have staffed the Operator's switchboards.³⁵ These instances were certainly the exceptions, however, and as soon as the crisis had passed, the "normal" sex again took over the job.

A uniform picture

Perhaps the most striking feature of the Bell System's sex segregation is its absolute uniformity. All the operating companies are apparently subject to an immutable law of sex segregation in almost all jobs. The same jobs are allocated to the same sex in every company with the same result—women are consistently locked into the lowest paying jobs with practically no prospect for upward mobility, regardless of their skill or ambition. Every city, irrespective of its size or geographical location, reflects the same segregation. Minor variations only serve to highlight the pervasive pattern throughout the Bell System.

This consistency is most apparent in the degree to which the major jobs are sex segregated in the operating companies. For the purposes of this report, any major job (a job employing 20 or more persons) that is 90% one sex or the other will be considered to be sexually identifiable and segregated. In the 30 SMSA's, 92.4% of all employees in major job classifications are in sex-segregated jobs.³⁶ (See Table 4.) There are no cities which may be categorized as "good" on this index. In New York City, the city with the least segregation, 86.0% of all employees are in classifications in which one sex is 90% predominant. An even more distressing statistic is the fact that in the 30 SMSA's, 54% of all employees in major job classifications are in 100% sex-segregated jobs. In seven of the 30 SMSA's all of the 25 largest jobs are readily identifiable as belonging to one sex or the other.³⁷ At least 21 of the 25 largest jobs are segregated in every one of the SMSA's.

Footnotes at end of article.

February 17, 1972 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—Extensions of Remarks

E 1247

TABLE 4.—SEX SEGREGATION OF JOBS WITH 20 OR MORE EMPLOYEES, BY SMSA, DEC. 31, 1970

Standard metropolitan statistical area	Percent of all employees in 100-percent sex segregated jobs	Percent of all employees in 90-percent sex segregated jobs
Atlanta	79.8	92.7
Baltimore	61.9	96.3
Birmingham	91.7	92.7
Chicago	36.9	98.0
Cleveland	57.3	95.9
Dallas	81.0	99.2
Denver	58.6	94.4
Detroit	75.1	97.7
El Paso	96.0	100.0
Greensboro	97.7	97.7
Houston	83.1	97.9
Indianapolis	79.4	95.3
Jacksonville	83.6	96.3
Kansas City	87.1	99.3
Los Angeles	27.3	94.7
Memphis	82.2	93.9
Miami	72.0	92.2
Mobile	100.0	100.0
New Orleans	95.2	96.6
New York	38.6	86.7
Newark	74.6	88.7
Norfolk	91.4	100.0
Philadelphia	84.2	95.0
Phoenix	73.9	95.3
Richmond	50.5	91.8
St. Louis	77.1	95.3
San Antonio	96.3	100.0
San Diego	54.1	96.0
San Francisco	37.9	92.5
Washington	58.4	92.9
Total (30 SMSA's)	53.9	92.4

Source: EEOC C-661—EEOC C-630.

Departmental segregation. Because virtually all jobs are sex segregated, whole departments may be designated as male or female in all the companies. Almost half of all females employed in the 30 SMSA's are in the Traffic Department while less than two percent of all males are assigned to that Department. The Traffic Department has been appropriately described by Bell officials as a "nunnery." In contrast, three-fourths of all males are employed in the Plant Department, but only one-eighth of all females. (See Chart 4.) Graphic and statistical presentations of the sex composition of all departments for each of the 30 SMSA's have been prepared and can be found in Exhibit 1, pp. 4-64. Those data very clearly show the sex-segregated nature of all major departments in every location.

The concentration of females in Traffic and males in Plant has two immediate implications. First, because the wages in the Plant Department are much higher than in the Traffic Department, males make more money. Second, the opportunities for promotion within non-management, into management and within management are infinitely better in Plant and, therefore, for males. Later sections will quantify both the wage and promotional disadvantage suffered by women in the Bell System. First, however, a detailed examination will be made of the specific jobs which are sex segregated.

The major female non-management jobs

Nationwide, eight out of ten female employees are in three major groups of jobs: Operator (40% of all female employees), Service Representative (8% of all female employees), and clerical and stenographic (32% of all female employees).³⁸ For almost a century the Bell companies have considered these jobs to be reserved for females.

Operator. At the end of 1970, the operating companies employed over 165,000 Operators, but only 224 (0.1%) were male. Were it not for the token effort of Pacific Tel. there would be almost none. Twelve companies have no male Operators.³⁹

Service Representative. Bell's recruitment literature says of the Service Representative, "She is the telephone Company."⁴⁰ This is a particularly apt description since 99% of all

Service Representatives are females. Five companies have no male Service Representatives. In only two companies and four of the surveyed SMSA's does the percentage of male Service Representatives exceed one percent. (See EEOC Exhibit 1, pp. 447, 448.)

Clerical. The third major "female" job group is clerical. In the operating companies 93% of these low paying jobs are held by women. Although seven percent of these jobs are held by men, it should not be assumed that these are the same clerical jobs held by females. Consistent with the over all pattern, most companies reserve a certain few clerical jobs—Utility Clerk, Construction Clerk, etc.—for males. These classifications are usually paid more than "female" clerical jobs. In every SMSA almost all clerical jobs continue to be identifiable as "women's" jobs.

Inside sales. A fourth "female" job group, somewhat smaller than the three discussed above, illustrates the Bell System's segregation of even functionally-related jobs. As observed in Chapter 1, there are two basic categories of sales jobs—inside sales which handles smaller equipment and advertising orders and outside sales which contracts for major customer purchases. Despite the functional relationship between the jobs, they continue to be distinguishable by the sex of the incumbents. Of 1369 inside sales workers in the 30 SMSA's, 95.2% are females; of 4000 outside sales workers, only 8.1% are females. (See EEOC Exhibit 1, p. 451.) In 1971 Southwestern Bell continues to designate its inside sales workers "Telephone Saleswomen."⁴¹

In short, in 1971 almost every major low-paying job in the Bell System is a "female" job. The introductory description of low-paying jobs (Operator, clerical jobs in Plant and Accounting, Service Representative and inside sales jobs) is also a perfect description of jobs which are almost totally female. The fact that exactly the same jobs are female in city after city and company after company is obviously the result of System policy. The fact that these jobs are also the lowest paying jobs everywhere in the System is also no accident. The contrary situation exists, of course, with respect to the jobs which the Bell System has allocated to males. The jobs are discussed below.

The major male non-management jobs

One-fourth of the operating company employees are in telephone craft positions.⁴² Except for the upper level management jobs, these classifications are the most desirable in the System. Not only is the pay a great deal higher and the opportunity for promotion much greater, the job itself is much more challenging and satisfying than the Operator and clerical jobs.

These more attractive craft jobs have never been open to females on the same basis as males. Prior to the effective date of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, there were virtually no females in any of the telephone crafts. In 1966 only three companies (New England Tel., Ohio Bell and Michigan Bell) employed any females in craft jobs.⁴³

The passage of Title VII has not, however, been a significant spur to the utilization of females in the telephone crafts. In 1971, although all the companies had at least one female craft worker, in only five companies did the proportion of female craft workers exceed one percent.⁴⁴

Two observations make this gross underutilization particularly distressing. First, it should be recalled that since the Bell System trains for every job,⁴⁵ the absence of female craft workers cannot possibly be explained by the lack of "qualified applicants."

Second, each Bell company employed females in craft jobs at a rate far below that of other companies in its area. (See Chart 5.)

In 1971, only Michigan Bell managed to employ female craft workers at a rate greater than area employers. In most of the operating companies, females are employed in the crafts at a rate only 10-15% of the area all-industries rate.

Of 190,000 telephone craft workers in the operating companies at the end of 1970, 99% were male.⁴⁶ The "outside" crafts (Linemen, Installer-Repairman, PBX Installer-Repairman and Cable Splicer) were virtually 100% male. In the 30 surveyed SMSA's there were only nine females in outside crafts (three Repairmen, one Installer-Repairman, one Transmission Man, one Installer, two Station Installers and one Cable Splicer). (See EEOC Exhibit 1, p. 450.)

The Bell System's employment of women in the "inside" crafts (Frameman, Switchman and Test Deskman) is hardly better; all are substantially sex segregated. (See EEOC Exhibit 1, pp. 449-450.)

Michigan Frameworkers. The Frameman classification is a particularly interesting case study of the Bell System's penchant for classifying every job by sex. Prior to 1965 only one company, Michigan Bell, employed women in Framework. At Michigan Bell this classification, titled Switchroom Helper, was totally female and had been so for at least 20 years.⁴⁷ The job was treated in every respect as a "female" clerical-type job. The "female" (clerical) test battery was administered to applicant;⁴⁸ applicants were required to be between 5'3" and 5'10" tall;⁴⁹ the rate of pay was within the clerical range rather than the craft range;⁵⁰ promotional opportunities were into lateral clerical jobs rather than to higher-rated crafts or management.⁵¹ The Switchroom Helper's job, though craft in function and identical to the all-male Frameman's job in other companies, was typed in every way as a female classification by Michigan Bell.

After 1965, some companies (though by no means all) realized that females could no longer be excluded from the Frameman's job. (See the discussion of BFOQ in Chapter 3.) Southern Bell and South Central Bell, to a limited extent, began what amounts to a conversion of a "male" job into a "female" job.

By the end of 1970, over 60% of the Framemen in Atlanta, Birmingham and Greensboro/Winston-Salem were "Framedames."⁵² The evidence also tends to show that the rate of pay for Framework relative to other crafts also began to reflect its "female" designation in these companies.⁵³

In January, 1970, Illinois Bell gave serious consideration to "an all female Frame force similar to Michigan Bell." They concluded, however, that their "hiring problems [among males] were not so critical that they should break toward an all female Frame force." Illinois Bell observed, nevertheless, that, "The Michigan people do still believe this is the way to go."⁵⁴

Most other companies, despite the examples in Michigan Bell and Southern Bell, continued to defend the male craft fortress. At the end of 1970, there were no female Framemen in six SMSA's, and less than five percent of all Framemen were female in eight other SMSA's. Despite the fact that Framemen in some cities were all female, only 12% of all Framemen in the 30 SMSA's were female.⁵⁵

The other major inside craft jobs continue to be exclusively male with little indication of any female participation to date. The Switchman classification was only 0.6% female at the end of 1970. Eleven of the 30 SMSA's had no female Switchmen. Females were similarly excluded from the Test Deskman's position, comprising only 1.7% of all employees in that position. In New York, for instance, of 1600 Deskmen, none were female.⁵⁶

In summary, on December 31, 1970, virtu-

Footnotes at end of article.

ally all craft jobs in the Bell System were held by males. Outside craft positions were exclusively male. Females had entered only one inside craft job, Framemen, and that only very selectively. As noted before, males held 92% of the outside sales jobs.

Thus, the description of the sex composition of major Bell System non-management jobs comes full circle. All low-paying, high-turnover, dead-end jobs are female. High-paying, desirable jobs with substantial chances for promotion to middle and upper management are male. It is no surprise, therefore, to find very few females in management jobs above the first level. The following section describes this exclusion from management.

Females and Males in Management

The exclusion of females from Plant craft positions and their concentration in the Traffic Operator's job has serious implications for their respective opportunities for promotion into management. As shown above, the chance for promotion into management within the Plant Department is twice as great as the chance for promotion to management in the Traffic Department. In the operating companies a woman's chances of reaching management are approximately one in eight while a man's chances are one in three. (See Chart 6.) The chances for a male to reach management are thus consistently two or three times the chances for a female.

Even these statistics, however, exaggerate a female's potential for achieving positions of responsibility and commensurate compensation. Of all male managers in the 30 SMSA's, 45% are in management level two or above; a meager 6.3% of all female managers have progressed above the initial plateau of management. (See Chart 7.) Even fewer females make it to the highest levels. Of 2650 employees above third level management in the 30 SMSA's, only 31 (1.2%) were female.

Most staggering are the departmental management figures. It has already been observed that most middle and upper level Bell System managers in all departments are either promoted up from craft jobs in the Plant Department or hired directly into management through the IMDP. Chart 7 records the effect of this Bell System policy on the chances of women being promoted to middle management. It is almost inconceivable that in the 30 SMSA's, 99.6% of all non-management employees in Traffic are females, 92.4% of all first level managers in Traffic are female, but only 25.3% of all managers in levels two through five are female. Equally staggering disparities exist in the Commercial and Accounting Departments.⁴⁷ It is now clear that in Traffic, Commercial, and Accounting, "men are managers, customers, or husbands." Females fill virtually all low-level jobs but are shut out of management jobs above the first level. For women, the Bell System's fabled "up from the ranks" promotion policy is the height of hypocrisy.

Even the law has not been a significant stimulus to promotion of women within management levels at the Bell System. After examining the distribution of women in management levels for the period between 1966 and 1969, AT&T's task force on women concluded in August, 1970, that,

Movement during this four year period has been quite slow; for all practical purposes, the only change has been a slight increase in second level jobs held by women.⁴⁸

Staff roles. Moreover, within management levels, females find themselves confined to staff positions and not in the mainstream of management. For instance, 9.1% of all females in management (as defined by the operating companies) are classified as Sec-

retaries,⁴⁹ a position that would not be considered management in almost any other context.

Those females in more traditional management jobs are still confined to advisory, support positions. Of the 31 females above District level in the surveyed cities, only three are located in the operating departments. The others fill legal, medical or other specialized support roles.⁵⁰ This same finding was emphasized in the report of the AT&T task force on women.

Only a few of the District and above women managers are functioning in line management jobs. The job titles of the vast majority of these managers, regardless of department, indicate either a specialist assignment or a staff role. The few women that do progress in management, do not move into the general management mainstream.⁵¹

The Bell System's failure to promote females must be classed as one of the most monumental inequities in private industry. Even so, AT&T Chairman of the Board, H. I. Romnes, on December 11, 1970, labeling as "outrageous" the EEOC's charges of "pervasive, system-wide" discrimination against women, stated that the Bell System "recruits, hires, assigns and promotes without discrimination." Romnes reported that females make up 33.5% of the System's managers and professionals.⁵² The hollowness of these statements is self-evident.

Female and male wages

Although by 1971 all the operating companies had ceased to officially label wage schedules as male or female,⁵³ the total segregation of jobs had the same inevitable effect. This is not a case of unequal pay for equal work. Females are paid less because they are excluded from all jobs classified at a higher wage.

In the 30 SMSA's, 80% of all female employees are in classifications whose maximum basic annual wage is less than \$7000; only four percent of all males are in such classifications. (See Chart 8.)

At the more lucrative end of the scale the differences are equally disparate. While 34% of all males are in classifications with a maximum annual salary of at least \$13,000, only three percent of all females are so situated. The chance that a female will earn over \$13,000 per year is less than one-tenth that of her male counterpart.

Furthermore, males begin at higher wages than females and continue to maintain a greater wage throughout their tenure in the Bell System. The average maximum wage for males in entry level jobs in the 30 SMSA's was \$8,613; the average maximum wage for beginning females was \$6,114 or only 71% of the male wage.⁵⁴ A female in first level management averages \$11,194. Should she compare herself to a male in first level management, she would discover that her wage is only 79% of his.⁵⁵ When measured in terms of total "occupational position," females' wages were only 75% of the average wage for all employees and only 60% of the average wage of male employees. Graphic displays of the male/female wage distribution and occupational position have been prepared for each SMSA and can be found in EEOC Exhibit 1, pp. 128-188 and pp. 238-299.

By any standard, the exclusion of females from craft jobs and middle and upper management positions is tragic. The psychological toll is incalculable. The toll in turnover is fantastic. The loss in wages is astronomical. The conclusion is inescapable that, in terms of providing equality of opportunity for females, the Bell System has been uniquely incompetent.

Summary

While the majority of the employees in the Bell System are female, almost all jobs in the company are sex segregated.

The Bell System originated and encourages

the common conception of certain jobs as male or female.

The sex segregation is uniform from company to company.

The Operator, Service Representative, and clerical classifications are almost exclusively female and contain 80% of all females in the System.

Nearly all craft jobs and middle and upper level management jobs are held by males.

"Male" jobs invariably pay more, are more rewarding, and provide greater promotional opportunities than "female" jobs.

TABLE 5.—SUMMARY OF FEMALE PARTICIPATION IN THE BELL SYSTEM, DEC. 31, 1970

	Total employment	Female employment	Percent female
Officials and managers.....	88,301	36,295	41.1
Professionals.....	58,756	12,051	20.5
Technicians.....	4,791	3,052	63.7
Sales workers.....	12,113	3,168	26.2
Management.....	5,814	661	11.4
Nonmanagement.....	6,299	2,507	39.8
Office and clerical.....	359,119	348,071	96.9
Secretaries (management).....	4,929	4,919	99.8
Clerical and stenographers.....	141,394	131,677	93.1
Telephone operators.....	165,372	165,148	99.9
Supervisors/services assistants.....	13,440	13,437	100.0
Service representatives.....	33,093	32,740	98.9
Other business office employees.....	891	150	16.8
Craft workers.....	192,328	2,120	1.1
Operatives.....	7,437	119	1.6
Service workers.....	9,605	4,648	48.4
Total.....	732,450	409,524	55.9

Source: EEOC W-659.

CHAPTER 3.—REACTION TO THE SEX PROVISIONS OF TITLE VII

In 1965 Bell System officials, oblivious to sex discrimination, defined equal employment as equal opportunities for minorities. They were, therefore, rather complacent about the newly passed Civil Rights Act. Many of the companies had been members of the Plans for Progress for several years and felt that their obligations had been fulfilled.¹ The sex provisions of Title VII, when they were considered at all, were not taken seriously and certainly were not of the same import as the race provisions. In 1965 none of the operating companies had any affirmative action commitments relating to sex,² and most did not consider sex discrimination to be a serious problem. "Not much thought had been devoted to possible discrimination based on sex."³

As the effective date of the Act approached, Bell officials counseled caution and adopted a "go slow" attitude.⁴ In a conference on the implications of Title VII held in April, 1965, for example, Mr. E. D. Maloney, Pacific Tel. Vice President, said,

"The Company does not want to do anything at this time which would affect the reasonable and efficient operation of our business. For sure, we don't intend to go off half-cocked; once we do, then we are stuck. If and when we are challenged, then we can take a different approach."⁵

This chapter will examine the reasons offered by the operating companies for their continued exclusion of the "opposite sex" from sex-segregated jobs after the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The most common rationalizations were the use of state "protective" laws restricting women's work and claims of Bona Fide Occupational Qualification (BFOQ).

Panic to protect against contamination

Certainly no affirmative action was contemplated by any of the operating companies in 1965. Many, however, realized the clear implication in Title VII that "... the mere

Footnotes at end of article.

fact that women [or men] have traditionally been excluded from certain jobs will not, of itself, be an acceptable reason for continued exclusion."⁶ The companies, therefore, began the process of justifying their traditional sex segregation in terms of Title VII.

Initially, the operating companies suggested a Bona Fide Occupational Qualification (BFOQ) for all jobs which were sexually segregated.⁷ Section 703(e)(1) of Title VII allows an employer to exclude women or men from jobs "in those certain instances" where sex is a "bona fide occupational qualification."

In December, 1965, the EEOC promulgated Guidelines on Discrimination Because of Sex which defined the BFOQ exception.⁸ According to the EEOC Guidelines, women could not be excluded from jobs because of "assumptions of the comparative employment characteristics of women in general." Nor could employers justify a BFOQ on "stereotyped characterization of the sexes," such as "men are less capable of assembling intricate equipment" or "women are less capable of aggressive salesmanship."

Some in the Bell System, however, argued that males should be excluded from clerical jobs because "the work and wage rates are not generally attractive to men" and "few men have the academic clerical training to qualify for this work."⁹ Others argued that entry craft jobs, though not justifying a BFOQ based on their job content, should be restricted to men because women could not fill higher-rated jobs in the craft progression.¹⁰

Throughout the Bell System there was an underlying fear of the "contamination" of male job classifications by the females.¹¹ As position papers were circulated by AT&T, some of the most bizarre BFOQ claims began to be abandoned. For some classifications no argument could be contrived to justify continued exclusion. There were some jobs for which no company claimed a BFOQ. There were other jobs for which all companies claimed a BFOQ. And there were certain jobs for which some companies claimed a BFOQ while other companies did not.

The following sections describe the welter of conflicting positions taken within the Bell System since 1965. Only one confident generalization can be made from this material: no matter what a particular company claimed regarding BFOQ, in practice, the result was always the same. Females were consistently excluded from "male" jobs and males were excluded from "female" jobs, irrespective of whether or not the company claimed a BFOQ. The immutable law of sex segregation proved to be considerably harder than the law of Title VII.

Jobs for which no BFOQ was claimed: Clerical and service representative jobs

As early as 1965, AT&T corporate headquarters conceded in a letter to all operating companies that there was no legitimate reason for excluding males from clerical jobs in the Plant and Accounting Departments and Service Representative jobs in the Commercial Department.¹² An exhaustive search of company documents revealed that not a single company claimed that males could lawfully be excluded from either clerical or Service Representative jobs.

The absence of an official company claim of BFOQ was, however, irrelevant. The Bell System was unalterably opposed to the mingling of the sexes. A memorandum which refers specifically to clerical and Service Representative positions, exemplifies what actually occurred throughout the Bell System:

"We are not anxious to place men in jobs that are normally held by women or women in jobs normally held by men. No individual

should be hired into a job normally held by the opposite sex unless approval is received."¹³

To say that the operating companies were "not anxious" to place males in clerical and Service Representative jobs is a considerable understatement. As long ago as 1965, the System affirmatively recognized the unlawfulness of continued exclusion of males, and yet the exclusion has continued for at least six years. Data already presented conclusively showed that as of December 31, 1970, these jobs were still virtually all-female.¹⁴ The fact that the companies never officially even claimed a legitimate reason for excluding males from clerical and Service Representative jobs did not prevent the companies from excluding males in practice. These jobs were just as staunchly "female" in 1971 as the job of Operator, for which the Bell System has valiantly attempted to justify a claim of BFOQ. Under these circumstances, the conclusion, harsh though it may be, is inescapable. The Bell System has deliberately flouted the law. This conclusion is reinforced by the openness, discussed in the next chapter, with which these violations of the law were accomplished.

BFOQ for operator: A lost cause even in 1965

In 1965 there was a great debate within the Bell System over the continued segregation of the Operator classification. In California, at least one independent telephone company had begun to hire male Operators in 1966, and their limited efforts seemed to be quite successful.¹⁵ Many Bell operating company officials felt the Operator's job could not lawfully be limited to females.¹⁶

Some Pacific Tel. officials even suggested the hiring of male Operators as an experiment in an effort to solve their turn-over problem.¹⁷ The following disadvantages of such a policy were expressed by other Pacific Tel. executives: (1) the Company already had a significant investment in the image of the Operators as the "voice with the smile" which would be lost, were males hired; (2) if males were in Operators' jobs there might be some pressure to equalize the Operator's pay with plant craft pay since men would then be serving in both positions.¹⁸ These observations are probably reflective of the real reasons for the Bell System's unflinching attachment to female Operators. However decisive these economic factors may have been in reality, they were never formally articulated as being lawful reasons for exclusion.

Rationale for BFOQ. Despite the early confusion over the Operator job, all operating companies toed the line after AT&T corporate headquarters circulated a position paper in January, 1966. The paper, entitled "Application of Title VII of Civil Rights Act to Traffic Operating Jobs in the Telephone Industry," awkwardly attempted to rationalize the exclusion of males. Three basic rationales were proposed. First, the paper argued that men were by nature unsuited to the Operator's job. The initial telephone company experience with rambunctious males was cited and the specter of deteriorating service was raised. "The present high level of service," AT&T contended, "is largely due to the employment of women as telephone operators."¹⁹

Second, the close nature of the work necessitated a segregated work force.

Many times operators' knees, elbows, hands and arms brush their neighbors' bodies. To have men and women (even those with the best intentions and good will) working side by side under these conditions would create an intolerable situation.²⁰

The possibility of segregating men and women at the switchboards was rejected as "possibly a violation of Title VII."²¹

Third, the Operators' chairs, switchboards, lounge and rest room facilities were designed for women, and the expense of accommodating males would be "too much for any management to consider or the public to pay for."²²

Thirteen of the operating companies formally adopted the AT&T rationale and officially excluded males from the Operator's job (and associated Traffic Department jobs) on the basis of a female BFOQ.²³ It is assumed that the remaining companies also claimed a BFOQ for Operator although such evidence was not furnished in response to the EEOC's Request for Documents. In any case, these companies also excluded males from the job.

Fallacies of the argument. The bankruptcy of this position is quite apparent. First, AT&T's 1966 position paper admitted that at least 25% of all males possessed the specific "nurturant" personality qualities which Bell claimed it sought in its Operators and 20% of all women are as "aggressive" as the average man.²⁴

Moreover, and this is critical, AT&T has never used any selection technique designed to measure personality qualities.²⁵ In as much as at least 20% of women do not possess the personality qualities "sought" by AT&T, the failure of the System to adopt selection techniques to screen out those women vividly testifies to the make-weight nature of this argument. On the other hand if personality factors are so critical to service, the failure of the Bell System to adopt professionally developed selection techniques designed to measure personality factors stands as a monumental example of corporate mismanagement, especially in view of the well-known and wide-spread deterioration of service in recent years.

In any event, AT&T obviously cannot simultaneously claim that personality factors are so important as to justify exclusion of all males from the Operator job and yet so insignificant that the System need not use selection techniques to measure those qualities.

The second argument advanced by AT&T—that the close nature of the work justified complete segregation—is so specious as to warrant summary rejection. Moreover, it has been reasonably surmised by Bell officials that the extremely acute problems of turnover could be substantially reduced by sexually integrating the Traffic Department nursery.²⁶ Further, the notorious claustrophobic conditions in the Traffic Department have been repeatedly condemned as being a major factor contributing to Operator unrest.²⁷

Another major fallacy in Bell's argument for exclusion of males from the Operator job can be found in the experience of other telephone companies. General Telephone Company, for example, had been successfully hiring males as Operators since October, 1966,²⁸ a fact which must have been well-known in the Bell System.²⁹ Nevertheless, AT&T blindly persisted in its attempt to preserve the all-female composition of the Operator's job.

Finally, it must be emphasized that AT&T's claim of a female BFOQ for Operator was based squarely on "stereotyped characterizations of the sexes," a rationale explicitly rejected by the EEOC as early as December, 1965.

It is quite obvious that the Bell System made a conscious decision to retain the female image of the Operator's job and to avoid hiring males. The position which AT&T adopted was irrational and uneconomic. Because of the system's predilection for female Operators, they were forced to adopt an incredibly strained and feeble argument to achieve a semblance of legality.

Abandoning the female BFOQ. AT&T continued in this premise long after the operating companies had realized its futility. In April, 1970, AT&T let it be known that it was still opposed to the hiring of male Operators but that the decision should be made by the individual operating company presidents.³⁰ All of the companies, with some reluctance, officially abandoned their BFOQ claims for Operators during the first six months of 1970.³¹

There has been no change in the actual

composition of the Operator's classification following the revocation of the ban on males. Although thousands upon thousands of Operators have been hired since the change in policy, as of December 31, 1970, in the entire Bell System there were only 224 male Operators, 90% of whom were in California. Twelve Bell companies still had no males at all.

No Company has taken any affirmative action to seek out male Operators, and most have actively discouraged such applicants. South Central Bell's accommodation to the new mandatory policy in April, 1970, is perhaps typical.

Henceforth, it is the company's policy that the female sex should not be asserted as a BFOQ for any job. However, it is not the Company's policy to seek out or encourage the placing of males in these titles. On the contrary, diligent efforts (short of asserting a female BFOQ) should be made to dissuade males from applying for or taking these jobs. Their interest should be steered, if possible, toward Plant craft or some other more suitable work. If such males are insistent on being considered for jobs normally filled by women, they should be processed in the regular manner for males. . . .²²

The Bell System couched sex segregation of Operators in terms of Title VII until that tactic was totally debunked. Stripped of these trappings, it became blatant discrimination.

Male BFOQ—Introduction

The concern over the "contamination" of male jobs elicited a much more intricate justification for male BFOQ's. The same disagreement which surrounded the formulation of female BFOQ's characterized the attempted legitimization of "male" jobs. This confusion and contradiction only highlights the inability of any employer to make generalizations which would justify the exclusion of all females, absolutely, from a particular category of jobs. The difficulties inherent in making categorical generalizations about individuals based solely on their sex was certainly recognized by many in the Bell System. Officials in some companies determined that it was "probably impossible, or at least very difficult, to make blanket restrictions" for any individual job title.²³ But in order to rationalize the continued exclusion of females from male jobs, most companies attempted the "impossible" and concocted numerous reasons for continued sex segregation.

The Bell companies used two major arguments to justify their exclusion of females from various outside sales, craft and management jobs. First, they contended that the placement of females in jobs which required overtime or lifting of heavy weights would contravene state protective legislation. Second, they claimed that women as a class were unable or unwilling to meet some of the rigors associated with traditionally male jobs. As will be shown below, these distinctions have had little actual effect on the sex composition of the job. All jobs remain sex segregated whether a BFOQ was claimed or not.

Male BFOQ: Outside Sales Jobs

By letter dated May 12, 1965, AT&T Assistant Vice President William Mercer notified all operating companies that "there would appear to be no general basis for excluding women" from outside sales jobs.²⁴ At least fourteen companies apparently have never claimed a BFOQ for outside sales jobs.²⁵ On December 31, 1970, the 22 SMSA's in these companies employed over 2,500 outside sales workers, of whom 92% were male. Those same SMSA's employed 444 inside sales workers, of whom 93% were female.²⁶

Five and one-half years after the effective date of the Civil Rights Act, these fourteen companies continue to sex segregate their sales jobs without even a claim of legitimacy.

The remaining companies justified their exclusion of females from outside sales jobs primarily upon the existence of various state protective laws limiting the number of hours women can work. Claims based on such laws will be dealt with more generally below.

The implications of the System's treatment of outside salesworkers, however, are quite clear. Only a handful of companies asserted a BFOQ claim for outside sales jobs. The absence of such a claim has not, however, meant that females have been afforded equal opportunity. Sales jobs still remain sexually segregated in all companies.

Craft jobs: State protective legislation

A fever of paternalism in the first half of the 20th century produced legislation in a number of states limiting the hours a woman could work and the weight that she could lift. In 1965 most of these laws remained in force.²⁷ Because arguably certain craft jobs required the working of hours and/or lifting of weight in excess of the limit permitted women under these laws, several Bell companies were faced in 1965 with a potential conflict between the state protective law and the federal Civil Rights Act, a conflict which was immediately recognized by all in the Bell System.²⁸

Pacific Tel., in particular, raised the possibility that the state laws might be challenged by the federal government as restrictive of females' employment opportunities.²⁹

Before discussing BFOQ claims based on these state laws, it should be emphasized that not all companies could rely on such laws as justification for their traditional exclusion of females from craft jobs (or outside sales jobs, for that matter), either because their respective states had no protective legislation or such legislation did not apply to the telephone company. Eight companies—C&P (Md.), C&P (Va.), Indiana Bell, New Jersey Bell, C&P (W. Va.), Southwestern Bell, New York Tel., and Northwestern Bell—have never claimed that their exclusion of females from craft jobs could be excused because of state protective legislation.³⁰ The rationalizations these companies adopted will be discussed in the next section.

Twelve companies, however, did assert a BFOQ for some craft jobs based on state protective legislation.³¹ These claims were not uniform, and the inconsistencies are sufficient to cast considerable doubt about the companies' good faith in asserting them.

Challenging state laws. There were four major reactions to the apparent conflict between state and federal law. First, Mountain Bell and Illinois Bell made a frontal attack on the state law's validity, but only after they had been found in violation of either state or federal civil rights laws.

In December, 1966, Mountain Bell challenged the Arizona protective law as "archaic" and in conflict with state and federal anti-discrimination laws.³² In June, 1968, the offending Arizona statute was revised to eliminate the conflict with Title VII.³³ Similar laws existed in Utah, Montana, New Mexico and Texas, but the Company made no effort to have them removed by the courts. Quite to the contrary, Mountain Bell continued to assert a BFOQ based on these "archaic" laws until March 1971.³⁴ Moreover, despite the absence of any state protective law in Arizona since 1968, Mountain Bell in Phoenix has continued to sex segregate the craft jobs. On December 31, 1970, in Phoenix, the Company employed 1405 telephone craft workers, of whom only 21 (1.5%) were female.³⁵

In March, 1970 (almost five years after the effective date of Title VII) Illinois Bell also challenged the state's protective laws in federal court, contending that they were neither realistic nor relevant to the needs of women in modern society. The court ruled the state law invalid in August, 1970.³⁶ No other Bell companies have made such challenges of state laws.³⁷

Exemptions from state law. A second al-

ternative was pursued by Bell of Pa., which sought exemptions from the state law for the classifications of Facilities Assigner and Frameman.³⁸ The exemption was granted by the Pennsylvania Bureau of Labor Standards in March, 1968, for all jobs in Philadelphia and not just those for which exemption was sought.³⁹ Unaccountably, the Company continued to rely on the state law. Even though they had a legal exemption, they continued to exclude women from other inside and outside crafts until January, 1970.⁴⁰

Similar exemptions were allowed in other states, but they were not applied for by the Bell companies.⁴¹ Not that exemptions would make much difference. Although unrestricted in its ability to employ females as craft workers, Bell of Pa. employed 4418 craft workers in Philadelphia on December 31, 1970 only 11 (.02%) were female.⁴² Clearly, the state protective law has not been the operative factor in excluding females from craft work at Bell of Pa.

Restriction of overtime. A third major policy toward state protective laws was adopted by Southwestern Bell, Pacific Tel. (Frameman only) Ohio Bell (Frameman only) and Wisconsin Tel. These companies allowed women into certain craft positions but restricted their overtime.⁴³ Wisconsin Tel. presents a particularly compelling example. After initially excluding women from all craft jobs on the basis of the state law, the Company revised its position in 1968 to "allow" women into these jobs but to restrict the overtime they could work.⁴⁴ The effect of this change in policy has been negligible. On December 31, 1970, Wisconsin Tel. employed 2864 craft workers, of whom 99.4% were male.⁴⁵

Southwestern Bell adopted a similar position relative to the Texas state protective laws. They restricted no jobs to men based on the state statute but limited females' overtime when they held those jobs.⁴⁶ Based on the same statutes, however, Mountain Bell in El Paso restricted all inside craft jobs to males.⁴⁷ These conflicting policies illustrate the contrived and artificial nature of claims of BFOQ based on state protective laws. Further demonstration of the absurdity of BFOQ claims can be found by examining the employment of female craft workers in Texas, where, as noted above, Southwestern Bell states it has never denied females entry into craft jobs based on the state protective law but has restricted only the hours women could work.

Of 4813 craft workers employed in Dallas, Houston and San Antonio on December 31, 1970, 98.5% were males.⁴⁸ Whether or not Southwestern Bell claimed a BFOQ based on Texas state law, the fact remains that craft jobs are the exclusive domain of men.

The following companies spurned all of the above alternatives and excluded women from most traditionally male classifications based on state protective legislation: C&P (D.C.), Michigan Bell, New England Tel., Pacific Northwest Bell, and South Central Bell.⁴⁹

A summary of the various companies' policies concerning exclusion of females from craft jobs based on state protective laws is obviously difficult since so many inconsistent claims were being made within the System. Two conclusions can be reached with some confidence, however. First, if the operating companies had truly desired to place females in craft jobs, they could have. The companies could have attacked the state law; they could have sought exemptions from the laws; or they could have placed women in the jobs but restricted their overtime. All of these alternatives are viable as indicated by the fact that some companies claimed to use them. It appears reasonable to conclude that the failure of most companies to pursue these alternatives vigorously can be attributed to their continued desire to sex segregate craft jobs.

This observation is reinforced by the second conclusion which can be confidently

Footnotes at end of article.

made. The fact that some companies attacked state laws, obtained exemptions, or "allowed" females into craft jobs but restricted their overtime made virtually no difference in actual practices. All companies continued to exclude females from craft positions. Bell System sex stereotypes, ingrained by a century of corporate policy, continued to thrive.

Craft jobs: Sex stereotypes

The second major justification for a male BFOQ rested on presumed differences between the abilities and disabilities of the sexes. Five liabilities were attributed to women which would prevent them from holding "male" jobs: (1) women who work on customer premises are subject to special hazards unique to their sex;⁶⁰ (2) women may not work under hazardous conditions inherent in working aloft or underground;⁶¹ (3) women may not lift excessive weight or expend an equivalent amount of energy;⁶² (4) because women cannot participate in the above activities, they may not hold jobs which require such experience;⁶³ (5) women would not be expected to complete the training period required for certain jobs.⁶⁴

It should be recalled that as early as 1965 some companies openly acknowledged that it was probably impossible, or at least very difficult, to make blanket restrictions for any particular job or classes of jobs and the EEOC had specifically rejected the use of such stereotypes. In fact in 1965 AT&T conceded in a letter to all operating companies that there was no legitimate reason for excluding women from any inside craft job.⁶⁵

Nevertheless, many companies claimed a male BFOQ for inside craft jobs based on one or another of the reasons listed above.⁶⁶ The EEOC has consistently opposed such BFOQ designations in its decisions. Eleven times since 1967 the Commission has rejected a BFOQ claim for Frameman or Switchman.⁶⁷ In the leading judicial interpretation of BFOQ, the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit rejected Southern Bell's claim of BFOQ for Switchman.⁶⁸ These decisions have been largely ignored.⁶⁹

The injustice of the Bell position was articulated by Southern Bell's only female Switchman in South Carolina in December, 1970.

"I think everybody felt that [women] couldn't do the job because of the way they hold their screwdriver or something. No one wants to be prejudiced and have someone say you can't do it because you're a woman or because you're black or something."⁷⁰

Yet that is precisely what the Bell System has uniformly done since 1965. They have asserted that all or substantially all women could not lift a particular weight or would not stay on the job long enough to justify training or would not be able to work safely in hazardous situations while all males could or would do these things.

Fallacy of the argument. The fallaciousness of this argument is apparent and, indeed, the operating companies have recognized it since 1965. In 1966, Mountain Bell acknowledged that employment decisions could not be made "on the basis of assumptions of the comparative employment characteristics of women in general or stereotyped characteristics of the sexes. . . ."⁷¹ Yet the Company claimed a BFOQ until March, 1971, for all jobs which require the lifting of "substantial weight or equivalent expenditure of energy."⁷²

In February, 1966, a New Jersey Bell memorandum was even more accurate in its interpretation of Title VII:

"Individuals must be considered on the basis of individual capacities and not on the basis of any characteristics generally attributed to a group such as men not being able

to assemble intricate equipment or women not being able to lift heavy weights."⁷³

Despite this realization, New Jersey Bell asserted a BFOQ for outside craft and building and motor vehicle classifications until 1971.

AT&T Vice President William C. Mercer reached an obvious conclusion in January, 1971, when he observed that—

"There are no real differences between women and men, other than those enforced by culture. I can't speak for all of society, but in business—and very importantly to me in the Telephone Company—we believe this to be true."⁷⁴

The effect of BFOQ claims

The Bell System's BFOQ claims over the last five years have been a sham; not only have they been tortured, contrived and contradictory, but they have had no substantial effect on the sex composition of jobs in the operating companies. They have served as a legal rationalization for the exclusionary policies that the Bell System has practiced for a century. Whether a BFOQ was claimed or not, most jobs have remained sex segregated.

A few examples betray the hypocrisy of the Bell System's BFOQ assertions. In 1965 all the operating companies agreed that the Service Representative job did "not require close enough contact to qualify for . . . a BFOQ."⁷⁵ Yet in 1971 this classification remains almost totally female, no more integrated than the Operator classification which the companies staunchly defended as inexorably female.⁷⁶

It makes no difference that a company claimed a BFOQ on the basis of state protective legislation. Mountain Bell, for instance, limited craft jobs in El Paso to males in conformity with state protective laws. Southwestern Bell made no such claim for its San Antonio craft workers. Yet in 1971 only 4% of the Framemen in El Paso were female, and none were female in San Antonio; there were no female Switchmen, Deskmen, or outside craft workers in either SMSA.⁷⁷

Companies that claimed no restrictive state protective laws in their operating areas (Indiana Bell, New Jersey Bell, New York Tel., Northwestern Bell and Southwestern Bell) nevertheless asserted a BFOQ for most craft jobs. State protective laws were a convenient peg on which the companies could hang their continued exclusion. They were not a necessary peg.

New Jersey Bell presents a particularly dramatic case of exclusion without regard to BFOQ claims. In 1965 the Company made three admirable decisions. First, it determined that there were no state protective laws applicable to the Company's female employees.⁷⁸ Second, it recognized that under the law females must be judged on an individual performance basis.⁷⁹ Third, it specifically denied the applicability of the BFOQ exceptions to the classification of Frameman or Switchman.⁸⁰ The Company's action, however, belied its commitments. Of 206 Framemen and 477 Switchmen in Newark in 1971, none were female.⁸¹

Such a pattern is typical of the Bell System. Though New York Tel. abandoned its BFOQ claims for Frameman in 1966, less than 1 percent of their Framemen were female in 1971.⁸² Similarly, Pacific Tel. dropped the legal trappings of its requirement that Framemen be male in 1967,⁸³ but no females were employed until 1969,⁸⁴ and less than 6 percent of all Framemen were female in 1971.⁸⁵ Ohio Bell removed its restrictions on placing females in the job of Framemen in February, 1969.⁸⁶ Two years later, only 2 percent of the Framemen in Cleveland were women.⁸⁷

Finally, although only two companies dared to claim that their Initial Management Development Program (IMDP) should

be exclusively male based on a BFOQ,⁸⁸ all operating companies actually sex segregated their college graduate management training programs until at least 1970.⁸⁹

Since the presence or absence of a BFOQ claim has made little difference in terms of job integration, there was scant cause for rejoicing when all the companies dropped these claims en masse during the first six months of 1970.⁹⁰ As pointed out above, the new position was accepted by most companies under duress, and there was no intention to embark on "affirmative action." "Diligent efforts" were to be made to preserve the sex-segregated status quo. The Bell System's 1965 position with regard to sex discrimination remained essentially unchanged. The companies had been stripped of their legal crutch, but they retained the underpinnings of a sexist system.

Summary

No BFOQ was ever claimed for clerical and Service Representative jobs, but they were still "female" jobs in 1971.

Early and awkward attempts (later abandoned) were made to claim a BFOQ for the Operator's job which remained 99 percent female in 1971.

Some companies claimed a BFOQ for outside sales jobs and some did not. All companies employed almost all males in these jobs in 1971.

Some companies claimed a BFOQ for some craft jobs based on state protective legislation. Some challenged the state laws. Some requested exemptions from the law in some areas but not in others and some restricted women's overtime hours while ostensibly allowing women into craft jobs. Some companies did none of these. In no company, however did women hold any significant number of craft jobs in 1971.

Some companies simply argued, among other things, that women could not lift heavy weights or work in hazardous areas. Whether or not such arguments were made, no company employed female craft workers in substantial numbers.

In sum, whatever the rationalizations might be—whether or not rationalizations were offered at all—there were no real differences among the companies in the sex composition of the jobs in the Bell System. All were just about as segregated in 1971 as they were in 1965.

CHAPTER 4.—THE SEXIST SYSTEM

The previous chapters have graphically demonstrated the extensive sex segregation of the Bell System. Virtually all jobs, from Janitress and Janitor to Saleswoman and Salesman to Chief Operator and Traffic Manager, have a distinctly female or male cast. It is preposterous to think that these distinctions between males and females could have occurred by chance. The disparities are so egregious and the corporate explanations are so feeble and contradictory that the segregation of males and females must be ascribed to a deliberately sexist policy. This chapter will analyze those deliberate policies of recruitment, hiring and promotion which have created and perpetuate this total sex segregation.

Recruitment methods

The Bell System has a staggering need for applicants. Because of the incredible turnover among short term employees (particularly Operators) and because only about one of every ten applicants is deemed suitable for Bell,¹ the applicant flow must exceed two million each year in order to supply the 200,000 new hires needed.² The pressure to recruit from every available source is, therefore, intense.

Bell traditionally maintained dual recruitment systems for females and males and saw no reason to change following the passage of Title VII. In October, 1965, a Bell of Pa. Assistant Vice President said:

Footnotes at end of article.

"For jobs in which males have heretofore been predominant, we will continue to seek males primarily, but we will consider qualified females except where there is a BFOQ. For jobs in which females have heretofore been predominant, we will continue to seek females but qualified males will be considered except where there is a BFOQ."

The same recruitment methods which produced segregation were, according to Bell's reasoning, sufficient even after such segregation was made unlawful. Systemwide, the primary recruitment techniques for nonmanagement employees in 1965 and 1971 were (1) referrals from current employees, (2) formalized high school recruiting and (3) classified advertisements. Within Bell's current employment context, these methods will inevitably produce a sex-segregated applicant flow.

Employee referral. Employee recruitment has for some years been Bell's preferred method of attracting new employees.⁴ The operating companies continually extol their employee recruiting programs, apparently oblivious to its malign effects. In 1969 Bell of Pa. said:

"We put thumbs down on the old 'opposites attract' theory. We're pretty well convinced telephone people take to people like themselves. That's why employee recruiting just has to be the best way to get prospects."

According to an AT&T recruiting manual, "Employees, perhaps unknowingly, do a preliminary screening job because they tend to refer applicants much like themselves."

This method of recruitment has produced a disproportionate share of new hires. In 1971 Pacific Tel. found that—

"We hire one out of every seven employee referred applicants. Of applicants from other sources we hire only about one out of 12. Friends and relatives of employees are often the best qualified applicants and are usually good employees. They know what to expect, and were sold on the Company before they appeared in Employment."

This presumed advantage is the operative factor in its discriminating effect. A Northwestern Bell personnel manual unconsciously identified the sinister nature of employee recruiting:

"Recruiting through employees is one of our best sources of desirable applicants. Our employees are already familiar with many of the advantages of working for our Company. They know something about the various kinds of work and jobs that might be available and they frequently are acquainted with people who can qualify for these jobs and who are interested in working for us."

The implication is only too apparent. Females, traditionally confined to "female" jobs, will have limited familiarity with "male" jobs. They will be unaware of vacancies in craft jobs and will be able to offer no encouragement to their female friends and relatives in this area. This is especially true when, as in the operating companies, employee recruiting is conducted on a departmental basis.⁵ Employee recruiting, the major Bell System recruitment technique, can have only one result. Females will continue to flow into "female" jobs and males into "male" jobs.

High school recruiting. The second major recruitment method is a concentrated effort to attract graduating high school seniors. High school recruitment is particularly appropriate at Bell since almost all nonmanagement jobs require no specific skills. Most of the operating companies, therefore, maintain a close liaison with high school guidance counselors, providing them with films and handbooks describing the jobs available to their students at Bell. Virtually all of these handbooks openly describe "opportunities for young women in the telephone business"¹⁰ or "beginning entry jobs for men."¹¹

Dr. Judith Long Laws, Assistant Professor of Sociology and Psychology at Cornell University, has identified the regular "tendency of high school counselors to counsel women away from 'men's' fields" as one of the major "structural obstacles which a sexist society put in women's way."¹² Bell is certainly a willing accomplice to this obstruction.

Recruiting materials. The most prodigious effort to attract high school students is through a barrage of brochures hawking telephone company jobs. Several years ago an AT&T Assistant Vice President warned each of the operating companies in a corporate position paper of the potential for discrimination in such publication:

"Employment literature should be reviewed to identify content that could be inferred to be in conflict with Title VII. This would include such items as recruiting booklets and other recruiting literature, vocational counselor's handbooks and employment office practices. Appropriate revisions should be made."

Pacific Northwest Bell, in consultation with AT&T officials, further determined that under Title VII employers should not "have limitations or show preference in advertising for applicants," and that, "A picture of a man or woman would be considered a show of preference."

Once again, the Bell companies maintained the status quo despite these warnings of its unlawfulness. In 1971, after ample time to make the needed revisions,¹³ all of the Bell System brochures continue to be blatantly sex segregated.

AT&T can hardly claim that its corporate hands are clean. In April, 1969, they launched a nationwide campaign, including full color ads in women's magazines, to recruit Service Representatives. In a letter to all General Commercial Managers in the operating companies, AT&T Assistant Vice President Lee Tait described the program as follows:

"It provides an excellent vehicle for selling the Service Representative job to young women in today's tight labor market. . . . Many think that the only job opportunities for women in the telephone company are clerical or switchboard operators."

There can be no possible justification for such a disregard of the law. Pamphlets describing Operator,¹⁴ Service Representative¹⁵ and clerical positions¹⁶ openly follow the dictum of a C&P(Va.) personnel manual that recruitment literature should be "fresh, female and applicant-centered."¹⁷ Two major brochures ("The Modern Telephone Operator"¹⁸ and "But She Doesn't Look Like a Telephone Company"), prepared by AT&T and used by every operating company, are illustrative. Both picture only females as Operators and Service Representatives and both use only the feminine gender to describe these employees. "Male" brochures used in 1971 ask, "Do you have jobs for young men?" and answer resoundingly, "Yes. . . ." Of the hundreds of brochures used in the 30 surveyed SMSAs only one or two picture females or males in "opposite sex" jobs.¹⁹ Films, talks and slides used in high school recruitment parrot the same sexist theme.²⁰

Impact of sex-biased advertising. The impact of such biased advertising was demonstrated in a 1971 study conducted by Drs. Sandra and Daryl Bem in Palo Alto, California.²¹ The subject sample consisted of high school seniors, most of whom planned to seek a job upon graduation. They were given a booklet of actual and simulated recruiting advertisements and were asked to indicate their interest in applying for the jobs of Operator, Service Representative, Lineworker and Frameworker in the Bell System.

The results, presented in Chart 9, show the dramatic change for both males and females when the traditional sex designations are eliminated or reversed. Though almost

no females expressed an interest in Operator or Line work while these jobs carried the male stigma, one-fourth of the women would apply for this work when recruited through neutral advertisements. One-half of the surveyed women would seek these traditionally male jobs if the sex designation of the advertisements were reversed. A similarly dramatic pattern occurred for males by simply eliminating the feminine connotations of the Operator and Service Representative advertisements. These findings clearly demonstrate that dual recruitment brochures for males and females create an overwhelming reluctance to seek non-traditional jobs. Such reluctance can, however, be substantially overcome if the sexual biases of the brochures are eliminated or reversed.

Classified advertisements. The third major recruitment technique is classified advertising, used by most companies as a source of last resort since it is not as "selective" as employee or high school recruitment.²² Once again, AT&T realized the potential for discrimination in this form of recruitment and in 1965 advised all of the operating companies that placement of ads in help wanted-male or help wanted-female columns would be an indication of preference for one sex or the other.²³

Such warnings went almost totally unheeded. In May, 1965, Illinois Bell determined that—

"Advertisements for applicants will have to be sufficiently descriptive in the case of Service Representative, Frameman, clerk and certain other jobs for which no BFOQ was claimed if we are not to stimulate a large number of the 'opposite' sex to apply."

In July of that year Illinois Bell formulated the following policy with regard to help wanted advertisements:

"The ads will be inserted under the heading 'Help Wanted-Men' or 'Help Wanted-Females' depending on which sex would generally be most interested. For example, ads for Operators, Stenographers and typists would be classified under 'Help Wanted-Women' as women generally fill these positions. Ads for sales trainees would be classified under 'Help Wanted-Men' as sales people are more commonly thought of as men."

Their circular reasoning apparently was as follows: "Since women are interested only in Operator and clerical jobs, we will attempt to interest only women in these jobs."

Economical, productive alternatives were available and were used by a few companies on a highly selective basis. For instance, Bell of Pa. placed advertisements for Service Consultants under both male and female headings in 1971. They persisted, however, to advertise for Operators and Service Representatives in the help wanted-female column and for craft jobs in the help wanted-male column.²⁴ Such a callous disregard for alternative, nondiscriminatory forms of advertising is unconscionable.

Another study by Drs. Bem and Bem confirms the expected disparate effect of such advertisements. The placement of ads under sex-typed headings is sufficient to dissuade females for applying for male jobs and vice versa.²⁵ Similarly, a Pacific Tel. study in September, 1970, discovered that recruiting for Operators in either the help wanted-male/female column or in both the male and female columns produced an applicant flow that was 50% male and 50% female.²⁶

The conclusion is inescapable. The Bell System has consciously and intentionally sought to segregate its applicant flow through its recruitment techniques. Far from taking affirmative action to reverse the traditional sex composition of jobs (nine companies have made absolutely no changes in their recruitment practices for women since 1965),²⁷ they have become further entrenched in the very techniques which produced the segregation. The operating companies' reliance on employee recruiting, their continued use of recruiting brochures which blatantly sex-type

Footnotes at end of article.

all jobs and the placement of advertisements under segregated classified headings illustrate once again their complete indifference to sex discrimination and their continued defense of the past.

Hiring

Bell's recruitment efforts and its general reputation as a large employer stimulate a steady stream of applicants. The operating companies are, however, highly selective in deciding whom they shall employ, and that process of selection is quite expensive. In 1970 Pacific Tel. hired only one in ten applicants and spent over \$7.5 million in operating its employment offices.⁵⁵

This process, like all others dealing with employment, is designed to funnel males and females into sexually "appropriate" jobs.

In 1966 New Jersey Bell described its employment procedures as follows:

"While many of our jobs have been traditionally filled by one sex or the other, this structure has been due to the unique specialties in our business and not due to conscious effort to discriminate. In the hiring programs, most male employees have been hired for craft work and the prescribed entrance requirements have historically measured the applicant's future potential. Similarly, most female applicants have been measured in terms of stenographic-clerical skills."⁵⁶

This section will show that such distinctions based on sex are the primary consideration in the hiring and placement of applicants in the Bell System. The skills or interests of the applicant are considered only within that framework. Male and female applicants follow a totally different path from the moment they enter the employment office until they are placed in a segregated job. Company disclaimers to the contrary, there is no doubt of the Bell System's conscious effort to discriminate between males and females.

The applicant. Like New Jersey Bell, all the operating companies have explained the disparate distribution of females and males in terms of the different interests of the sexes. In 1970 a New York Tel. Assistant Vice President explained the hiring process as follows:

"Many people walk into our employment offices and say 'I want to be an operator' or 'I want to be a clerk,' or 'I want to be an installer.' We take that into account because we feel if they are coming and asking for a job they would like, and they can do it, they should be considered."⁵⁷

Three factors, however, mitigate against this explanation of disparities in placement. First, Bell has predetermined the job interests of its applicants through its recruiting, as was pointed out in the preceding section. Second, "applicants often apply for any available job and are placed in the job that best meets their qualifications, aspirations and convenience."⁵⁸ In these cases the employment office, not the applicant, determines where she or he will be placed.⁵⁹ Third, the operating companies force all applicants into one of two stereotyped molds. For instance, a 1967 New Jersey Bell personnel guide indicates that, "In most Traffic employment bureaus, it will be taken for granted that the applicant is applying for the position of Operator."⁶⁰ Northwestern Bell mapped the entire career of its female and male applicants as follows:

"Men will probably be interested in outside construction, in skilled inside and outside Plant occupations, truck driving, sales and so forth. Most of them will think in terms of starting long range career employment. Women will probably be interested principally in secretarial, stenographic, receptionist, clerical, switchboard operation or in-plant selling types of work. Starting long range careers will probably be secondary."⁶¹

The type casting of applicants extends to one of their most important job requirements—the salary. A 1971 Southwestern Bell "School Talk" defines the interests of boys and girls as follows:

"Most of our entrance jobs that girls are normally interested in have a starting salary of \$67.50 per week. The ones that boys are normally interested in start at \$78.50 per week."⁶²

The Bell companies have never been overly concerned with the job interests of applicants except when they coincided with their sexual stereotypes. Males seeking Operator's jobs have had to apply repeatedly before they are taken seriously.⁶³ The smoke screen of applicant interest is only a ruse, in the same category as the BFOQ claims for Operator.

Two universes. Until the late 1960's, the employment functions in the operating companies were decentralized. Departments often did their own hiring and set up appropriate hiring offices.⁶⁴ Because of the highly segregated nature of the non-management employment in most departments, these departmental hiring offices soon became dual processing centers limited to women or men. In 1965 all the companies maintained separate hiring offices for women and men, and AT&T advised them that, "It is believed that separate employment offices for men and women could continue to operate for the present, but we cannot depend on this in the future."⁶⁵ Any change in that procedure would, according to Pacific Tel., cause "considerable difficulty."⁶⁶ There was a total unconcern for the difficulty and disadvantage which this policy caused for female and male applicants. Though some companies have converted to centralized employment offices in 1971 many continue to maintain two separate offices for females and males, each hiring for a different category of jobs.⁶⁷

Even in centralized offices, however, the processing of females and males follows divergent paths. In 1965 Pacific Tel. admitted that, "Employment office procedures are truly discriminatory at the present time. Men are tested separately from women and take a completely different battery of tests."⁶⁸ The recognition of this unlawful practice did not, however, stimulate the Company to change. In March, 1969, four years later, the Department of Defense determined that Pacific Tel. had a "present practice" of processing male and female applicants through separate employment channels with separate employment criteria for each.⁶⁹ Pacific Tel. is hardly unique. All of the companies continue routinely to process females and males in radically different ways with sex segregation the final goal.

Employment procedures. Bell's standard employment procedure is outlined in Chart 10. The applicant, either by telephone or in person, is first interviewed in a "gross pre-screen." This brief interview is intended to discourage those persons whose work requirements (salary, location, type of work) are inconsistent with the company's available jobs. No applicant who wishes to proceed, however, is rejected at this stage. The applicant is then given one or more of several batteries of tests based on the interviewer's evaluation of her or his interests and experience. If the test is completed successfully, a detailed application is filled out and an intensive interview is conducted. If the applicant's abilities and interests (as determined by the tests and the interview) "match" the company's job opening and the applicant passes security, reference and physical checks, a job is offered.⁷⁰ Each of these stages may be defined in terms of gender and each contributes to the funneling of females and males into different jobs.

First, as a concomitant to segregated employment offices, the Bell System has traditionally maintained segregated interviewers, females interviewing female applicants for Operator, Service Representative and clerical

jobs and males interviewing applicants for craft and management positions. Six years after the effective date of Title VII, many companies continue this practice *in toto*.⁷¹ Almost all continue to segregate management and non-management interviewers.⁷²

Testing procedures. Second, although male and female applicants are indistinguishable in terms of age, education and experience,⁷³ there are dual criteria for judging the sexes, beginning with the tests they are given. Sex is, without doubt, the most important criteria for determining which test will be administered to the applicant. The Operator, clerical and Service Representative test batteries are consistently referred to by Bell officials as the "female test battery,"⁷⁴ and the craft tests are similarly referred to as the "male test battery."⁷⁵ This testing practice creates two separate universes, thus fore-ordaining the sexes' disparate careers.

The dual employment criteria then proliferate. Females are asked about their child care arrangements (even though Bell's own studies indicate that turnover for females with children is not substantially different from those without children),⁷⁶ their plans for marriage,⁷⁷ their families' attitude toward their work,⁷⁸ their husbands' permanency,⁷⁹ and whether they are pregnant.⁸⁰ Females may also be in the subject of a "home visit" to acquaint the parents or family with the requirements of the job and determine the applicant's employability.⁸¹

Males, on the other hand, are required to meet an entirely different set of standards. They must have a valid driver's license and a good driving record,⁸² must have the physical ability and willingness to do craft work,⁸³ and must pass a security clearance,⁸⁴ none of which are required of females. Further, while female college graduates are recruited and employed in non-management position,⁸⁵ there has been, at least through 1970, a "well-known" Bell System policy of not hiring male college graduates into non-management jobs.⁸⁶

A particularly incisive example of dual hiring criteria is found in the high school reference check forms used by New England Tel. in 1971. The form for females (headed "Miss") asks for grades in English, math, bookkeeping, typing, stenography, business machines and art.⁸⁷ The comparable form for males (headed "Mr.") asks for the applicant's grades in English, algebra, plane geometry, solid geometry, trigonometry, physics, mechanical drawing, shop courses and languages.⁸⁸ Once more, individuality is smothered by Bell's sex stereotypes.

"Neutral" criteria. In addition to these openly disparate hiring criteria, Bell uses "neutral" criteria which have a disadvantageous effect on females. At least one company, until 1971, disqualified the parents of illegitimate children from employment. But since the brunt of the responsibility for these children falls on the mother, women are, in practice, the only ones affected by such a rule.⁸⁹

Another such "neutral" standard is the minimum height requirement set by most operating companies for craft jobs.⁹⁰ The companies have never demonstrated, however, that such requirements are compelled by business necessity. Quite to the contrary, their internal contradictions cast doubt on the relevancy of these standards. For instance, the minimum height for Framemen in Michigan Bell and South Central Bell, where there are substantial numbers of females, is 5'3" and 5'2", respectively.⁹¹ In Southwestern Bell, however, the minimum height for Framemen is 5'6".⁹² The disparate impact of this standard is obvious; many more males fall within the required range than females.

This dual hiring system, characterized by sexually disparate criteria and by neutral criteria with a disparate effect, when superimposed upon Bell's segregated recruitment

techniques, assures the creation of two distinct universes. The brave souls who can resist the pressures to conform to this monolithic system are rare. Most either succumb to the stereotype or (like a male applicant for Operator in Birmingham who was refused consideration)⁷³ they rebel and are thus rejected. The effect of the dual hiring procedures has been amply demonstrated throughout this report. Placement in segregated jobs is assured by funneling applicants through separate employment offices, through segregated interviewers and by applying disparate hiring standards. The system is designed to assimilate only those who are willing to accept the Bell stereotype of their sex; all others are marked as rejects for their audacity to be individuals.

Promotion

The Bell System has always boasted that it is an "up from the ranks" company. "An Introduction to the Bell System," prepared by AT&T, explains this policy as follows:

"Bell System policy is quite clear in this respect: promotions are made almost entirely from within the System, and all promotions are on the basis of merit. In the Bell System it is possible for any person, no matter how humble his starting position, to rise to any position within the System, provided only that his performance justifies it. Because of this, the Bell System has been called a 'pure meritocracy.'"⁷⁴

One of the primary selling points for telephone company employment has been its career opportunities. A new employee adopted into the Bell family is, according to their recruitment literature, expected to stay with the Company until retirement and progress through the ranks of non-management and into management. Regrettably, this expectation is a myth for women. The "pure meritocracy" applies only to the privileged male class.

The most realistic expectation for women is a career that begins and ends in the Operator job. Women with 20, 30 or even 50 years of Bell System service are often still in the entry-level position of Operator.⁷⁵ A Southwestern Bell study of turnover observed that, "In the minds of most Operators, chances for advancement are remote."⁷⁶

A large portion of the blame for the intolerable turnover among Operators and other female employees must be laid to the absence of promotional opportunities. In June, 1970, New England Tel.'s General Operations Supervisor described the following casual relationship between turnover and promotional opportunities.

Each year all departments lose a large number of people either because they are attracted by higher wages offered in other companies or they see no opportunity for advancement in their present position. This is particularly true of clerical personnel as well as other initial assignments such as Telephone Operator. We are sure many of these people could be retained in the Company if they had some indication that there would be a definite opportunity for progress sometime in the future.⁷⁷

His solution to this problem is, however, untenable. He suggested that female Operators and clericals be allowed to transfer to Service Representative, "the highest paying non-management position [for women] in the Company."⁷⁸ This simply ameliorates the problem by transferring it from one female job to another. Dissatisfaction with promotional opportunities is almost as intense among Service Representatives as among Operators.

A 1970 turnover study conducted by C&P (D.C.) indicated that 69% of all terminating Service Representatives were not satisfied with their chances for promotion. Typical

comments were, "There is no real chance for advancement in the Company;" "I would not have terminated my employment with the Company if I felt I would have advanced within a year;" "I was impressed with the fact that women are discriminated against."⁷⁹

Structural obstacles. The concentration of females in the lowest job categories confirms their lack of promotional opportunities. There are five basic obstacles to females' progress in Bell's promotion system: (1) obscure, informal procedures, (2) sex-segregated lines of progression, (3) departmental seniority, (4) restricted transfer to entry-level jobs and (5) unreachable standards for promotion to "male" jobs.

The procedures for obtaining promotion in most Bell companies are a mystery to both females and males.⁸⁰ For females, however, the right to transfer to a "male" job is a closely guarded secret to which only male supervisors are privy.⁸¹ In 1966 the C&P companies agreed to consider women for framework but attached the following proviso:

It is not intended that employees will be encouraged to request such reassignments or that publicity will be given to the fact that such employee requests will be accepted or encouraged.⁸²

A female Southern Bell Frameman said in June, 1970, that, "The kind of woman who usually applies for the [Frame] job is one who has worked with the Company for many years and so knows its ways."⁸³

One of the prime factors frustrating women's complete knowledge of and involvement in the promotion process is the almost total absence of bidding systems common in other industries. Only two companies, Southern Bell and South Central Bell, have bidding procedures.⁸⁴ In the other companies an employee may request a promotion, either formally or informally, and may be considered if a vacancy should occur.⁸⁵ Employees are not formally informed of vacancies or of the disposition of their promotion requests.⁸⁶ Females, often confined to an isolated work area, would have little opportunity to learn of craft vacancies in such a disjointed system.

It is a cruel irony that when the companies began to "allow" women to enter higher-paying jobs, the route of those jobs continued to be an enigma.

Segregated lines of progression. The second major barrier to female promotion is the segregation of lines of progression. The operating companies uniformly contend that there are no fixed promotion ladders in the sense that one job is an absolute prerequisite for another.⁸⁷ The companies' practice of training for all jobs following a promotion makes it unnecessary to have had work experience in a specific area prior to assignment to the job.⁸⁸ Company job descriptions, personnel manuals and recruitment brochures do, however, describe lines of progression in non-management jobs. These are inevitably sex-segregated. Charts 11 and 12 show the basic progression in the female and male lines, respectively. Although promotions often occur between departments, only in abnormal cases do promotions occur between "male" and "female" jobs.

A particularly apt example of promotion channels based on sex occurs at Michigan Bell. As indicated in Chapter 2, the Switchroom Helper's job (Frameman in other companies) is an all-female craft job in Michigan. As outlined in Chart 12, the normal promotion for Frameman or Switchroom Helper would be to Installer-Repairman, Lineman or Switchman. In Michigan Bell, however, the normal progression for female Switchroom Helpers is gerrymandered to require promotion to Installation Order Clerk, a clerical job with a top rate of slightly less than Switchroom Helper.⁸⁹ One's career is virtually predestined by the line of progression into which she or he is hired.

Seniority. The third structural impediment

ment to females' promotion involves the application of contractual seniority provisions. In no company is seniority the dominant factor in determining who shall be promoted. The typical collective bargaining agreement provides that seniority shall be applicable only when two or more employees being considered are equally qualified as determined by the company.⁹⁰ This relatively weak seniority standard gives the company almost unrestricted latitude in filling vacancies.⁹¹

The definition of seniority varies from company to company, but the most common definition is "net credited Bell System service" or the total amount of time employed within the Bell System.⁹² In eight companies (Illinois Bell, Indiana Bell, Michigan Bell, New England Tel., New Jersey Bell, Ohio Bell, Pacific Tel. and Southwestern Bell), however, the application of seniority is on a departmental basis or employees within a department are given preferential consideration over all other applicants.⁹³ Such a preference, imposed upon a structure of segregated departments, becomes a very substantial obstacle to females' progression.

For instance, should a female Operator, realizing the paucity of promotional potential in the Traffic Department, seek a craft job, she will be at a substantial competitive disadvantage with all Plant Department employees—the vast majority of whom are male. Females in Traffic may be considered for promotion only when there are no qualified persons within the Plant Department seeking the job.

The operating companies were not unaware of the discriminatory effect of such a departmental seniority system. In October, 1968, Illinois Bell's Legal Department determined that: Seniority groups set out in the contract . . . would be considered to be discriminatory since they establish separate groups for those wage groups which have been traditionally male jobs and those which have been female jobs. Therefore, if a Wage Group 14 [female] employee requests or is being considered for promotion, segregated seniority groupings should not have a bearing on the decision.⁹⁴

Their analysis of the law was totally accurate, but their ingrained prejudices brushed the law aside. In 1971 they stated unabashedly that "seniority within the department takes precedence over seniority from another department."⁹⁵

Such a system of departmental preferences perpetuates and intensifies the disadvantage suffered by females when they were hired. They are effectively locked into the lowest paying jobs and prevented from competing on an equal basis with males.

Hiring v. transfer. A fourth structural impediment of the upward mobility of females has been the operating companies' predilection for filling entry craft jobs with new hires rather than lower-level employees wishing to transfer. Such promotions are quite attractive to females since virtually all male jobs pay more than virtually all female jobs. Yet until late 1970 all of the companies routinely preferred new hires over applicants for transfer.⁹⁶ Southwestern Bell's callous position in 1967 was that, "The Company has the right to hire new employees into the Frameman title no matter how many employees already on the payroll want the job."⁹⁷

The justifications for this policy were twofold. First, the operating companies had a consuming desire to maintain entry-level craft jobs as stepping stones to higher non-management and management positions.⁹⁸ But because of Bell policies, women would not or could not be promoted out of entry craft jobs and would, therefore, create a bottleneck. Second, Bell reasoned that training costs would be doubled if females were allowed to transfer to entry crafts since both a new craftworker and a new Operator/clerical would have to be trained.⁹⁹ Accord-

Footnotes at end of article.

ing to this reasoning, a female would be forever indentured to her entry job, a slave to Bell's stereotypes.

Although all companies retain the unfettered right to hire into entry level, and all continue to fill most entry vacancies with new hires, most companies have now made paper provisions for equal consideration of employees wishing to transfer.¹⁰² Even this policy, if adhered to, gives the employee no credit for general experience with the company. It is a grim paradox that women who have proved their worth to the company over many years are treated as fledglings.

Promotion standards. The standards by which transfer applicants are judged present a fifth impediment to female promotion. Three general qualifications are paramount: (1) successful completion of the craft ("male") test battery, (2) craft experience and (3) satisfactory or above average performance in one's present job.

Bell's strict segregation of males and females at the time of pre-employment testing has a profound effect on their careers. The point was made quite graphically in a 1965 arbitration award involving New Jersey Bell:

Succinctly, the pre-employment tests created two universes; the test given to females resulted in their being thereafter restricted from consideration for promotion to the universe of "male" jobs; even if they can qualify for a particular job in the male universe, they cannot be considered because their pre-employment test did not test their overall capabilities for all the vocational jobs.¹⁰³

With only two exceptions, females are consistently required to meet the same craft test standard as male craft hires.¹⁰⁴ These exceptions, however, illustrate the fallacy of the entire requirement. First, Michigan Bell has for 20 years evaluated Switchroom Helpers (Framemen) on the basis of the "female" clerical test battery.¹⁰⁵ The "necessary requirement" that females be measured in terms of craft aptitude seems to have been quite unnecessary in that instance. The second exception occurred in 1968 at Illinois Bell. After using females in Frame work during a Plant strike, Illinois Bell magnanimously decreed that those females would not be required to take the craft test battery to continue work on that job.¹⁰⁶ Apparently, in such a service emergency the companies can choose qualified females for promotion without testing them. Further, C&P (D.C.) has allowed females to transfer between "female" jobs without meeting pre-employment test standards in recognition of the "value of previous experience and background."¹⁰⁷ No company, however, has allowed such credit for females who move to craft jobs.

The disparity of this policy is particularly acute for females with long telephone company service. In many cases, their male contemporaries were hired into the crafts before the institution of the present tests and, therefore, have never been required to pass the current pre-employment tests battery.¹⁰⁸ Now, females who were excluded from the crafts at the time of their hire must hurdle an obstacle never placed before their male counterparts.

Prior experience. A second necessary requirement for promotion to certain craft jobs (Switchman, Deskman and others) is experience in a prior craft job.¹⁰⁹ (A similar requirement of outside sales experience is made in some companies for promotion to higher outside sales jobs.)¹¹⁰ This requirement is a classic example of "Catch 22"—females may not enter craft jobs because they have no craft experience, and they may not get craft experience because they are excluded from the crafts! In October, 1968, Illinois Bell indicated that its Legal Department . . . does not know of any ground on

which we can make satisfactory job performance on another craft job an absolute prerequisite for promotion to Plant Assigner or any job to which an employee might request transfer or promotion.¹¹¹

Far from adopting this position, most companies continued to require craft experience. Southern Bell presents the most extreme example. In 1971 the Company indicated that "knowledge of the proposed job" was a major criterion in selecting an employee to fill a vacancy. Such knowledge, according to the Company, is generally acquired as a result of formal training or performing in the job on a relief basis.¹¹² Yet since 1965 Southern Bell has refused to allow female Framemen to relieve as Switchmen even though this is a normal practice for males.¹¹³ The Bell Companies have asked women to meet a standard which is absolutely impossible for them to attain.

The third standard for promotion which operates to eliminate females is the universal requirement that an employee have satisfactory or above-average performance on her or his present job.¹¹⁴ Such a policy has an adverse effect on females in at least two ways. First, by requiring "above average" performance on the present job, half of the all females are automatically disqualified from consideration, regardless of their ability relative to males.

Second, and much more importantly, the nature of the jobs to which females are confined reduces the probability of their satisfactory performance. Dr. Laws explains the effects of discrimination on females' motivation in terms of "Expectancy-Value theory."

Under this model we can see that an individual can desire a goal greatly, but if she does not believe that she has a good chance of attaining it, her effort will be small.¹¹⁵

Applying this model to the Bell System, she has concluded that, "the overall effect would be to depress the work motivation of Bell's women employees."¹¹⁶

It is completely consistent with the above model to assume that Operators, Service Representatives and clerks, whose expectation for promotion is slim, would be less interested in maintaining a high level of performance and, therefore, may be deemed "unsatisfactory" by their supervisors. Further, the extreme regimentation of the Operator's job, "beyond all proportion within the System,"¹¹⁷ may contribute blots to her record that would not affect her performance in a craft job. Promotion to a more invigorating environment where initiative and ability are rewarded rather than suppressed may cause a flowering which would go unrecognized in the oppressive Traffic Department. By requiring satisfactory performance in dissatisfying jobs to qualify for promotion, the Bell System is undoubtedly losing a significant wealth of talented women.

The Bell companies have been oblivious to the structural difficulties inherent in their system which prohibit females' promotions. They have instead explained females' failure to be promoted with the stale argument that women just don't want craft jobs.¹¹⁸ This is simply not true.¹¹⁹ Given the same opportunities as men, women seek the same jobs for basically the same reasons—better pay and more interesting work.¹²⁰ Most often, however, a woman's interest in a male job is frustrated or ignored by her male supervisor.

The grotesque exaggeration of the arduous duties associated with craft jobs has undoubtedly slaked feminine interest. A C&P (W.Va.) supervisor explained the Frameman's job to female clerks as follows:

Girls, if you are serious about the Frame job, if you have examined the job requirements and are willing to climb around platforms and ladders, if you realize you are going to have rough hands with short or broken fingernails, if you think you can handle the

tools and keep them in proper condition and do everything a man can do and in the same amount—then the company is willing to consider your request.¹²¹

Surely this is not the same explanation given by Michigan Bell where all Frameworkers are female:

Arbitrator's awards in 1966 and 1967 rejected Southwestern Bell's similarly hackneyed contentions of arduousness for the Plant Assigner and Framemen jobs as "completely without merit," "not supported by any evidence whatever," and a "relatively minor part of the jobs."¹²² Bell's distorted descriptions of craft jobs have been further rebutted by the experience of females.¹²³ They nevertheless serve as a significant discouragement to women seeking advancement.

Absence of role models. An additional factor which minimizes feminine interest in male jobs is the absence of role models in these jobs. Women (and men) are often quite reluctant to be the first pioneer in a new field. A Pacific Tel. Frameman said, "I knew there were several Framewomen so the idea of being the only girl didn't concern me."¹²⁴ That concern, unfortunately, is quite real in most of the operating companies.

It is not at all surprising that few women have been willing to take on the entire male hierarchy of the Bell System. Most women who have advanced to "male" jobs have done so only after a lengthy struggle. Lorena Weeks, just such a woman, encountered all the might of Southern Bell when she bid on a Switchman's vacancy in March, 1966. It was to be five years before she would be awarded the job. Her story epitomizes women's collective struggle for promotion:

In March, 1966, a job was put up for bid for Switchman in the Louisville and Wadley exchanges. Since a Switchman's work is inside and involved equipment, some of which I had become familiar with as a telephone operator, I decided to bid on the job. . . . My bid for the Switchman's job in Wadley was returned. The only reason the Company gave for not letting me have the job was that I am a woman. The job went to the only other bidder, a man with less seniority than me.¹²⁵

Ms. Weeks then took her case to court and finally, in November, 1970, Southern Bell was ordered to place her on the Job of Switchman.

Every day I thought the Company would tell me to report for work in Wadley. Time drug on all through Christmas and the Holidays. Each day I hoped to be placed on my new job. Nothing happened—finally my attorney was able to get another hearing before Judge Bell in March, 1971. I told him how pressed we were for funds to keep our now three children in college . . . He told me that before I left his chambers that day that he would issue an order and put me on the job the next day. He did and I went to work on March 3, 1971. . . .

I am enjoying my work and am happier than I have ever been since working with the Telephone Company.

During the time I was waiting for a final decision I was criticized by both males and females. They seemed to think I was trying to take something from "the breadwinner" while I was only trying to prove that all men aren't breadwinners and that a loaf of bread costs a woman as much as it does a man.¹²⁶

It is little wonder that many women are discouraged from seeking "male" jobs by such examples.

Wage treatment. The disadvantage accorded to females in the promotion process does not end once she receives the promotion. The computation of wages following the promotion has the effect of perpetuating the inequities attributable to her sex. In April, 1965, Pacific Tel. determined that its union contracts might be in conflict with Title VII because . . . the rules governing computation of wage rates when changing wage schedules vary between men and women.

Length of service is used for men and whereas amount of money is used for women.¹²⁷

Despite this realization, Pacific Tel. negotiated a "Wage Administrative Practice" in 1968 (and revised in 1970) which continues the same distinctions.¹²⁸ An example from the Pacific Tel. collective bargaining agreement in effect on January 1, 1971,¹²⁹ is illustrative of the wage treatment procedures in all the companies following promotion.¹³⁰ (See Chart 13.) A male with 72 months service as a Frameman who is promoted to Station Installer will receive an increase from \$152.50 per week to \$156.50 per week. Should a female Operator with identical service be promoted to the same job and perform the same duties, her new wage will be only \$124.00. Her wage, relative to the male Framemen with whom she was hired, has increased only slightly.

This same disparity continues through a hypothetical promotion to PBX Installer after 18 months. In this example, it will take the female four and one-half years to achieve parity with her male counterpart, and during that time she will have lost \$6500 when compared to a male in the same classification and with the same company seniority.

This issue was treated in a 1967 arbitration award involving Southwestern Bell. The subject was broached following an Arbitrator's order to place a female clerk in a Plant craft job with appropriate back pay. The union subsequently grieved when the female was paid at a rate of only \$95.50 per week rather than the \$136.00 per week paid to her male predecessor. The Arbitrator held as follows:

The Company, in calculating the back pay for Bernita Brock, has not complied with the existing award in this case. It should accept the award as determining that women in the situation of [clerks promoted to craft jobs] are qualified for the positions the Arbitrators awarded them. Miss Brock's wage rate should be calculated on that basis.¹³¹

This final inequity typifies the Bell's System's utter recalcitrance in promoting women through the non-management ranks. Their skills and ambitions are denigrated; avenues of promotion, when open to all, remain a secret; dual lines of progression, restrictive seniority systems and unreachable standards continue to prohibit females' promotion. As a final insult, the woman who achieves a higher position is paid less than comparably situated men in her job. In light of this closed promotional system, one is amazed that all Bell's women employees do not become turnover statistics.

Maternity Leave

The sexist, paternalistic attitudes of the Bell System extend beyond the recruitment, hiring and promotion of female employees. Rules and regulations regarding maternity further restrict women's employment opportunities in three ways: (1) requirements that mothers-to-be take a leave of absence at a particular time, (2) suspension of benefits normally given for other sickness disabilities and (3) failure to provide equitable reemployment guarantees.

Timing of leave. In 1971, eight companies (Indiana Bell, Michigan Bell, New England Tel., New Jersey Bell, Northwestern Bell, Ohio Bell, South Central Bell and Southern Bell) continued to require pregnant females either to resign or take leave of absence at the end of the sixth or seventh month.¹³² Not only is such a policy contrary to the medical requirement considered to be appropriate by leading gynecologists,¹³³ but it is, according to Pacific Tel., detrimental to the company's interests:

From the Company's standpoint, it is important that there be no arbitrary rule requiring pregnant employees to leave their job at a specified time in the pregnancy period. Such a rule would be detrimental to the

Company's interests in failing to utilize the services of experienced employees for as long as they meet the requirements of the job. Such a rule would also be detrimental to the employee's interest since it would not permit consideration of individual desires or economic needs. . . .¹³⁴

Just as in all other matters dealing with employment, the employee must be treated as an individual, not as a member of a stereotyped racial, ethnic or sexual class. The timing of maternity leave should be contingent on the ability of the woman to do the job safely and not on the presuppositions of Bell's pseudo-physician managers.

Two other limitations on maternity leaves restrict females' employment. First, four companies (Mountain Bell, New England Tel., New Jersey Bell and Northwestern Bell) limit maternity leave to married females.¹³⁵ Second, New Jersey Bell and Pacific Tel. require females to have at least nine months service before they may take maternity leave.¹³⁶

Suspension of benefits. The second major disadvantage accruing to females because of maternity is the suspension of benefits which are given during other sickness disabilities. Maternity leave is treated as a special leave, granted through the companies' largess, and not as an employee right. Thus, privileges granted during sickness are suspended during maternity leave.¹³⁷

Reemployment. The third disadvantage occurs at the end of maternity leave. Only Mountain Bell and South Central Bell confer guaranteed reemployment rights to a female taking leave.¹³⁸ All other companies provide for reemployment only when there is a vacancy suitable to the employee's abilities.¹³⁹ In New York the returning mother loses all promotions she may have earned prior to her pregnancy.

Operating employees will not be returned to duty [following maternity leave] as other than an Operator thus losing any other title held at the time the leave is granted. . . . Non-overtime employees will be returned to duty (provided there is work available) in the lowest clerical grade available in the unit.¹⁴⁰

No other class of employees suffering a sickness disability is treated in such a manner. In all other instances the employee is welcomed back with no diminution of rights or benefits. As usual, only women are treated differently.

Summary

In order to maintain the sex segregation of the jobs throughout the System, the Bell companies use a variety of techniques that extend through the entire gamut of recruitment, hiring and promotion procedures.

Recruitment is largely through employee referral, high school presentations, and various forms of advertising. In all cases, the designation of each job as "male" or "female" is actively encouraged.

In the hiring process, from the time a potential application makes the first contact with the company until she or he is finally hired or rejected, one is treated in entirely different ways depending on the sex of the applicant. This dual processing includes different interviewers, different interview questions, different test batteries, and the use of different hiring criteria.

Promotion from "female" jobs to "male" jobs or vice versa is severely inhibited by a number of obstacles including the deliberate obfuscation of opportunities and procedures, the maintenance of sex-segregated lines of progression, departmental seniority (which is tantamount to sex-group seniority), provisions restricting transfers, and unreachable promotion standards.

Arguments about female "job interest" or "arduousness" have been shown to be meritless.

The lack of appropriate role models and

inequitable wage treatment following promotion discourage females' transfer to "male" jobs.

Unreasonable and discriminatory maternity leave provisions further restrict the opportunities of female employees.

The Bell System was perfectly aware that recruitment brochures picturing only females were unlawful, that segregated employment offices would deny females access to craft jobs and that departmental seniority had a disparate impact on women. But the overriding consideration was to prevent female "contamination" of "male" jobs.

The "pure meritocracy" claimed by Bell exists only for males. For females, competition and its rewards are limited to the feminine sphere. While telephone employment can be a rewarding vocation for men, it can be no more than a way station for women, a mockery of their career aspirations.

CHAPTER 5.—WOMEN IN MANAGEMENT

The achievement of management status and subsequent progression through management ranks has been a traditional index of success. At Bell, where one of every four employees is "management," this goal ought to be quite realistic. As one would expect, however, the participation of women is restricted to certain familiar roles—staff functions and the supervision of other women.¹ The same conclusions reached regarding women in non-management positions must be extended to management. Women are in the lowest paying, least desirable, "terminal" management positions.

Although one-third of all managers in the Bell System are females, the vast majority of them (94%) are in the lowest level of the managerial ranks. For male managers, half of whom are second level or above, the beginning management jobs are only stepping stones to better positions with greater responsibility. For women, the initial and ultimate positions are identical. This chapter will analyze the two methods for entrance into management—promotion from non-management and hiring into management training programs—and their relationships to progression within management.

Entrance into management: Up from the ranks

From its infancy Bell has adopted a policy of training and grooming its best non-management employees for supervisory positions.² Through the first century of Bell's operation, the large majority of first line supervisors began as Installers, Linemen, Framemen or Operators, and many went on to more responsible positions in the operating companies. In a very real sense, the first level management at Bell is an extension of the non-management lines of progression discussed in Chapter 4. As was also noted in Chapter 2, the probability for promotion into management in the "female" Traffic Department is substantially less than in the "male" Plant Department.

Like the non-management promotion ladders, the management progression is rigidly sex segregated. (See Charts 14 and 15.) Men in the Plant Department move into Foreman jobs relating to their particular skills while women Operators and clericals move into "female" supervisory positions in the Traffic, Accounting and Commercial Departments. The rigid differentiation between the sexes at the non-management level leads inexorably to the same type of segregation at the first level of management.

The primary justification for this situation rests on the assumption that the supervisor must have had experience in the job being supervised. This tenet was so firmly fixed that in 1965 several operating companies claimed a BFOQ for male and female supervisory jobs.³ Pacific Tel.'s reasoning was typical:

"It would be very difficult for a woman to qualify for many of [the supervisory craft

Footnotes at end of article.

jobs] because she is restricted from doing craft work supervised by a given title."*

Such a view was still held in 1970 according to AT&T's study of women management.

"There are many management jobs not presently available to women. This is particularly true at lower levels of management where job related experience is overemphasized at the expense of management skills."

As long ago as 1959, however, AT&T had recognized the fact that new male managers could acquire sufficient craft knowledge without having actual craft experience.⁸ Certainly Bell has never required its Traffic Managers (all males) to have experience as Operators. The superfluous requirement of craft experience for Plant Department supervision is a subterfuge for the exclusion of women.

In addition to the segregated routes into management for each sex, females have been evaluated, until very recently, on a different basis than men for promotion to management. All companies have maintained a formal Management Assessment Program which was limited to men until the late 1960's.⁹ Females were evaluated informally for promotion within their own area while males were formally considered for promotions to a wide spectrum of management jobs. Yet, when women began to be evaluated through the same formal channels as men, they continued to be segregated. In October, 1970, Mountain Bell indicated that its "Personnel Review Program" was now open to women, but females and males would continue to be segregated: "The reasoning behind this is that men and women are generally not considered for the same first level assignments."¹⁰

The pattern is quite clear. Women enter management with relative ease, but they are confined to the lowest category of jobs within that group. By the companies' own admission, such segregation is not required by business reasons. It is, rather, based on the segregation of the pool of non-management jobs from which managers are drawn, the erroneous belief that females must have craft experience to supervise in that field, and the failure to assess females on the same basis as males.

Entrance into management: College recruiting

In the last decade AT&T has come to rely on college graduates for a large portion of its entering managers,¹¹ particularly those that are expected to progress to the upper levels of management. Specific training programs have been designed for these managers, and they are inevitably sex segregated.

The most ambitious program is the Initial Management Development Program (IMDP). This program was developed in the early 1960's after AT&T realized that—

"Most college recruits were not put on assignments which challenged them or which allowed the companies to evaluate their potential. The expectations and goals of new college hires declined during their early years with the Company. This was especially true of those on restricted jobs and unsatisfying training programs."¹²

The IMDP was designed, therefore, to provide immediate supervisory experience to the outstanding college graduate. He (never she) was hired with the understanding that continued employment after the first year was conditioned on his performance. If, after one year, he did not evidence the potential to progress to District level (third level) within five years, his employment would be terminated.¹³

This high risk/high gain program was, as one would expect, limited to men. AT&T Assistant Vice President William C. Mercer defined the Company's position unequivocally in a 1965 letter to the operating companies.

"It is felt that entrance into our initial management training program should continue to be limited to male college graduates. Such graduates are employed with the expectation of their reaching the district level and for those who survive the training which is extensive, coverage on a career basis is presumed. Because of the increased likelihood of career interruption of women, as compared to men, and the consequent additional expense involved, the assignment of college women to such a program upon employment would not appear to be justified."¹⁴

The spuriousness of this argument was amply demonstrated by AT&T's 1970 study of women in management.

"Turnover data for both men and women college graduates hired directly into management . . . seems quite similar. In view of the limited progress afforded to the female college graduate and the nature of her early assignments as compared to men, one would expect a higher turnover ratio. The fact that it is almost comparable to men indicates a staying power that should be tapped."¹⁵

In spite of this fact, all the companies adopted the American Company view and proceeded to limit their recruitment for this program to males.¹⁶

Although Bell would not consider women for its most ambitious management program, they were willing, according to Assistant Vice President Mercer, to consider them for lesser programs.

"College women should continue to be employed in training programs with lesser occupational objectives, where the training program is shorter and where the requirement for career coverage is not so acute."¹⁷

Thus, parallel "women's IMDP" programs were established, and women were actively recruited.¹⁸ The experience of the Assistant Placement Director at Simmons College for women in Boston is undoubtedly typical of Bell's segregated college recruiting.

"The following facts about New England Telephone Company's recruiting program at Simmons College are evident: (1) Simmons women are not informed about the management training program. . . . (2) The [recruiting] literature is geared to women only. (3) In the literature describing positions available to college women, promotional opportunities are not discussed in broad terms. (4) Based on reports of positions accepted by Simmons graduates, New England Telephone has not employed women for positions which lead into management."¹⁹

There was no question that the women employed in these "lesser" programs were as well qualified according to Bell standards as their male counterparts. A study of the SCAT test scores for male and female college graduates in Pacific Tel. indicated no differences.²⁰ Scholastic and motivational qualities are also equal according to Pacific Tel.

"There have been past instances where females have had the same basic qualifications required for MAP [IMDP] but were hired as non-CEP [College Employment Program] at lower starting salary rates. These people were placed in job assignments similar to MAP people."²¹

The lesser program may have pacified the conscience of Bell managers, but it was no favor to college women. They were treated as second class employees, paid less and challenged less, solely because of their sex.

Women entering management are faced with the same types of discrimination that face nonmanagement women. They are recruited differently, trained differently and paid differently. Again, sex, not ability or motivation, is the determining factor.

Promotion within management

Females have been promoted into management in relatively large numbers; they have not moved up within management, however. AT&T's task force on women in management observed that,

"Promotional opportunities beyond first level [management] are not equal for men and women despite the fact that there are essentially the same number of male and female first level managers. For example, the chance that a given male first level manager will reach district level sometime in his career (all other things being equal) is about one in four or five. For an incumbent female first level manager, the odds become less than one in 300."²²

The fact of females' exclusion from management above second level is irrefutable. The primary question is "Why?" Three factors prevent females from taking positions of greater leadership: (1) the types of assignments given to women and men in first level management, (2) the lack of role models for women in upper level management and (3) male stereotypes of the female's role in management.

As pointed out in the previous section, women managers are heavily concentrated in the Traffic, Commercial and Accounting Departments, and they usually hold staff positions or supervise female clericals. This limitation has two major consequences. First, because these female jobs offer no challenge to the ambitious female and because promotions are quite slow,²³ their performance is often below capacity. An employee tends to produce what the company expects.²⁴ A 1965 Bell System study of male managers found that,

"Young managers who are given highly challenging jobs in the early stages of their careers will tend to internalize high standards of performance and positive job attitudes. The result will be a relatively high level of performance in subsequent years. . . . Young managers who are not challenged at the early stages of their careers will be severely handicapped inasmuch as the lower performance standards they internalize will tend to persist even if they are placed in more challenging jobs later in their careers."²⁵

The stodgy atmosphere of the Traffic and Commercial Department is precisely the kind of handicapping experience described. Few talented women will be able to survive this misuse of their abilities.²⁶

Dr. Laws has also analyzed Bell's employment of women in management in terms of work motivation theory and concludes as follows:

"It is no exaggeration to say that for the female employee, Bell is an integrated system of negative incentives for work performance and satisfaction. The forms of sex discrimination practiced at Bell correspond almost perfectly with the categories of predictors of work performance. In terms of selection and placement, rate of compensation, and promotion possibilities, women encounter systematic discrimination which is clearly linked to their sex. Any one of these features of the employment situation is capable of feeding back upon motivation in a destructive way."²⁷

Another impediment resulting from the initial management assignment is structural rather than attitudinal. AT&T's task force on women indicated that, "Opportunity factors clearly favor the talented male manager at the expense of the talented female manager."²⁸ The two "essential opportunity factors" which are denied to women are (1) special schools or training programs and (2) rotational assignments. According to this 1970 study, "most management jobs filled by women are viewed as terminal hire or staff assignments."²⁹

Men readily transfer between management jobs in the several operating departments, gaining experience which will be valuable in higher assignments. Women are confined to single departments, often in a staff role. They are definitely outside the mainstream of management at Bell.³⁰

The second factor preventing women from

Footnotes at end of article.

attaining positions of greater leadership is the lack of viable role models. Very simply, because women see no females in the upper levels of management, they unconsciously assume that they could not reach that level.³¹ The comments of women who have gotten above first level are indicative.

"At first I hesitated to take this job because I'd always thought it needed a man's viewpoint. I don't know why. Because I was used to seeing a man here, I suppose."³²

"[District level management] wasn't a goal—because it would have seemed unattainable."³³

"I never consciously aspired to district level. I just tried to do what I was assigned the very best I could."³⁴

When asked when a woman would be appointed to Division (fourth) level one female manager said, "We have to be reasonable."³⁵ This attitudinal barrier can be breached only by convincing women that they can and should aspire to upper management and that these jobs are not the exclusive domain of men.³⁶

The third major factor limiting female advancement in management is the Bell stereotype of women's role in management. (See Table 6.) Bell's men have decided what its women can and cannot do and what they want or do not want. Women are rarely consulted, as their fates are settled by men.³⁷ The same prejudices which led Bell to claim a BFOQ for many non-management jobs leads it to exclude females from the more lucrative management jobs.

TABLE 6.—BELL MANAGERS' ATTITUDES TOWARD WOMEN IN MANAGEMENT

Women in management are specialists.
The best women leave before a management job is available to them.
Women are not as mobile as men.
Women in management can't compete with IMDP men.
Women in management are a threat to men.
Women are not as competent as men.
In order to manage, a woman must have "masculine characteristics".
Men cannot consider women as equals.
Women just don't want to manage.
Women cannot supervise men in the field.
Women prefer staff jobs.
Women are too emotional.
Men will not want a management job which women hold.
Women should subscribe to a passive, domestic image.
Men and women should not work together too closely.

Source: EEOC R-1289, pp. 12-13.

chs Summary

Women are virtually excluded from all middle and upper management levels and even their first level assignments are limited to staff roles or the supervision of other women.

The management progression is sex segregated, an extension of the non-management promotion ladder.

Bell has restricted supervisory craft jobs to men based on the requirement of experience in the job to be supervised. Yet, Bell has recognized the superfluity of this requirement for management trainees and has had no qualms about placing men in the upper levels of the Traffic Department.

Females have been evaluated and recruited based on stereotypes that have been shown to be false.

Promotional opportunities for women have been retarded by the nature of their management assignments; the lack of role models, and the imposition of the prejudices of the male-dominated management.

Bell has at long last recognized the extent

Footnotes at end of article.

of the discrimination it practices against women in management and the "definite urgency regarding change in this area."³⁸ But a concerted and dramatic effort is required.³⁹ Recognition of the problem is insufficient unless that recognition bears fruit in immediate action.

CHAPTER 6.—CONCLUDING COMMENTS REGARDING SEX DISCRIMINATION

The Bell monolith is, without doubt, the largest oppressor of women workers in the United States. This harsh conclusion is inescapable in light of the discussion in the previous chapters. Bell's women are forced either to adjust their ambitions downward to conform to the company's restrictive expectations or to seek more rewarding work with another employer.

Bell's policies toward women are morally and ethically indefensible and since July 2, 1965, they have been against the law. Nevertheless, the discrimination continues.

It is difficult to quantify all of the effects of this discrimination. Statistical measures omit the real, human tragedies testified to by Ms. Weeks and Ms. Roig.¹ Sterile, economic measures cannot be ignored, however, for if they indicate enormous financial deprivation, surely the intangible consequences of discrimination are severe.

The magnitude of the discrimination. By every standard females at Bell are disadvantaged, but the most dramatic measure is in terms of lost wages. Because women in the 30 SMSA's are not distributed equitably through the whole range of available jobs, they lose \$422 million every year. (See Chart 16.) Nationwide in the Bell System women lose \$950 million annually.²

Dr. Ronald Oaxaca, an economist at the University of Western Ontario, has calculated that, if differences in the personal characteristics (i.e., age, education, etc.) of females and males are taken into consideration, "the effects of discrimination account for roughly 55% of the observed male-female wage differential in the telephone industry."³ Thus, Bell's incumbent female employees, given their age, education and experience, are paid an aggregate of \$500 million per year less than males with comparable personal characteristics.

Effect on Rates. Other economists have estimated that this differential attributable to discrimination could have a significant effect on telephone rates. If AT&T had operated to minimize labor costs (i.e. employed workers at the lowest possible wage, regardless of sex), they would have employed large numbers of women in all job categories. The total effect of this savings would have been an annual reduction of 2% to 4% in overall telephone rates.⁴

There can be no plausible rationalization for the vast disparities between females and males detailed in this report. Bell's culpability is virtually absolute. First, Bell has consciously, overtly and intentionally excluded females from the more remunerative jobs. The barriers to women's entrance into, and progression within, the Bell hierarchy are legion and virtually insurmountable.

Second, the segregation of the sexes practiced by Bell is far more extensive and intensive than that practiced by the society at large. The diverse skills and aspirations of women have been recognized by more progressive employers for some time. While sex segregation is not peculiar to the Bell System, Bell is certainly the archetype.

Third, despite Bell's presumed "unique competence" to improve the status of the female worker, they have been incredibly timid and reactionary. The telephone company, through its nationwide advertisements, repeated contacts with the public and civic leadership in the communities it serves, has a special opportunity to influence public opinion. They have, however, rejected this role in favor of an active stimulation of the

societal impediments to the employment of females and males on an equal basis.

An affirmative obligation. A century of discrimination against women will not be reversed by passive dictums that women will now be "allowed" to enter previously male jobs. Bell's history is replete with examples of conscious, calculated action to discourage interest in "opposite sex" jobs. Their affirmative obligation to eliminate these pervasive inequities is now overwhelming.

CHAPTER 7.—BLACKS IN THE BELL SYSTEM HISTORICAL EXCLUSION AND SEGREGATION

In 1963, Frederick Kappel, AT&T Chairman of the Board, stated that, "The question of how Negro and White people shall live, go to school, and work as fellow citizens demands good solutions in every part of the nation. . . . A fundamental social change is underway. What has been in the past is no longer going to be in the future."¹ Unfortunately, what had been in the past at the Bell System was the relative exclusion of black workers from employment in the Bell operating companies except in the lowest paying and most undesirable blue collar jobs.

Even today there are blacks who toil in service worker or laborer jobs who were not able to obtain any better positions when hired by Bell decades ago. More importantly, the present gross underrepresentation of black workers in desirable craft and management jobs is directly attributable to their past exclusion from most entry-level positions. Finally, many of the institutional practices which contributed to the exclusion in the past are still being used.

This chapter describes the historical exclusion of the black worker from the Bell System. Following the historical analysis, a thorough examination of the black employment patterns existing on December 31, 1970, is presented. A third chapter explains how these patterns are fostered by Bell System practices.

1930-1940

From the earliest times, black workers were almost completely excluded from employment in the telecommunications industry.² In 1930, when blacks constituted 9.7 percent of the total population in the United States,³ they represented only 0.7 percent of the workers in the telecommunications industry and were exclusively concentrated in the few service worker (Porter and Janitor) and laborer jobs.⁴ Between 1930 and 1940, the lot of blacks in the telephone industry did not improve appreciably. In 1940, blacks still represented only 0.7% of all telephone industry employees, and, as before, this small percentage was confined to service worker and laborer jobs.⁵

This traditional restriction of blacks to Janitor, Porter, and laborer jobs is highlighted by the fact that in the Spring of 1971, Southwestern Bell employed black service workers whose dates of hire go back to at least 1926.⁶ Other early hire dates for blacks still employed as service workers in 1971 are as follows: South Central Bell (1928); C&P (1928); Southern Bell (1929); Illinois Bell (1933); Pacific Tel. (1933); Michigan Bell (1937); and Ohio Bell (1937).⁷

The pattern of exclusion which existed throughout the telephone industry in the 1930's is further underscored by the fact that Southern Bell in Columbus, Georgia, for example, in December, 1969, employed only six blacks with dates of hire prior to the passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, and all six were service workers or laborers with over 26 years average seniority.⁸

1940-1950

During and after World War II, employment in the telephone industry expanded dramatically, adding nearly 280,000 new employees.⁹ Although black employment did increase somewhat during this period, the increase was not very significant. By 1950, black

workers still represented only 1.3 percent of all telephone employees,¹⁰ while they represented 10 percent of the national population.¹¹

The 1940's, however, witnessed a breakthrough; blacks began to be hired into jobs above the service worker and laborer level. Most of those hired were females in the job of Operator, marking the beginning of an important new trend in black employment in the telephone companies. Between 1940 and 1950, the number of black female Operators increased tenfold, while the number of black male employees merely doubled.¹² As Illinois Bell's General Personnel Supervisor recently said, "A really significant step was taken in 1947—we hired our first Negro telephone operator."¹³

This new pattern of hiring black females for the Operator job was to develop rapidly into the single most significant pattern of black employment in the Bell System. By the end of 1970, 43.9 percent of all black workers employed by the Bell operating companies were Operators.¹⁴

However, the absolute number of black Operators hired during the 1940's was still very small. Consequently, by 1950, less than 1.0 percent of all females in the telephone communications industry were black.¹⁵ Moreover, this modest increase in black employment as Operators during the 1940's was almost certainly due to economic factors.¹⁶ Not only did this trend begin long before the modern civil rights movement, but, more importantly, it came at a time when the Bell System was rapidly expanding and in the job in which turnover had always been the greatest. Furthermore, job opportunities for females in general vastly increased during this wartime period, and the Bell System experienced greater difficulties attracting white females for the Operator job.¹⁷

1950-1960

By 1960, black employment in the telephone industry had inched up to 2.5 percent of the total industry employment.¹⁸ In that same year, blacks comprised 10.5 percent of the national population.¹⁹ The increase in black employment during the 1950's, reflecting the trend begun a decade earlier, was concentrated primarily in the job of Operator.²⁰ But rather than being evenly distributed throughout the nation, the increase in the number of black Operators during the 1950's was heavily concentrated in areas outside the South with large urban populations: the five states of New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Michigan and Ohio, and the five SMSA's of New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, Detroit, and Los Angeles.²¹ This increase, like that of the 1940's, was dictated in large part by labor market conditions in major urban industrial areas.²²

Decline in the South. In contrast to this geographically-concentrated increase in black employment, the 1950's also saw a reduction in the percentage of jobs held by blacks in most Southern states. Black male employment was particularly affected.²³

The decline in the percentage of black employment in Southern Bell (now Southern Bell and South Central Bell), Southwestern Bell, and C&P (Va.) was the result of the large increase in telephone company employment combined with the continued restriction of blacks in those companies to the very few service workers and laborer jobs.²⁴ This geographical pattern thus constitutes the second major trend in black employment in the Bell System: while Bell companies in the North, particularly in areas with major urban populations, began to hire blacks in increasing numbers for entry-level jobs above service worker and laborer largely for economic reasons, the Bell companies in the South continued the racially exclusionary policies of the past.

Hereford's case. A poignant example of this blatant racial exclusion of blacks involved an attempt in 1954 by a black Garageman named Hereford at Southwestern Bell in Texas to transfer to the all-white job of Stockman. The Company denied him transfer, and the CWA filed a grievance on his behalf, taking the case all the way to arbitration. While the Arbitrator ruled for the Company on the basis of an interpretation of the collective bargaining agreement, he concluded as follows:²⁵

"The one real question to be answered is that of race qualification. In our society can a colored man take a position with a company which has always been filled by a white man. . . . The fact of his race permeated the whole hearing—The officials high-up in administration of the Company's affairs were not worried about Hereford's education, they were worried about his race."

The job of Stockman in Texas remained all-white until 1961.²⁶

In short, the years between 1950 and 1960 saw a small but significant increase in black employment in the Bell companies. This increase was not evenly distributed, either occupationally or geographically, but was concentrated primarily in the job of Operator and centered in a handful of Eastern and Northern SMSA's. In the South, the continuation of the traditional exclusionary policies caused an actual drop in black employment.

1960-1970

During the 1960's, black employment in the Bell System as a whole increased steadily, reaching 4.0% of the work force in 1963,²⁷ 4.6% in 1966,²⁸ and 9.8% in 1970.²⁹ This increase continued to follow the earlier pattern of heavy concentration in a few industrial centers outside the South and in the job of Operator. Also during this decade, a third major pattern of black employment in the Bell System began to emerge. Even in those areas where blacks had been hired in increasing numbers since the 1940's, they did not penetrate into management positions in any significant numbers.

Geographic pattern during the 1960's. As late as 1966, nearly two years after passage of the Civil Rights Act, black employment in the Bell System nationwide was still relatively low. Indeed, when the employment of blacks by Bell operating companies in 1966 is measured against the percentage of blacks employed at that time by all major employers in the respective Bell operating areas (the area all-industry average), only two Bell companies, New York Tel. and C&P (W. Va.), had black employment greater than or even equal to the all-industry averages in their areas. (See Chart 17.) Among the remaining companies, only Northwestern Bell was close to the area average.

Even those companies which had begun to hire blacks as Operators decades earlier compared unfavorably to other companies in their areas. Thus, as shown in Chart 17, Ohio Bell's employment of blacks in 1966, for example, was only 80 percent of the all-industry average in its operating area. Black employment rates in 1966 for other Bell companies outside the South as compared to the respective all-industry averages were even worse: Bell of Pa., 78 percent of the area average; Pacific Tel., 69 percent of the area average; Michigan Bell, 65 percent of the area average; and Illinois Bell, 62 percent of the area average. These companies, while professing to be leaders, were, in fact, well below average in 1966.

SMSA's. This same conclusion is reached when Bell employment is examined on an SMSA basis one year later. (See Chart 18.) As noted before, the increased Bell System employment of blacks during the 1950's had been concentrated in five SMSA's: New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, Detroit, and Los Angeles. By 1967, however, only one of those SMSA's, New York, employed blacks at a

higher rate than the all-industry average for that SMSA. In addition to these five areas, the following SMSA's had also made significant gains in over-all black employment by 1967: Washington, D.C., San Francisco, Newark, and Cleveland.³⁰

However, despite these gains, the fact remains that in 1967, Bell companies in only four of the thirty SMSA's—New York, Los Angeles, Detroit, and Washington, D.C.—exceeded or even came close to the all-industry average for black employment in their respective areas. The low rates of black employment in the other 26 SMSA's, including Philadelphia and Chicago which had been hiring blacks for nearly a generation, are particularly disturbing in view of the low skill requirements for all major entry-level jobs in the Bell System. Thus, although Bell companies each year hired approximately 200,000 unskilled workers (mostly in urban areas having a large concentration of blacks), black employment in 1966 had not reached even the area average in any Bell company except New York Tel. and C&P (W. Va.) and had approached or exceeded the area average in 1967 in only four SMSA's.

The Southern pattern: official exclusion. While the employment of blacks in the Bell System nationwide in 1966 and 1967 was poor, the increasing lag of the Bell companies in the South was a disaster. As seen in Charts 17 and 18, the highest black employment rates (as compared to area rates) were clearly in the major industrial urban centers in the North and West, while the lowest rates were in the South. In 1966, Southern Bell, C&P (Va.), and Southwestern Bell all employed blacks at less than 30 percent of the rate of all major employers in their operating areas.

This astonishingly low level of black employment in the Southern operating companies as late as 1967 was the direct result of a policy of blatant racial exclusion. Southern Bell, for example, at least up to the effective date of the Civil Rights Act, openly advertised in racially designated newspaper help-wanted columns³¹ and maintained racially segregated restrooms and other comfort facilities.³² Indeed, Southern Bell admits that, prior to 1963, it hired blacks only for laborer and service worker jobs.³³ Moreover, the EEOC had found that even after July 2, 1965, Southern Bell excluded blacks in certain areas as a matter of company policy.³⁴

A tell-tale vestige of this very recent era of overt racial discrimination can still be found in the South Central Bell job description for Janitress used in Birmingham. Revised in 1968 and still used in 1971, the job description states that the supervisor of Janitresses is to be "male (white)."³⁵

Such overt racial discrimination was also practiced by Southwestern Bell, as seen in the 1954 Texas arbitration case noted before. The EEOC concluded in November, 1967, after an extensive investigation of Southwestern Bell's employment practices in Dallas, that the Company had "a long history of racial discrimination against Negroes. . . ." The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit also concluded that, at least until January, 1967, Southwestern Bell in Arkansas maintained a racially restrictive hiring policy which excluded blacks from all but the least attractive jobs.³⁷

These and many more examples show that Southern Bell and Southwestern Bell maintained a blatant pattern of overt racial discrimination until the mid-1960's. Their employment of blacks above service worker and laborer did not begin until some twenty years after that breakthrough had already been achieved in Bell companies elsewhere.

Occupational distribution of increased black employment during the 1960's. As noted above, the period between 1960 and 1967 saw a dramatic increase in black employment in the New York SMSA and smaller, yet significant, gains in other SMSA's.

However, an overwhelming proportion of the black workers in these SMSA's were still in one job: Operator. Although specific data on the number of black Operators in 1967 is unavailable, EEO-1 reports filed annually with the EEOC by Bell companies (and all other large employers) provide a rough index of the concentration of blacks in the Operator's job and their virtual exclusion from craft jobs in 1967.

Other substantial documentary material supports the conclusion that *Southern Bell* and *Southwestern Bell* officially excluded blacks from all the lowest jobs well into the 1960's.³⁸ Among the highlights of this material are the following facts: In the entire state of Mississippi, Southern Bell employed no blacks in any entry-level jobs above service worker or laborer until June, 1965.³⁹ In New Orleans, Southern Bell hired its first black above service worker or laborer in November, 1963, and its first black Operator one year later.⁴⁰ The Company hired its first black Operator in Florida in March, 1964;⁴¹ and in South Carolina in July, 1964.⁴² Southwestern Bell hired its first black Operator anywhere in Kansas in 1963.⁴³ The first black Installer employed anywhere in Kansas was hired in June, 1969.⁴⁴ No black above service worker or laborer was hired in Arkansas until 1964.⁴⁵ The first black Operator in Oklahoma was hired March, 1964.⁴⁶

TABLE 7.—1967 BLACK EMPLOYMENT IN SELECTED EEO-1 CATEGORIES, BY SMSA

(In percent)

	Jobs held by blacks	
	Office and clerical	Craft
New York	26.2	2.1
Newark	14.1	1.8
Philadelphia	15.2	3.6
Cleveland	11.5	4.7
Chicago	15.5	2.6
Detroit	23.3	9.9
Los Angeles	10.8	3.7
San Francisco	9.3	3.9
Washington, D.C.	28.7	7.3

Source: EEO-1 data.

TABLE 7.—1967 BLACK EMPLOYMENT IN SELECTED EEO-1 CATEGORIES, BY SMSA

(In percent)

	Jobs held by blacks	
	Office and clerical	Craft
New York	26.2	2.1
Newark	14.1	1.8
Philadelphia	15.2	3.6
Cleveland	11.5	4.7
Chicago	15.5	2.6
Detroit	23.3	9.9
Los Angeles	10.8	3.7
San Francisco	9.3	3.9
Washington, D.C.	28.7	7.3

Source: EEO-1 data.

TABLE 7.—1967 BLACK EMPLOYMENT IN SELECTED EEO-1 CATEGORIES, BY SMSA

(In percent)

	Jobs held by blacks	
	Office and clerical	Craft
New York	26.2	2.1
Newark	14.1	1.8
Philadelphia	15.2	3.6
Cleveland	11.5	4.7
Chicago	15.5	2.6
Detroit	23.3	9.9
Los Angeles	10.8	3.7
San Francisco	9.3	3.9
Washington, D.C.	28.7	7.3

Source: EEO-1 data.

Footnotes at end of article.

Table 7 shows that in each of the above SMSA's in 1967, black employment in the "office and clerical" jobs far exceeded black employment in craft jobs. Charts and other Tables in Exhibit 1 indicate that an identical pattern existed in all the 30 SMSA's.⁴⁷ Since the Bell System includes Operators in the "office and clerical" category, the concentration of blacks in the Operator job shows up in the statistics as a high percentage of blacks in the "office and clerical" category.

Craft exclusion. Here, as elsewhere, AT&T's claim of leadership in hiring blacks can be easily tested by comparing the percentage of black craft workers in the Bell System with the percentage of black craft workers in other companies. Table 8 tells the unfortunate story. Blacks, notoriously excluded from craft jobs in general, found it even more difficult to obtain a craft job (with no skill requirement) in the Bell System. The exclusion of blacks from craft jobs in 1967 was particularly severe in New York, Newark, Philadelphia, Chicago, and Washington, D.C. Table 8 also clearly demonstrates that when compared to other employers, the Southern SMSA's employed black craft workers at an outrageously low level. (See also EEOC Exhibit 1, pp. 206-209.)

TABLE 8.—Bell system black employment in craft jobs compared to all industry black employment in craft jobs, for selected SMSA's 1967

Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas	Bell craft employment as a percent of all-industry level
Detroit	186.8
San Francisco	88.6
Cleveland	83.9
Los Angeles	75.5
Washington, D.C.	57.0
Philadelphia	42.4
New York	31.8
Chicago	31.7
Newark	24.6
Birmingham	21.3
Dallas	16.7
Mobile	15.3
Atlanta	14.1
New Orleans	13.7
Greensboro-Winston Salem	12.0
Norfolk	10.9
Miami	10.2
Memphis	6.4
Jacksonville	0.0

Source: EEO-1 Data.

The evidence is overwhelming that those areas which had made significant strides in employing blacks had done so by placing most of them in office and clerical jobs rather than craft jobs. It is tragically ironic that blacks, first excluded from all jobs above service worker and laborer, had progressed only one step up the ladder by 1967. Blacks had moved up to Operator but still could obtain only a minuscule number of craft jobs. What had been in the past continued.

Sex composition. Another measure, albeit approximate, of the occupational concentration of blacks into the Operator job is the sex composition of black employment in the various companies and SMSA's. Table 9 shows that in all SMSA's with a relatively high black employment, a vastly disproportionate percentage of these black workers were female in 1967.⁴⁸ In New York, for example, 92% of all black employees were female while only 50% of all whites were female.

TABLE 9.—PROPORTION OF ANGLOS WHO WERE FEMALE COMPARED TO PROPORTION OF BLACKS WHO WERE FEMALE, BY SMSA, IN 1967—Continued

(In percent)

	Anglos	Blacks
New York	50	92
Newark	56	88
Philadelphia	61	82

	Anglos	Blacks
Cleveland	48	72
Chicago	50	81
Detroit	52	84
Los Angeles	57	81
San Francisco	50	81
Washington, D.C.	53	82

Between 1967 and 1969, all Bell companies increased their percentage of black new hires, and most of these continued to be black females.⁴⁹ All the operating companies with substantial numbers of new black hires registered this imbalance of black females. This same new-hire pattern existed in the Southern companies as elsewhere. Although lagging far behind the rest of the Bell System in their total black employment, the Southern companies by 1969 were following the same pattern as the other companies with respect to the few blacks hired. Most were female.

Thus, the evidence demonstrates that the occupational distribution of black employees in the Bell System followed a uniform pattern, regardless of the total employment figures for blacks in any particular company. Whether in the West, North, East or South, in the 1960's black employees at Bell companies were primarily females classified as "office and clerical" employees. The pattern of black occupational distribution which first emerged in the 1940's in the East was, by 1969, evident in all areas. Somehow, black employment was being concentrated in the lowest-paying, least-desirable, dead-end jobs in the Bell System. Blacks still had not obtained a significant number of high-paying craft jobs in any area. This fact emphasizes the futility of the employment advances made by blacks in the Bell System since 1930.

Economic factors affecting black employment. As noted before, the chief chronicler of black employment at the Bell System, Dr. Bernard Anderson, has concluded that labor market conditions in the North and East were a major, if not primary, force contributing to the increased employment of blacks as Operators during the 1950's.⁵⁰ Other evidence, not available to Dr. Anderson, demonstrates conclusively that the same economic forces at work during the 1950's continued in the 1960's to push up the employment of blacks in the Operator job, especially in large SMSA's with sizable black populations. In the last 10 years turn-over among Operators has continued to escalate, reaching astounding levels in major urban areas. It is these areas that are becoming increasingly black and in which the Operator's wage is no longer attractive to whites. The combination of these factors is rapidly converting the Traffic Department from simply a "nunnery" into a "ghetto nunnery."

This conclusion has been reached repeatedly by persons at the highest levels within the Bell System itself. In October, 1969, an extremely important "Report on Force Loss and the Urban Labor Market" was presented by AT&T Vice President Walter Straley to the assembled Presidents of all Bell companies.⁵¹ According to the report, "What a telephone company needs to know about its labor market [is] who is available for work paying as little as \$4,000 to \$5,000 a year."⁵² According to Straley's remarks, two out of three persons available at that wage were black: "It is therefore just a plain fact that in today's world, telephone company wages are more in line with black expectations—and the tighter the labor market the more this is true."⁵³ The report continues:⁵⁴

"Population and labor force projections are not at all encouraging. The kind of people we need are going to be in very short supply. . . . Most of our new hires go into entry level jobs which means we must have access to an ample supply of people who will work at comparatively low rates of pay.

That means city people more so than suburbanites. That means lots of black people.

"There are not enough white, middle class, success-oriented men and women in the labor force—or at least that portion of the labor force available to the telephone companies—to supply our requirements for craft and occupational people. And from now on, the number of such people who are available will grow smaller even as our need becomes greater. It is therefore perfectly plain that we need nonwhite employees. Not because we are good citizens. Or because it is the law as well as a national goal to give them employment. We need them because we have so many jobs to fill and they will take them."

Vice President Straley's findings were repeated in the 1970 Annual Report of AT&T's Department of Environmental Affairs:⁵⁵

"The tight labor market in many large cities has created shortages of qualified employees in many job categories. Prominent among these are shortages of qualified applicants for traffic operators, clerical and service representative workers. Shortages are created by high force losses as well as by the scarcity of qualified persons looking for telephone work. . . . In a few central city employment pockets among Eastern and mid-Western cities, our applicants are 90% black."

In the same vein, in December, 1969, the President of Pacific Tel. stated that, "We are experiencing greater difficulty in hiring and maintaining the quality and quantity of people to do the job we have to do. . . . The problem . . . is even more acute in our metropolitan areas, where our wage levels have become less competitive over the years. . . ."⁵⁶

To recapitulate, the increased black employment during the 1960's was dictated by labor market conditions which forced the Bell System to hire black females as Operators. Similar economic factors did not apply to Plant craft jobs and consequently few black males were hired. It is reasonable, therefore, to conclude that the Bell System hired blacks only when there were no economically viable alternatives.

Underrepresentation of blacks in management during the 1960's. By 1969, a generation had passed since the first breakthrough by blacks in Operator jobs in the East and North. With a twenty-five year history of ever-increasing black employment, the companies in these areas had had substantial opportunity to place blacks in management. But figures for 1970 show a bleak picture.

As noted before, of all Bell operating companies, New York Tel. alone had surpassed the area-wide all-industry level of black employment by 1966. Indeed, in that year New York Tel. already exceeded the area rate by 34 percent. And yet, as of December 31, 1969, only 4.4% of all New York Tel. black employees were in management, while 27.2% of the Company's white employees held management jobs. Analysis of the management statistics for other major long-term Bell employers of blacks reveals the same picture. (See Table 10.) Unfortunately, by 1970 only a small fraction of blacks had found their way into management, even in companies with the best hiring records.⁵⁷

TABLE 10.—BELL SYSTEM EMPLOYMENT OF BLACKS IN MANAGEMENT, DEC. 31, 1969

Company	Percent of employees in management	
	White	Black
New York	26.3	4.4
Ohio	23.8	6.6
Bell of Pennsylvania	23.3	4.1
Pacific Telephone	24.5	5.0
Michigan Bell	22.1	5.0
Illinois Bell	27.6	6.8

Source: EEOC R-1224.

Footnotes at end of article.

In need hardly be stressed that Southern Bell, South Central Bell, and Southwestern Bell had virtually no blacks in management. On December 31, 1969, 0.7% of the blacks at South Central Bell, 0.6% of the blacks at Southern Bell, and 0.9% of the blacks at Southwestern Bell were in management.⁵⁸

If the management employment pattern of blacks in the South follows the pace set earlier in the North and East (as has happened in the case of Operators), the outlook for Southern black managers is dismal. Twenty-five years of black employment in New York Tel., Illinois Bell, Michigan Bell, Ohio Bell, Bell of Pa., and Pacific Tel. have not produced substantial numbers of black managers. This failure of the Bell System to provide blacks with significant management opportunities is the third, and final, major component of the black employment pattern in the Bell System.

Summary

Black employment in the Bell System increased steadily from the virtual exclusion of the 1930's and 1940's to an all-time high at the end of the 1960's. Yet, even at that time, most Bell companies had still not reached the average level of black employment for all major companies in their respective operating areas.

Most of the increase in black employment from the 1940's to the end of the 1960's came in a low-paying, dead-end, and otherwise highly undesirable job, that of Operator. Very few blacks obtained jobs as craft workers.

Even this increase has not been uniform throughout the System; the Southern companies—Southern Bell, South Central Bell, Southwestern Bell, and C&P (Va.)—continued their exclusionist policies up to the mid-1960's and consequently lagged far behind the rest of the System.

Even the companies with the best and most sustained efforts of black employment (New York Tel., Ohio Bell, Bell of Pa., Michigan Bell, Illinois Bell, and Pacific Tel.) did not, after decades of hiring blacks, have a significant number of black workers in management.

Far from being leaders in the field of equal employment, despite their "unique competence," the Bell companies were still just trying to catch up. Moreover, the Bell System's poor record of black employment is particularly disturbing in view of the fact that each year large numbers of persons are hired in major urban areas for jobs requiring little, if any, skills.

CHAPTER 8.—BELL'S EMPLOYMENT OF BLACKS ON DECEMBER 31, 1970

This chapter analyzes the black employment situation in the Bell System at one particular point in time: December 31, 1970. Its conclusion that blacks are systematically denied equal employment opportunities in the Bell System is shocking, but should not be surprising in view of the three major historical trends discussed above. The picture of black employment in the Bell System at the end of 1970 shows Bell's claim of "unique competence to play a leading role in the improvement of employment opportunity" to be hollow, at best.

Black employment relative to population. One can assume that, absent employer discrimination, the percentage of minority employees in a company's workforce should roughly approximate the percentage of that minority in the relevant population, especially if the jobs the employer has to offer require no particular skills. As Jerome W. Hull, Pacific Tel. President, stated on March 15, 1971:¹

"... our current goal with respect to minorities is to achieve a racial composition in our employee body which is in direct relationship to that of the communities we serve. And not just in total number of people in our business, but at every level of our

non-management and management structure."

By this criteria, it is clear that something is wrong at the Bell System. Of the 30 SMSA's analyzed, only four employed blacks at the end of 1970 at a rate equal to or above the proportion of blacks in the respective SMSA population. (See Chart 19.) In the remaining 26 SMSA's, Bell companies would have to increase their black employment by more than one-third in order to achieve parity with the population.²

Thus, at the end of 1970, black employment in the Bell System was still staggeringly imbalanced, with a large concentration of black workers in a few major urban areas. Indeed, the three SMSA's of New York, Cleveland, and Los Angeles accounted for 46 percent of all blacks employed by Bell in the 30 SMSA's while representing only 34 percent of Bell's total employment in those SMSA's.³ The large concentration of blacks in these SMSA's is not surprising. New York, Cleveland, and Los Angeles were among the SMSA's in which jobs above the level of service worker and laborer were first opened to blacks in the 1940's.

The Southern picture. Of the 26 SMSA's which in 1970 had not achieved parity with the population in their employment of blacks, the worst, predictably, were those located in the South. As shown in Chart 19, the 13 SMSA's with the lowest black penetration ratios are all located in companies in the South: The C&P companies, Southern Bell, South Central Bell, and Southwestern Bell.⁴ South Central Bell in Mobile, the SMSA with the lowest black penetration ratio, employed blacks at the end of 1970 at a rate only 20 percent of the black population in that area.⁵ In order for the Company to achieve parity with the black population in the Mobile SMSA, black employment would have to be increased by 400 percent.⁶

Taken as a whole, Bell's Southern companies at the end of 1970 would have to increase their black employment in the 17 Southern SMSA's by 57 percent in order to match the black population. (See Table 11.) South Central Bell would have to increase its black employment in four SMSA's by 166% and C&P (Va.) its black employment in two SMSA's by 195%.

Even in entry-level jobs requiring little, if any, skills, Bell companies in six Southern SMSA's (Birmingham, Jacksonville, Memphis, Mobile, New Orleans, and Norfolk) failed to match the relevant black population in 1971.⁷ The companies in these six SMSA's would have to increase black employment in entry-level jobs alone by 43 percent to equal the percentage of blacks in the population.⁸ In Mobile, South Central Bell would have to increase black employment in the entry-level jobs by 170 percent to achieve parity.⁹

In short, in the overwhelming number of SMSA's analyzed, Bell companies failed to employ blacks in percentages equal to the black portion of the population. These deficits were most critical in the South where blacks had been virtually excluded as a class until the mid-1960's, but were still bad in most northern cities where blacks had for years been employed in jobs above service worker and laborer.

Black employment relative to other employers. The Bell System has claimed to be a leader in the field of employment opportunity for blacks for many years. Yet, at the end of 1970, twelve of the twenty Bell operating companies still failed to employ blacks in the same proportion as all major employers in their respective areas.¹⁰ (See Chart 17, above.) Moreover, only New York Tel., Ohio Bell, Pacific Tel., and Bell of Pa. substantially exceeded their respective all-industry area averages for black employment. Not surprisingly, on the other hand, all the Southern companies fell well below the average employment of blacks in their operating areas. Eight years after Frederick Kappe's pious statement, the black penetration rate in Southern Bell, South Central Bell

and C&P (va.) was less than 46 percent of the penetration rate for other employers in their areas.

TABLE 11.—BLACK RECRUITMENT OPPORTUNITIES IN 26 SMSA'S, DEC. 31, 1970

Standard metropolitan statistical areas	Ratio of black employment percentage to black population percentage	Percent by which current black employment must be increased to equal population
26 SMSA's with recruitment opportunities.....	0.7432	34.6
17 SMSA's in southern companies.....	.6367	57.1
5 SMSA's in Southwestern Bell.....	.7300	37.0
4 SMSA's in Southern Bell.....	.5892	69.7
4 SMSA's in South Central Bell.....	.3763	165.7
2 SMSA's in C. & P. (Virginia).....	.3385	195.4
9 SMSA's outside the South.....	.8612	16.1

Source: EEOC C-661, EEOC C-690, and census data.

Black occupational standing. Despite considerable variations between companies and SMSA's in terms of the number of black workers employed in the Bell System, those who are employed are universally concentrated in the lower-paying and least desirable jobs. At the end of 1970, the average wage of all Bell operating company employees in the 30 SMSA's was \$9,080 per year, while the average wage for Bell's black employees in the 30 SMSA's was only \$6,817.¹¹ To quantify the concentration of blacks in low-paying jobs, an "occupational position" measure has been developed which compares the wages of black employees to the average wage for all workers. Graphic representations of the occupational position of blacks in each of 30 SMSA's can be found in EEOC Exhibit 1, pp. 238-299. (See also EEOC MAP 2.)

This data definitely shows that the occupational position of blacks is virtually the same in every SMSA. For example, blacks were employed in the New York SMSA at the end of 1970 at a rate one and one-half times the black population in that SMSA, while in the Mobile SMSA, they were employed at a rate only one-fifth the black population.¹² Yet in both SMSA's the average wage for black employee was only about 75 percent of the wage for all employees.¹³

The graphic illustrations for each of the 30 SMSA's noted above combine the black penetration rate and the black occupational standing. (See EEOC Exhibit 1, pp. 238-299). Chart 20, which reproduces the data for New York and Mobile, clearly shows that the occupational standing of blacks in New York is no better than in Mobile. In other words, in both cities blacks are in the lowest-paying jobs. The only difference is, New York has filled more of its low-paying jobs with blacks than has Mobile. Neither employment of blacks over a long period of time, nor a professed policy of equal employment seems to have had much impact on the low occupational standing of blacks.

A second example further illustrates this conclusion. In 1962 a Pacific Tel. Vice President said that the recently adopted plan for Progress.

"... does not constitute a new policy on our part. But it does serve to reemphasize our continuing policy to ensure that all telephone people, including members of minority groups, are regards recruiting, placement, transfers, promotion, training and use of facilities.¹⁴

Yet, nine years later in the Los Angeles SMSA, a black employee had an average annual wage of only \$7040 as opposed to an average wage for all employees of \$8848.¹⁵

Footnotes at end of article.

TABLE 12.—PROPORTION OF ANGLOS WHO ARE FEMALE COMPARED TO PROPORTION OF BLACKS WHO ARE FEMALE, DEC. 31, 1970

Company	Percent black who are female	Percent Anglos who are female
Bell of Pennsylvania.....	76.6	52.5
C. & P. (all).....	77.4	51.4
Indiana Bell.....	65.0	52.1
Illinois Bell.....	73.1	49.2
Michigan Bell.....	82.1	50.3
Mountain Bell.....	73.2	54.3
New England Telephone.....	75.3	54.4
New Jersey Bell.....	82.0	51.4
New York Telephone.....	80.6	46.4
Northwestern Bell.....	68.0	55.8
Ohio Bell.....	75.0	49.8
Pacific Northwest Bell.....	73.0	53.9
Pacific Telephone.....	81.0	55.4
South Central Bell.....	77.4	57.6
Southern Bell.....	84.1	56.5
Southwestern Bell.....	78.4	55.7
Wisconsin Telephone.....	77.9	53.4
Total.....	78.9	53.0

Source: EEOC w-659.

Thus, there is no correlation between the penetration rate of blacks in the Bell System and their occupational position; whether a company employs many or few black workers, those workers are concentrated in the lowest paying jobs. This phenomenon is largely attributable to the fact that the blacks in all Bell companies are disproportionately employed as Operators.

These findings are frightening. No Bell company has yet provided blacks with true equality. New York Tel. and Pacific Tel. may hire thousands of blacks, but they are no better off than the few blacks in Mobile. They are all locked into low paying jobs.

Overrepresentation of black females. The previous chapter noted that one way to measure the discrimination against blacks in the Bell System was to examine the disproportionate number of blacks who were female or conversely, the relative exclusion of black males. At the end of 1970, every Bell company had a substantial overrepresentation of females in its black work force in contrast to its white force.¹⁶ As shown in Table 12 of 72,000 blacks employed in the System at that time, 79 percent were female, while only 53 percent of the white employees were female. In no company were more than 57.6 percent of the white employees female, while in five companies (Michigan Bell, New Jersey Bell, New York Tel., Pacific Tel., and Southern Bell) at least 80 percent of the black workers were female.

This should not, by any stretch of the imagination, be taken to mean that black females are well employed. As noted before, they have the lowest-paying major job in the System. Since "female" jobs are appropriately identical to low-paying jobs, it is no surprise that when blacks entered the System in substantial numbers, they would be black females. "Male" jobs are higher-paying and more rewarding. Just as white females have been kept out of this preserve, so also have all blacks, male and female.

The fact that most blacks in the Bell System are female has two important implications. First, all companies have a long way to go in terms of affording equal opportunity to black males. Second, most blacks in the Bell system suffer a double handicap of race and sex.

The myriad Bell System policies which discriminate against females because of their sex also clearly affect blacks much more than whites.

Black overrepresentation in "clerical" jobs. A second comparison points to the disproportionate representation of blacks in "office and clerical" jobs. The 1967 pattern remained unchanged three years later. In every operating company the proportion of blacks in office and clerical jobs is much greater than

the proportion of blacks in craft jobs. (See EEOC Exhibit 1, pp. 230-237.) In the companies and SMSA's with the largest black employment, this disparity is most acute.

This is not a typical pattern of employment for companies outside the Bell System.¹⁷ In most areas, black participation in crafts is higher than in office and clerical. There can be no doubt that AT&T has developed a very unique employment pattern. The System has a very large, low-paying "female" job which has been allocated to blacks. The concentration of blacks into the office and clerical category clearly dominates all employment statistics of the Bell System.

Concentration of blacks in the Traffic Department. Since most Traffic employees are in the low-paying Operator job and most Plant workers are in higher-paying craft jobs, the impact of concentrating blacks in the Operator category and excluding them from craft jobs shows up in the distribution of blacks by department. As shown in Table 13, the black penetration rate in the Traffic Department in the 30 SMSA's at the end of 1970 was more than twice that of the Accounting or Commercial Departments and more than three times that of the Marketing, Plant, or all other departments. In only one of the 30 SMSA's

TABLE 13.—Black penetration rate in 30 SMSA's by department

Department	Black penetration rate in Department
Traffic.....	28.6
Accounting.....	13.9
Commercial.....	12.3
Marketing.....	9.7
Plant.....	9.2
All Others.....	9.3

Source: EEOC C-661—EEOC C-690

(Los Angeles) did the penetration rate for blacks in another major department exceed that of the Traffic Department.¹⁸

The heavy concentration of blacks in the Traffic Department has not gone unnoticed in the Bell System. A 1968 Southern Bell memorandum, for example, recommended direct involvement of management in departments other than Traffic as "an absolute must to improving Negro female representation in other departments."¹⁹ Yet, in 1971, 70.3 percent of all blacks in the four Southern Bell SMSA's were in the Traffic Department, while only 25.7 percent of all whites were in that department.²⁰

Compared with Plant, the largest department in the operating companies, the concentration of blacks in the Traffic Department is striking. In the 30 SMSA's, 52.4 percent of all black employees were in the Traffic Dept., while only 23.4 percent of all Anglo employees held jobs in that department. Almost exactly the opposite pattern existed in the Plant Dept.; 24.6 percent of all blacks were in Plant jobs, while 44.0 percent of all Anglos were in these jobs.²¹

Black service workers. As noted above, until the 1940's service worker jobs were the only ones available to blacks in any Bell company. This restriction prevailed in the Southern companies until the mid-1960's, and in 1971 these classifications still seemed to be almost reserved for blacks, especially in the South. (See Table 14.) Although nationwide blacks comprised only 9.8 percent of all employees in the operating companies in 1971, they made up 37.3 percent of all service workers.²² Thus, the chance that a black employee will be a service worker is still five and one-half times greater than for a white employee. In the South there are still virtually no white service workers.

Black Operators. When blacks were first hired into jobs other than service worker or laborer, they were almost immediately concentrated in the Operator's job. By the end of 1970, the Operator's job in some SMSA's had become a "black job." In the 30 selected

17, 1972

SMSA's at the end of 1970, a black employee was almost three times as likely to be an Operator as was a white employee. While 43.2 percent of all blacks were Operators, only 14.9 percent of all whites were Operators.²²

TABLE 14.—BLACK SERVICE WORKERS IN THE SOUTH
(In percent)

Company	Employees	Service workers
C. & P. (all)	14.7	82.0
Southern	8.2	93.8
South Central	7.4	96.6
Southwestern	7.8	66.7

Few black Service Representatives. The overrepresentation of blacks in the low-paying Operator job contrasts dramatically with the underrepresentation of blacks in the higher paying Service Representative and craft classifications. Although 34% of the Operators in the 30 SMSA's were black, only 13.1% of the Service Representatives were black. Thus, the chance that an Operator will be black is 2.6 times greater than the chance that a Service Representative will be black.²⁴

As with over-all black employment, a regional pattern is discernible in this underutilization of blacks in the Service Representative job. Some South Central Bell and Southwestern Bell districts had, in the Spring of 1971, never employed a black Service Representative.²⁵ Eleven of the twelve cities with the greatest disparities between the percentage of blacks who are Service Representatives and those who are Operators were in the South.²⁶ But in every SMSA, the percentage of black Operators was higher than the percentage of black Service Representatives.²⁷

Blacks in crafts. Black participation in the telephone crafts, the highest-paying non-management positions in the companies, was also quite low when measured by almost any standard. Using even the most lenient criterion, the employment of blacks in crafts by all employers in the area, the Bell System's performance is deficient. Thirteen of the twenty operating companies employed blacks at a rate below the employers in their areas. (See Chart 21.) The Southern companies, of course, present the most appalling picture. C&P (Va.), C&P (Md.), Southern Bell and South Central Bell employ blacks in the crafts at less than one-third the rate of area employers. But, perhaps more appalling is the record of some Northern and Western companies that have employed blacks for three decades.

New Jersey Bell, Pacific Tel. and Illinois Bell also fail to meet the black craft penetration rate of area employers. In fact, New Jersey Bell employed black craft workers at no greater rate relative to the area than did Southwestern Bell, a company which officially excluded blacks from craft jobs until the mid-1960's.

On an SMSA basis, the Dec. 31, 1970 data show that 22 cities were below the area average. (See Chart 22.) The list of worst SMSA's reads like a Rogues Gallery: Norfolk, Greensboro-Winston Salem, Memphis, New Orleans, Dallas, Mobile, Birmingham, Atlanta, Richmond, Washington, D.C., and Jacksonville. Nationally, in the 30 SMSA's, 11.3% of all blacks were in telephone craft jobs while 26.8% of all whites were in those jobs.²⁸ The chance, therefore, that a white employee will be in the telephone crafts is 2.4 times greater than a black employee.

In the South, a black craft employee is quite extraordinary. In January, 1970, a Southern black craft employee reported, "I've had several instances where whites 'll ask me

if I'm sure I'm a telephone man."²⁹ A number of South Central,³⁰ Southern,³¹ and Southwestern Bell³² districts have never employed blacks in some entry-level craft jobs. Twelve of the thirteen SMSA's with the highest concentration of whites in the telephone crafts are in the Southern companies.³³

Of perhaps even more significance is the fact that several major SMSA's which had a long history of hiring blacks as Operators still did not employ black craft workers at even the average rate achieved by all area employers; Newark, San Francisco, Chicago, Cleveland and Philadelphia were all below the average on Dec. 31, 1970.

Blacks in craft jobs compared to population. When measured against the stricter standard of population, Bell System's employment of blacks in craft jobs is a catastrophe. On December 31, 1970, no SMSA came even remotely close to employing blacks as craft workers in proportion to the percentage of blacks in the population. Twenty-two SMSA's employed blacks at rates less than 50% of their numbers in the relevant population. (See Chart 23.)

Comparison with the Operator classification makes the underutilization in the crafts even more graphic. While 34.2% of all Operators were black, only 11.3% of all entry-SMSA's were black.³⁴ In other words, the level telephone craft employees in the 30 SMSA's were black.³⁵ In other words, the chance that an Operator would be black was three times greater than that an entry-level craft employee would be black. When compared with all craft employees, the chance that an Operator would be black was almost five times greater.³⁶ New York is, again, the classic example of the failure of the Bell companies to utilize blacks equally in all classifications: Although 54.9% of all Operators were black, only 12.0% of all entry-level craft employees were black.³⁷

Exclusion from top crafts. Not only are blacks generally underrepresented in the telephone crafts, they are almost totally excluded from the top craft jobs of Switchman, Cable Splicer, PBX Installer-Repairman, etc. Of approximately 82,000 white telephone craft employees in the 30 SMSA's, 60.2% were in top craft jobs.³⁸ Of 6,450 black craft employees, only 34.9% were in top craft jobs. The chance, therefore, that a white craft employee would be in a top craft position was 1.7 times greater than that of a black craft employee. In every SMSA there were proportionately more white craft employees in top craft jobs than black craft employees in top craft positions. Again, the Southern SMSA's were the worst. Of 246 top craft employees in Greensboro, for instance, none were black;³⁹ the population of Greensboro is 19.6% black.⁴⁰

Blacks in management. Finally, blacks were grossly underrepresented in management in all the companies.⁴¹ (See Table 15.) Nationwide, about one in every four whites are in management. The chance that a white employee will reach management is 4.7 times greater than the chance that a black employee will reach management.

TABLE 15.—DISTRIBUTION OF ANGLOS AND BLACKS IN MANAGEMENT, DEC. 31, 1970

Company	Percent of all Anglos who are in management	Percent of all blacks who are in management	Concentration ratio (2)÷(3)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1. Southern Bell	19.3	0.8	24.1
2. South Central Bell	20.4	1.1	18.5
3. Southwestern Bell	19.7	1.6	12.3
4. C. & P. (4 units)	24.6	4.4	5.6
5. Bell of Pennsylvania	24.4	4.7	5.2
6. New Jersey Bell	25.1	5.2	4.8
7. New York Telephone	28.5	5.9	4.8
8. Wisconsin Telephone	22.9	4.8	4.8

Company	Percent of all Anglos who are in management	Percent of all blacks who are in management	Concentration ratio (2)÷(3)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
9. Mountain States Bell	22.8	4.9	4.7
10. Pacific Telephone	26.1	6.0	4.4
11. Illinois Bell	28.4	7.9	3.6
12. Michigan Bell	22.8	6.5	3.5
13. New England Telephone	21.2	6.2	3.4
14. Indiana Bell	25.9	7.8	3.3
15. Ohio Bell	24.9	7.9	3.2
16. Pacific Northwest	21.8	7.6	2.9
17. Northwestern Bell	21.6	7.7	2.8

Source: EEOC W-659.

Consistent with the established pattern in nonmanagement classifications, the Southern companies have the lowest representation of blacks in management. In even the "best" companies, however, the chance that a white will reach management is three times that of blacks. As noted in Chapter 7, the lack of black managers in companies like New York Tel., New Jersey Bell, Michigan Bell, Ohio Bell, Bell of Pa., and Pacific Tel. cannot reasonably be explained by the claim that "these things take time." Those companies have been hiring blacks for decades.

Salaries disparities. The concentration of blacks in the low-paying Operator and service worker jobs, their underrepresentation in the Service Representative and craft jobs, and their virtual exclusion from top craft and management positions is shown quite dramatically when average salaries for blacks and Anglos are compared. In the 30 SMSA's at the end of 1970, 78.7 percent of all black employees were in jobs paying a maximum basic annual wage of \$7,000 or less; only 39.5 percent of all white employees were in jobs having such a low salary.⁴² Thus, the chance that a black employee will have a salary of \$7,000 or less is roughly twice as great as that of a white employee.

Even more staggering is the disparity in jobs paying \$10,000 or more. While 28.2 percent of all whites are in jobs with a maximum basic annual salary of \$10,000 or more, only 5.6 percent of all black employees had jobs with such wages.⁴³ In two Southern SMSAs Greensboro and Mobile no blacks held jobs which pay over \$10,000, while 355 white employees held such jobs.⁴⁴ In each of the 30 SMSAs, including those in which blacks have been employed for more than a generation, the chance for a white employee to reach a job paying \$10,000 or more is at least four times greater than for a black employee.

Conclusion

The evidence for December 31, 1970, demonstrates the inexorable effect of the occupational trends discussed in the historical section. The early relegation of blacks to laborer and service worker jobs is reflected in the fact that a black is still 5½ times more likely to wind up a Janitor than is a white. A black is also 3 times more likely to be an Operator. But the high-paying craft jobs are an entirely different story. A black has less than half a chance that a white has of obtaining one of those jobs. Thus, it is absolutely clear that blacks are not randomly distributed in all jobs. The concentration of blacks in the least desirable jobs and the relative exclusion of blacks from the best jobs certainly does not support Bell's claim of leadership. On the contrary, the evidence would support exactly the opposite conclusion.

Summary

Thirty years after the Bell System first began to desegregate and six and one-half years after equal employment became the law of the land, Bell companies in most of the 30 SMSA's still employed blacks at a rate

less than that of the population or lower even than the average of all major employers. —The companies in the South had failed by large measure to match even the minimal efforts of the rest of the System.

—Those black workers that have been employed in the Bell System have been largely relegated to the lowest paying, least desirable jobs in the companies.

—The black worker does not have an equal chance to be hired, and, if hired, he or she does not have an equal chance to get the best jobs.

—Most blacks in the Bell System are female and thus suffer from a dual handicap of both race and sex.

TABLE 16.—SUMMARY OF BLACK PARTICIPATION IN THE BELL SYSTEM, DEC. 31, 1970

	Total employment	Black employment	Percent black
Officials and managers.....	88,301	2,493	2.8
Professionals.....	58,756	950	1.6
Technicians.....	4,791	269	5.6
Sales workers.....	12,113	404	3.3
Management.....	5,814	114	2.0
Nonmanagement.....	6,299	290	4.6
Office and clerical.....	359,119	53,765	15.0
Secretaries (management).....	4,929	139	2.8
Clerical and stenographic.....	141,394	17,309	12.2
Telephone operators.....	165,372	31,638	19.1
Supervisors/service assistants.....	13,440	2,031	15.1
Service representatives.....	33,093	2,583	7.8
Other business office employees.....	891	65	7.3
Craftsmen.....	192,328	8,823	4.6
Operatives.....	7,437	1,851	24.9
Service workers.....	9,605	3,585	37.3
Total.....	732,450	72,140	9.8

Source: EEOC W-659.

CHAPTER 9.—BELL SYSTEM PRACTICES AS THEY AFFECT BLACKS

This chapter will examine the hiring and promotion practices which screen out blacks from the better jobs, creating the picture of black employment that has been described in the previous Chapter.

As has been repeatedly emphasized, the low overall participation rate of blacks in most Bell System companies, relative both to the area all-industry average or the population, is quite surprising for three reasons. First, due to extraordinarily high turnover among non-management employees, the Bell System hires approximately two hundred thousand persons every year. Second, Bell System employment is concentrated in SMSA's which contain the bulk of the black population in the United States. Third, virtually all of the new employees hired by Bell System companies each year possess minimal job skills.

The conflux of these elements would lead one to expect that in almost every SMSA the black participation rate would have long ago surpassed the all-industry average. But, of course, this did not happen. The low utilization of blacks in the South is easily explained by deliberate racially discriminatory hiring practices. Elsewhere, the lag in reaching the all-industry average is largely explained by Bell System pre-employment criteria which tend to screen out blacks and screen in whites. Two criteria—paper credentials and test scores—are of paramount importance and will be examined below. Following a general discussion of educational and testing policies of the Bell System, an analysis

of labor market forces will show how the Bell System's educational and testing policies have capitalized on those economic forces to concentrate blacks into the job of Operator.

Paper Credentials for Hiring

Diploma requirement. Historically, every operating company in the Bell System required at least a high school diploma for every entry-level non-management job above service worker and laborer.¹ The impact of this requirement is obvious. Since a much greater proportion of whites graduate from high school than do blacks, a much greater proportion of the white labor market is presumed "qualified" to work in the Bell System. Nationwide in 1970, for example, 77.0% of all whites between the ages of 18 and 24 had completed high school; only 58.2% of blacks in the same age group were high school graduates.² As noted by a 1970 Southwestern Bell publication, "twice as many Negroes drop out [of high school] as do whites. In the ghetto schools the dropout rate often tops 70 percent of any given class."³

The fact that Bell companies traditionally required an applicant to possess a diploma as evidence that he or she did not drop out of high school has meant that a disproportionate number of blacks were being shut out of the Bell System, and this fact goes a long way to explain the slow progress blacks have made in most Bell companies.

Preference for diploma. While historically a high school diploma was required for all jobs in the Bell System, it is also very important to observe that the high school diploma requirement has been widely attacked because of its irrelevance in selecting good employees and its differential impact on blacks.⁴ It no longer has the same status that it once did, even in the Bell System. For the economic reasons discussed below, the high school diploma requirement was generally abandoned for the operator job many years ago.⁵

The requirement as to craft jobs is an entirely different story, however. The idea that all craft applicants have to be high school graduates is dying hard. All companies continued to require a high school diploma for craft jobs long after that requirement had been discarded for Operator.⁶ At least three companies, Illinois Bell, Ohio Bell and Southwestern Bell, used recruiting brochures in 1971 which indicate that the requirement still existed for craft jobs.⁷ Even those companies which no longer require a diploma to become a craft worker nevertheless grant a preference to high school graduates. This preference is communicated through advertisement in school newspapers and annuals, regular classified advertisements, requisition to employment agencies, and voluminous recruiting literature.⁸

A policy which prefers high school graduates will also, inevitably, prefer whites over blacks. The white advantage inherent in the high school diploma preference policy is particularly disturbing in the South. C&P (Va.), Southern, South Central and Southwestern Bell all have a long, long way to go in employing black craft workers. Under such circumstances, the continued use of the preference for high school graduates can be justified only if there is persuasive evidence that the possession of a high school diploma has some substantial relationship to actual job performance.

The Bell System has never undertaken any study, however, to validate its preference for a high school diploma and blindly grants the preference without any empirical evidence that a high school diploma is related to successful job performance. The Bell System is thus in no better position than the Duke Power Company whose use of a high school diploma requirement was declared unlawful by the Supreme Court.⁹

Educational requirements for Service Representatives. Finally, it should also be noted that while a high school diploma was the minimum requirement for employment in the Bell System, it did not qualify an applicant for all non-management jobs. Significantly, all Bell companies have required or strongly preferred some college for Service Representative and all sales jobs in the Marketing and/or Directory Department.¹⁰ Even in 1971, virtually all companies continued to require at least a high school diploma for Service Representative and sales jobs and most companies gave a preference to applicants with some college.¹¹

Obviously, due to the substantially lower educational levels which prevail among blacks, a policy which prefers some college gives a very decided advantage to white applicants. Nationwide in 1970, 31.6% of all whites in the 18 to 24 age bracket had 1 or more years of college, but only 20.0% of blacks of similar ages had at least 1 year of college.¹² Translated into employment terms, the Bell System policy of preferring applicants with some college for Service Representative or sales jobs gives whites a substantial advantage over blacks.

The Bell System appears never to have undertaken any study to determine if college training is at all related to being a good Service Representative or sales worker. Indeed, AT&T has never thoroughly analyzed either job to see what characteristics a satisfactory employee should have and has instead adopted blanket educational requirements to fill the void.¹³ This is not only very poor personnel management, but it is also very poor equal employment policy.

No employer can lawfully utilize hiring criteria which systematically reject a disparate number of blacks without any evidence that the criteria are valid predictors of job success. And yet, the nation's largest private employer does just that.

In summary, part of the explanation for the below-average black participation rate in most Bell companies lies in the educational requirements imposed by company policy. These educational requirements have had and continue to have a disparate impact on blacks and suppress black employment to a level considerably lower than it otherwise would be. The preference which Bell System paper credential requirements give to whites has been reduced over time, but significant impediments to black employment in craft, Service Representative and sales jobs still exist. No evidence has ever been presented that these paper credential requirements reliably relate to job performance.

Test score requirements for hiring

Although paper credential requirements are a serious obstacle to black employment in the Bell System, test score requirements imposed by AT&T are an even greater barrier to black applicants. As was observed in the discussion concerning sexually differentiated testing policies, Bell companies give two basic test batteries—one for craft jobs and another for Operator, clerical, and Service Representative jobs. Both of these test batteries reject a vastly disproportionate number of black applicants and hence give white applicants an appreciably better chance of getting a job in the Bell System.

Craft test battery. The specific tests which compose the craft battery have changed periodically, but the impact on blacks has remained essentially the same, irrespective of the name of the test given. In 1964, the two primary tests in the craft battery were the Wonderlic Test and the Bennett Mechanical Comprehension Test.¹⁴ This particular combination of tests has been widely used in industry and was the same set of tests which the Supreme Court rejected as being unrelated to job performance in the seminal case of *Griggs v. Duke Power Co.*¹⁵

BSQT I. In the Fall of 1964, AT&T dropped the much-maligned Wonderlic Test from the

Footnotes at end of article.

craft battery and substituted another general intelligence test published by the Educational Testing Service.¹⁴ This test is now known throughout the Bell System as BSQT I (Bell System Qualification Test I). The Bennett Test was retained until 1967 and became known as BSQT II.¹⁵ Both the BSQT I and BSQT II rejected a very lop-sided proportion of black applicants.

In one study conducted by AT&T at five Bell companies in 1965, 40% of white applicants but only 15% of black applicant scored high enough on BSQT I to qualify for craft jobs.¹⁶ Thus, a white applicant had more than two and one-half times better chance of getting a craft job than did a black. In a study of the BSQT II, 58% of all white applicants qualified but only 20% of all black applicants passed.¹⁷ In other words, a black had only 1/3 the chance of passing the BSQT II as did a white. These same disparities in qualifying rates for blacks and white on BSQT I and BSQT II are consistently reported.¹⁸

In 1968 the craft battery was changed again; BSQT II was eliminated and replaced by a test of abstract reasoning, now known as BSQT IV. This new combination of tests, BSQT I and BSQT II and BSQT IV, has the same disproportionate impact on blacks, and whites continue to obtain a substantial advantage in qualifying for craft jobs solely on the basis of test scores.¹⁹ The disadvantage blacks suffer because of low "intelligence test" scores far outweighs the disadvantage inflicted by the System's educational prerequisites.

Operator battery. Similarly, blacks score substantially lower than whites on the Operator/clerical/Service Representative battery (referred to hereafter as the Operator battery). In 1964, the Operator battery consisted of the Wonderlic Test and several very short tests such as Number Transcription, Number Comparison, Spelling and Filing.²⁰ The main test, however, was the Wonderlic, and it had a devastating impact upon black applicants. Approximately 70% of white applicants passed the Wonderlic Test while 80% of the black applicants failed.²¹

Gradually, between 1965 and 1968, Bell companies dropped the Wonderlic Test from the Operator battery and substituted a short version of the BSQT I, appropriately known as BSQT I—Short Form.²² The impact on blacks remained unchanged, however, and 70% of white applicants passed BSQT I—Short Form while 80% of the blacks failed.²³

In a study in Michigan involving 43,000 applicants, using a revised scoring technique, 69.9% of all white applicants were fully test-qualified on the Operator battery while only 29.4% of the blacks were so qualified.²⁴

Thus, the Bell System testing practices constitute a major barrier to increased black employment in the Bell System. Under these circumstances, continued use of such tests can be justified only if they validly predict who will and who will not perform satisfactorily on the job. Although the Bell System has conducted at least 27 studies of its test batteries, these studies contain virtually no evidence that the tests accurately predict job performance.²⁵ In the absence of substantial empirical evidence of job-related validity, the Bell System's test batteries cannot lawfully be used to screen out blacks.

Conclusion. Considering the very great advantage obtained by whites solely on the basis of the Bell System's paper and pencil tests, it is small wonder that the Bell System has lagged substantially behind other industries in employing blacks. Although Bell System companies have hired approximately two million unskilled workers in the last decade, most of them in SMSA's with massive black populations, paper credential prerequisites and test score requirements have acted

to keep blacks from obtaining a proportionate share of telephone company jobs. The fact that by 1971 many SMSA's had finally equaled the all-industry average for over-all black participation by employing blacks as Operators is almost exclusively a function of the labor market conditions discussed below.

Bell System practices which cause concentration of black females in Operator job

The Bell System responded to its desperate need to find enough Operator applicants by eliminating the high school educational requirement for the job and virtually ignoring the test standards which had been established for Operator applicants. Most Bell companies were forced to hire large numbers of non-high school graduates and large numbers of persons who were marginally test-qualified or actually "unqualified" based on test scores.²⁶ At the same time, because turn-over was much less in craft jobs and the pay and working conditions were substantially more attractive, Bell companies for the most part were able to maintain their traditional requirements for craft jobs.²⁷

Similarly, Bell Companies skimmed the cream off the flow of female applicants and placed them in the job of Service Representative.²⁸ Thus, the traditionally high requirements which screened out most blacks were maintained for craft jobs and Service Representative; applicants failing to meet those criteria, mostly blacks, were put in the Operator job.

In Chicago, for example, between July, 1969, and June, 1970, 71.3% of all Operators hired were black; 33.6% of all craft workers hired were black; and 29.7% of all Service Representatives hired were black.²⁹ An AT&T study of those figures concluded that the disparities were directly attributable to the labor market conditions discussed above.³⁰ A second example further illustrates the point: During a three month period in 1970, new hire data for C&P (D.C.) indicate that 92.2% of the Operators hired were black; 39.7% of the Service Representatives hired were black; and 32.9% of new craft hires were black.³¹

Viewed from any angle, all available evidence leads to the conclusion that the concentration of blacks into the Operator job is no accident. It is the direct result of deliberate company policies adopted in response to the compelling problems created by the high turnover among Operators and the low wages offered to attract applicants to the job. There is no doubt that AT&T is attempting to solve this problem by maintaining the low wages and hiring blacks who will work for a wage which whites shun.³²

Bell system practices which frustrate the movement of blacks out of the Operator's job

Most blacks in the Bell System suffer from a double handicap—they are at once both black and female and the Bell companies have never been overly generous in their treatment of either group. As the Bell companies move into the 1970's, black females continue to pour into and out of the job of Operator.

Because Operator has, since the days of Emma Nutt, been a female job, it has been cut off from the mainstream of movement upward within the System. The consistent high turn-over among Operators has reinforced AT&T's natural inclination not to transfer or promote Operators to better jobs. AT&T obviously decided that vacancies due to "dismissals" and resignations were numerous enough without creating additional vacancies by promotion and transfer.³³

The evidence surely indicates that System policy continues to follow this circular pattern. The Operator job is, quite pointedly, a horrendous job. No greater testimony to this fact exists than the unbelievably high rate at which employees bolt from the job. The Bell System's response is amazing: rather than restructure the job, improve the

wages, and provide important new avenues for promotion and transfer—changes which even common sense would suggest—AT&T has decided to keep the wages depressed and simply hire more and more black females.

The inevitable effects of these policy decisions are all too ominous. Most of the blacks in the Bell System will never have a real chance at a good job. The economic realities of the labor market will force large numbers of blacks to apply for Operator jobs. After all, any job is better than no job; any job except Operator. The realities of the Operator job will thus force blacks to quit as fast as they are forced to apply. They will never stay long enough to get a promotion or a transfer, even if such opportunities existed. This sad situation appears to be AT&T's major answer to the cries for equal opportunity.

Bell System practices which cause low utilization of blacks in management jobs

As previously demonstrated, black workers in the Bell System hold only a very small number of management jobs. As of December 31, 1970, for example, blacks held 2.3 percent of management jobs in the System nationwide although they constituted 11.5 percent of the national population.³⁴ Moreover, only one in 20 black employees was in management while one in four white employees was a manager.³⁵

The immediate temptation is to explain these disparities by claiming that "promotion to management takes time." The fact that promotion does take time and few blacks have been in the Bell System long enough to reach management is indeed part of the problem. But careful analysis shows that it is only a small part. The primary reason for the dearth of black managers in the Bell System are four: (1) most black employees are females and, being women, their chances of promotion are slim; (2) most black females are Operators in the Traffic Department, the department with the lowest percentage of managers; (3) few blacks have been hired as craft workers in the Plant Department, where the number of managers is large and which provides middle and upper management personnel for all other departments; and (4) approximately 50% of all Bell System middle and upper-level managers are college graduate hires, and black college graduates are in relatively short supply. These four factors interact so that few blacks ever make management.

Black females. First, a substantially disproportionate number of blacks in the Bell System are female. Data presented earlier show that nationwide in 1971, 79% of black employees were female.³⁶ Other material showed that females have much less opportunity to reach management than males. It is clear, therefore, that simply because a disproportionate number of blacks are female, they do not have nearly the same chance of reaching management as do whites in the Bell System.

Black Operators. Second, compounding the problem, a disproportionate number of black females are Operators in the Traffic Department where the chances of promotion are slimmest. Table 12 presented earlier, shows that in 1971 in the 30 SMSA's, the percentage of black employees in the Traffic Department is more than twice as great as in any other department. Moreover, as shown earlier, a black employee is three times more likely to be an Operator than a white employee.³⁷ Combine these facts with data which shows that the Traffic Department has far and away the lowest percentage of management employees, and it is easy to see why there are so few black managers. Most blacks "just happen" to be employed in jobs which provide the least chance for advancement.

Black craft workers. Third, looking at black employment from the other side of the coin, relatively few blacks have been hired into

craft jobs where chances of promotion are greatest.

Over-all in 1971 in the 30 SMSA's, blacks were 9.2% of Plant Department employees. This figure contrasts sharply with the 28.6% of the Traffic Department which was black. In other words, relatively few blacks are in the Plant Department. Management figures presented earlier at p. 26 show that 1 out of 5 Plant Department employees are in Management, twice the percentage of the Traffic Department.⁴⁰ Moreover, craft employees move up through the Plant Department into middle and upper management ranks of other departments, increasing the likelihood that craft workers will make management. But because blacks have not been employed in craft jobs in very large numbers, blacks have not obtained a very large number of management jobs.

Blacks in middle management. Fourth, approximately 50% of Bell System upper and middle level managers are college graduates who have been hired directly into management.⁴¹ The number of black college graduates is relatively small, of course, so that the chances of blacks being hired directly into management are remote. Census data show that in 1969, in the age group 18 to 24, 6.6% of all whites were college graduates but only 1.7% of blacks had a college degree.⁴² It is not surprising, therefore, to discover that the number of blacks hired directly into management by Bell companies is comparatively small. Nationwide in 1969, the Bell System hired over 4,000 college graduates, of whom only 4.1% were black.⁴³ This figure contrasts dramatically with the fact that blacks constituted more than 22% of non-management hires in the same year.⁴⁴

The "time lag" argument. Putting all this together yields the following picture. There are two main avenues to management in the Bell System. One path leads up through the craft jobs and the other leads through college. Since blacks hold disproportionately few craft jobs or college degrees, few blacks have made it to the management ranks in the Bell System. The fact that it "takes time" to be promoted to management hardly explains the low number of black managers in the Bell System. A more accurate explanation lies in the Bell System practices which have concentrated blacks into the jobs from which there is virtually no hope of being promoted into middle or upper management while simultaneously hiring large numbers of whites into craft jobs and large numbers of white college graduates directly into management. Until these practices are changed, there is scant hope that blacks will ever find proportional representation in Bell System management.

The experience of New York Tel. aptly illustrates this conclusion. New York Tel. has been the pioneer in black employment within the Bell System for thirty years. As of December 31, 1970, of all blacks employed in the 30 SMSA's, over one-third were employed in New York.⁴⁵ New York was the first SMSA to employ blacks in the same proportion as all industries in its area and was the first SMSA to employ blacks in excess of their percentage in the population. By December 31, 1970, blacks represented more than 24% of all employees.⁴⁶ Nevertheless, despite decades of hiring blacks, only 6% of all managers in the New York SMSA were black.⁴⁷

This small number of black managers is directly attributable to the factors discussed earlier. 80.6% of the black employees in New York were female,⁴⁸ and a New York female had only slightly better than half the chance of making management as did a New York male.⁴⁹ As of the same date, 54.4% of the black females were Operators in the Traffic Department.⁵⁰ Only one in ten Traffic employees was a manager. While 54.9% of the

Operators were black, only 10.5% of the craft workers in the Plant Department were black.⁵¹ One in five Plant employees was a manager, twice the ratio of Traffic. In addition, only 7.7% of the college graduates hired into management programs in New York in 1970 were black.⁵² In short, New York Tel. had few black managers because New York Tel.'s policies have concentrated blacks in dead-end jobs in the Traffic Department while hiring large numbers of whites into craft jobs and directly into management. Thus, it is no mere fortuity that blacks have held few management jobs in New York. The Company's policies thwart movement of blacks into management at every turn.

Summary

The requirement of a high school diploma has a disparate impact upon blacks, artificially reducing the proportion of qualified applicants who are black. Ever the softer position of "preferring" a high school diploma has the same impact.

The test batteries, both "male" and "female", reject a greatly disproportionate number of blacks, and changing the content of the test batteries has not significantly changed the rate at which blacks are disqualified.

There is no reason to believe the Bell System test batteries reliably predict job performance, and their continued use is indefensible.

The urgent need to fill and re-fill the Operator vacancies has compelled the System virtually to abandon its test requirements in order to get enough blacks to fill the job at wages which are unattractive to whites.

The dearth of black managers is due to the fact that most black employees are female Operators in the Traffic Department, the major employment group with the least chance of getting into management. Half of the middle and upper level managers are college graduates, a requirement with a greatly disparate impact on blacks.

CHAPTER 10.—CONCLUDING COMMENTS ON BLACKS IN THE BELL SYSTEM

An overview of the history of black employment in the Bell System leads to one very hard fact: in no Bell company are blacks on an equal footing with whites. Throughout the South, the lingering effects of deliberate racial discrimination are readily apparent in both the small number and types of jobs blacks hold. Elsewhere, progress in black employment has meant the hiring of large numbers of black females as Operators. There are relatively few black craft workers or black managers anywhere in the System.

This pattern of black employment is the result of many factors, including a heritage of overt exclusion, labor market conditions, and irrelevant and artificially high educational and testing requirements. For whatever reason, however, the failure of the Bell System to provide real equality of opportunity for blacks must be considered a national tragedy.

In dollar terms alone, the discrimination against blacks takes a heavy toll. Because blacks are not employed in numbers proportional to their percentage in the population and because those that are employed work in low-paying jobs, each year blacks in the 30 SMSA's lose over \$225 million. (See Chart 24.)

It would be a mistake, however, to calculate the effects of discrimination in terms of lost wages alone. Judge Gewin, of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, has eloquently described the intangible results of racially discriminatory employment practices.¹

Those who love their work may sometimes forget that a successful human community requires the performance of many rapid and colorless tasks. Even the most tedious physical labor is endurable and in a sense enjoyable, however, when the laborer knows that

his work will be appreciated and his work rewarded. "Work without home," said Cole-ridge, "draws nectar in a sieve, and hope without an object cannot live." the ethic which permeates the American dream is that a person may advance as far as his talents and his merit will carry him. And it is unthinkable that a citizen of this great country should be relegated to unremitting toil with never a glimmer of light in the midnight of it all.

CHAPTER 11.—THE INVISIBLE MINORITY

Spanish-surnamed Americans have been described as "the invisible minority," and in the Bell System this is quite literally true. Although there are significant concentrations of Spanish-surnamed Americans in the barrios and ghettos of the nation's major urban centers, and many large employers utilize them extensively in their workforce very few are employed by the Bell System. The current Bell System underutilization of Spanish-speaking minorities resembles the position of blacks in the early 1960's before the legal, economic and social pressures to provide equal opportunity began to be felt.

Every statistical measure points to the exclusion of Spanish-surnamed Americans from the System's work force, particularly at the higher levels. The same pernicious system which has blocked the progress of blacks also serves as an obstacle to Spanish-surnamed Americans. Compounding this disadvantage, however, is the Bell System's persistent neglect of Spanish-surnamed Americans.

Twelve SMSA's—A pattern of exclusion

There is really only one pattern in Bell's employment of Spanish-surnamed Americans: exclusion. For them, the statements of Pacific Tel. President Jerome W. Hull must have a particularly hollow ring.

"We never followed a policy of discrimination in employment. And for many years we have conducted programs to make our overall employment profile reflect the population characteristics of the state we serve."²

Such pious statements of intent bear no relationship to the operating companies' consistently poor performance. In none of the twelve SMSA's surveyed (each of which has a substantial Spanish-surnamed American population) does Bell's total employment of Spanish-surnamed Americans approach their proportion in the population. (See Table 17.)

In those twelve SMSA's, Spanish-surnamed Americans are employed by Bell companies at a rate only 40% of their proportion in the population. Bell would have to increase its current Spanish-surnamed employment by over 140% in order to achieve parity with the population. These statistics alone describe a pervasive pattern of discrimination.

TABLE 17.—BELL UTILIZATION OF SPANISH-SURNAMED AMERICANS RELATIVE TO THE POPULATION, 12 SMSA'S DEC. 31, 1970

SMSA	Spanish-surnamed Americans penetration ratio	Percent Spanish-surnamed ¹
Chicago.....	0.19	430.6
Dallas.....	.35	188.7
Denver.....	.56	78.9
El Paso.....	.32	210.2
Houston.....	.58	71.8
Los Angeles.....	.56	79.2
Miami.....	.25	294.1
New York.....	.36	180.3
Phoenix.....	.27	266.6
San Antonio.....	.46	115.6
San Diego.....	.53	88.1
San Francisco.....	.46	116.6

¹ Americans employment would have to increase to match population.

Source: EEOC exhibit 1, pp. 247, 251, 253, 257, 261, 269, 273, 279, 286, 293, 295, and 297.

Other indexes make the pattern conclusive. In none of the twelve selected SMSA's does Bell's employment of Spanish-surnamed Americans even approach that of other employers in their area. (See Chart 22.) Similarly, none of the three companies (Pacific Tel., Mountain Bell and Southwestern Bell) with major Spanish-surnamed populations in their operating areas employ Spanish-surnamed Americans at a rate comparable to area employers. (See Chart 21 at p. 231 above.) These Bell companies' utilization of Spanish-surnamed Americans is, in fact, quite comparable to the utilization of blacks in South Central Bell, Southern Bell and C&P (Va.).

Such a low level of Spanish-surnamed American employment, five and one-half years after the effective date of Title VII, destroys any pretentious claims of leadership in the field. It points instead to company policies which operate effectively to exclude Spanish-surnamed Americans.

The occupational position of Spanish-surnamed Americans

The few Spanish-surnamed Americans who survive Bell's hiring juggernaut are, like women and blacks, confined to the lowest non-management jobs and excluded from management almost altogether. The average Spanish-surnamed employee in the 30 SMSA's can expect to earn only 78% as much as her or his Anglo counterpart.² The most striking differences occur at the wage extremes. Although only 45% of all employees (including blacks) are paid a rate of less than \$7000 per year, 64% of all Spanish-surnamed Americans are in this lowest bracket. Conversely, while over one-fourth of all employees earn more than \$10,000 per year, only 8% of all Spanish-surnamed Americans have reached this level. (Chart 25.)

As might be expected, pitifully few Spanish-surnamed Americans within the Bell System have reached management. As noted earlier, over one-fourth of Bell's Anglo employees are managers; yet only a paltry 6% of all Spanish-surnamed employees are managers.³ Consistent with the pattern for women and blacks, almost all (90.5%) Spanish-surnamed managers are in the first level while one-third of all Anglos have progressed to more responsible and more remunerative positions.⁴

By any measure, the discrimination against Spanish-surnamed Americans is both intensive and extensive. All rationalizations for these disparities must be rejected because (1) other employers have been able to employ Spanish-surnamed Americans in much greater numbers than the Bell operating companies, and (2) Bell's employment policies inevitably lock out those of Spanish ancestry.

The policies which exclude Spanish-surnamed Americans

It is axiomatic that the same recruitment, hiring and promotion policies which screen out blacks will have a similarly disparate effect on Spanish-surnamed Americans, perhaps to an even greater degree. These factors cannot, however, account for all of the difference in participation between blacks and Spanish-surnamed Americans in cities like New York and Los Angeles. The conclusion is inescapable that while some Bell companies have made minimal efforts to employ blacks, albeit in the lowest classifications, no attempt has been made to eliminate ingrained discrimination against Spanish-surnamed Americans. Thus the patterns, cemented through years of tradition, continue unabated into the 1970's with little prospect of change.

Recruitment. Bell has never been fully cognizant of the Spanish-surnamed population in its extensive recruitment efforts. In 1971 none of the 12 SMSA's used any recruitment brochures which were printed in Spanish. In fact, in five of the SMSA's surveyed there were no brochures which even contained pictures of Spanish-surnamed employees.⁵ Bell has long recognized the need to let blacks know that they will be welcome in the company,⁶ but no such need has been felt with regard to the Spanish community.

In 1971 Pacific Tel. recognized its responsibility under the law to bring its employment picture into equality with the ethnic composition of the community.

"This isn't an easy balance to keep since often the people of the needed ethnic groups don't walk in the door. . . . If they don't come to us—and they usually don't—we're obligated to find ways to bring them in."⁷

Bell has hardly fulfilled its "obligation" to find ways to bring Spanish-surnamed Americans into the System. This callous indifference to the employment of Spanish-surnamed Americans is analogous to the Southern companies' reticence in the employment of blacks, and the result has been the same.

The interview. Spanish-surnamed interviewers are a particular rarity in Bell's central employment office. Three of the twelve surveyed SMSA's have no Spanish-surnamed interviewers and four SMSA's have only one.⁸ Dr. Felix Lopez has determined that Bell's employment interview process itself ". . . is bound to be hard on minority group applicants, particularly those who come from disadvantaged backgrounds. . . . The interviewer's cultural biases and past Company practices are bound to assert themselves in an attempt to discourage the applicant and to seek reasons for disqualifying him or her."⁹

Bell has made no systematic effort to determine whether Spanish-surnamed Americans are disproportionately rejected during the employment interview. All of the available data indicate, however, that the lack of Spanish-surnamed interviewers and the opportunity for prejudice inherent in Bell's interview process combine to screen this minority out.¹⁰

Hiring Standards. The hiring standards used by the Bell System have a particularly devastating effect on the Spanish-surnamed. The paper credential requirement (or preference) of a high school or college diploma screens out a much greater proportion of the Spanish-surnamed than Anglos.¹¹ While less than half of the Spanish-surnamed Americans in the country in the 25-34 year age bracket have completed high school, almost three-fourths of the non-Spanish-surnamed population has completed high school. Among those with some college education, the disparity is even greater. Only 15% of all Spanish-surnamed Americans have completed at least one year of college compared to 30% for all other national origins.¹² This preference for paper credentials, which is unrelated to ability or performance, eliminates a sizeable portion of the Spanish-surnamed population.

The testing requirements, discussed in detail above, screen out another large segment of Spanish-surnamed Americans. The evidence of the few studies conducted indicates clearly that Spanish-surnamed Americans score significantly lower on the average than Anglos on Bell's current test batteries. Typically, AT&T has paid little attention to the effect of its tests on those of Spanish descent. There has been at least one effort (by New Jersey Bell) to accommodate Spanish-surnamed Americans by translating the debunked Wonderlic Test into Spanish.¹³ The incongruity of an intelligence test based on the Anglo culture translated into Spanish is obvious. In fact, New Jersey Bell recognized that "there appears to be justification for

concern that the phraseology of the test questions are not readily understandable or familiar to natives of Puerto Rico, Cuba or South America."¹⁴ No other attempt has been made to translate the current tests into Spanish or to produce a culturally fair test for Spanish-surnamed applicants.

In as much as these test batteries have never been shown to be predictive of job performance for Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, Cubans, or others of Spanish descent, the only demonstrated function of these tests is to exclude Spanish-surnamed Americans. Continued use of the Bell System test batteries, without empirical evidence of their relationship to job performance, is incompatible with the System's obligation to provide equal opportunity to the Spanish-surnamed.

Besides these barriers, common to both Spanish-surnamed and black applicants, there are two unique obstacles to Spanish-surnamed employment. First, the often extraneous requirement that almost perfect English be spoken is a substantial barrier to many Spanish-surnamed Americans. Only one company, New Jersey Bell, has made specific efforts to identify those jobs for which written or spoken English is not a requirement.¹⁵ On the contrary, Pacific Tel. and Southwestern Bell continue to advertise for installers who can speak good English.¹⁶ One wonders whether installers in these companies are required to speak good Spanish when working in the barrio. Moreover, no studies have been made to determine the level of English proficiency, if any, which is required for any job.

A second hiring standard which works to the particular disadvantage of Spanish-surnamed Americans is the height requirement for certain jobs. Because they are significantly shorter than Anglos, fewer of their number will be able to meet these height standards. As pointed out in Chapter 4, these requirements are contradictory between companies and have not been shown to be necessary for performance on the job. Until such a showing, this requirement must also be rejected because of its disproportionate impact on the Spanish-surnamed.

Summary

Spanish-surnamed Americans are employed by Bell at a rate significantly lower than their proportion in the population or their proportion in the work force of area employers.

The Spanish-surnamed Americans who have found employment at Bell are in the lowest paying classifications and are virtually excluded from management.

Bell's current employment pattern with regard to Spanish-surnamed Americans is analogous to the position of blacks in the Southern companies during the 1960's.

Bell's recruitment and hiring policies which restrict black employment have an even greater impact on Spanish-surnamed Americans. Irrelevant language and height requirements further impede Spanish-surnamed employment.

Bell has made no substantial effort to improve the employment status of Spanish-surnamed Americans.

Conclusion

As with women and blacks, the most telling index of discrimination against Spanish-surnamed Americans is the annual loss of wages. Because they are denied employment at Bell and because they are confined to the lowest-paying jobs, Spanish-surnamed Americans lose over \$137 million annually. (See Chart 26.)

This figure dramatizes Bell's total unresponsiveness to the plight of the Spanish-surnamed American. This "invisible minority" has been pushed aside and ignored. The resulting deprivation is eloquently described in a poem by Rodolfo Gonzales.

Footnotes at end of article.

I am Joaquin,
Lost in a world of confusion
Caught up in the whirl of an Anglo society,
Confused by the rules,
Scorned by attitudes,
Suppressed by manipulations,
And destroyed by modern society.
My fathers have lost the economic battle,
And won the fight for cultural survival.

In a country that has wiped out all my history,
stifled all my pride.
In a country that has placed a different indignity upon my ancient burdens,
Inferiority is the new load. . . .¹⁷

Conclusion

The foregoing Prehearing Analysis and Summary of Evidence and EEOC Exhibits 1-6 are respectfully submitted,

JOHN DE J. PEMBERTON, Jr.,
Acting General Counsel.

DAVID COPUS, Attorney.

LAWRENCE GARTNER, Attorney.

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 1800 G Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20506.

FOOTNOTES

Chapter 1.—The Bell System

¹ EEOC E-11, pp. 50-51.

² EEOC Z-1929, p. 12-3.

³ EEOC W-659, pp. 65-87.

⁴ See Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas, Office of Statistical Standards, Bureau of the Budget, 1967.

⁵ The method by which these SMSA's were selected is described in EEOC Exhibit 1, pp. 474-476.

⁶ EEOC C-861—EEOC C-690.

⁷ *Ibid.*
⁸ *Ibid.*, as annotated. For a description of the annotation process, see EEOC Exhibit 1, pp. 477-480.

⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, as annotated.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, as annotated.

¹² *Ibid.*, as annotated.

¹³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, as annotated.

¹⁵ EEOC R-798, p. 6. This document is particularly important and can be found in EEOC Exhibit 5.

¹⁶ EEOC R-799, p. 5.

¹⁷ EEOC R-798, p. 7.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 26.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

²¹ EEOC C-1540, p. 9. This document is particularly important and can be found in EEOC Exhibit 5. See generally, EEOC Findings nos. 1735-1751, 1735-1751.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 10.

²³ EEOC C-661—EEOC C-690.

²⁴ EEOC Z-686, p. 2. This document is particularly important and can be found in EEOC Exhibit 5.

²⁵ EEOC C-661—EEOC C-690, as annotated.

²⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁷ *Ibid.*

²⁸ See EEOC Findings nos. 1752-1819.

²⁹ EEOC Finding no. 1776.

³⁰ EEOC Finding no. 3618.

³¹ EEOC C-1540, p. 3.

³² *Ibid.*

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

³⁴ *Ibid.*

³⁵ EEOC C-661—EEOC C-690, as annotated.

³⁶ EEOC Finding no. 4870. This finding relates solely to Pacific Tel., but it is assumed to be typical of all Bell operating companies.

³⁷ See generally EEOC C-1542—EEOC C-1546.

³⁸ *Ibid.* See also EEOC Findings nos. 4036, 4644, 4655, 4680, 4670, 4685, and 4691.

³⁹ See generally EEOC C-1542—EEOC C-1546. This program is generally limited to females and is discussed in Chapter 5 of this report.

⁴⁰ EEOC C-661—EEOC C-690, as annotated.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*

Chapter 2.—Women in the Bell System: A study in sex segregation

¹ EEOC Exhibit 1, Charts 209 and 211.

² EEOC Finding no. 31.

³ EEOC Finding no. 3618.

⁴ EEOC Finding no. 68. See also EEOC Findings nos. 193 and 1236.

⁵ EEOC Finding no. 2464.

⁶ EEOC Z-420, p. 3.

⁷ EEOC Finding no. 562. See also EEOC Finding no. 537.

⁸ EEOC W-659.

⁹ See the following EEOC Finding nos. for identification of "female" job classifications: 101, 102, 146, 150, 152, 155, 176, 182-185, 190, 202, 205, 206, 208, 209, 215, 216, 219, 220, 237, 240, 241, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 252, 254, 258, 263, 264, 304, 310, 323-326, 338, 356, 376, 379-381, 407, 415, 418, 419, 426, 431-434, 436, 438, 445-447, 458, 463-466, 478, 479, 491, 532, 542, 543, 554, 558-560, 563, 571, 580-584, 629, 631-635, 638, 639, 643, 650, 694, 695, 697, 739-742, 743-745, 756, 758, 759, 763, 764, 765, 769-771, 876, 877, 897, 934, 935, 982, 988, 991, 993, 996, 997, 1003, 1020, 1021, 1022, 1031 1037, 1038, 1041, 1042-1046, 1141 and 1143.

See the following EEOC Finding nos. for identification of "male" job classifications: 160, 165, 166, 288, 289, 291, 304, 310, 333, 335, 336, 338-340, 398, 399, 400, 407, 420, 465, 466, 518, 520, 532, 597, 598, 602, 609, 610, 612, 663, 665, 674, 675, 677, 818, 849, 876, 877, 1063, 1064, 1065, 1106, 1107 and 1108.

¹⁰ See the following EEOC Finding nos. for identification of "female" job classifications: 120, 129, 140-142, 174, 175, 179-181, 203, 231, 238, 239, 319, 320, 353-355, 368, 369-374, 405, 410, 411, 412, 424, 437, 448, 476, 477, 494, 495, 528, 535, 539, 619, 627, 628, 680, 682-684, 733, 734, 735-738, 861-863, 929, 986, 987, 1018, 1019, 1033, 1048, 1130, 1141 and 1144.

See the following EEOC Finding nos. for identification of "male" job classifications: 129, 161, 162, 173, 231, 276, 389-397, 406, 417, 424, 455, 522-528, 619, 651, 652-658, 666-673, 676, 680, 681, 683, 818-824, 861-863, 901, 1070, 1072 and 1131.

¹¹ See the following EEOC Finding nos. for identification of "female" job classifications: 123, 169, 233, 256, 257, 259, 300, 305, 306, 308, 312, 327, 328, 348, 364, 367, 413, 488-490, 540, 553, 564, 566-568, 584, 586, 616, 696, 731, 780, 894, 899, 916, 917, 925, 930, 931, 959, 994, 999-1000, 1119 and 1121.

See the following EEOC Finding nos. for identification of "male" job classifications: 171, 233, 277, 300, 306, 312, 460, 599, 600, 616, 809-812, 916, 937-940, 1068, 1091, 1095, 1096, 1103, 1119 and 1121.

¹² See the following EEOC Finding nos. for identification of "female" job classifications: 73-75, 78-80, 103, 108, 127, 154, 171, 242, 262, 322, 363, 409, 481, 482, 557, 562, 647, 711, 714, 716, 717, 718, 719, 869, 870, 885, 893, 898, 960, 981, 1140 and 1148.

See the following EEOC Finding nos. for identification of "male" job classifications: 83-85, 93, 95, 105, 106, 108, 171, 279, 330, 332, 409, 423, 506, 516, 517, 831-833, 869-870, 905, 906, 907 and 1061.

¹³ See the following EEOC Finding nos. for identification of "female" job classifications: 69-72, 81, 82, 119, 428, 440, 461, 487, 617, 702 and 902.

See the following EEOC Finding nos. for identification of "male" job classifications: 128, 138, 452, 453, 461, 617, 814, 842, 902, 903, 949, 1071, 1089, 1090 and 1109.

¹⁴ See the following EEOC Finding nos. for identification of "female" job classifications: 427, 541, 556, 573, 574, 1001 and 1122.

See the following EEOC Finding nos. for identification of "male" job classifications: 301, 307, 337, 403, 404, 451, 606, 1122, and 1999.

¹⁵ See the following EEOC Finding nos. for identification of "female" job classifications: 199-200, 204, 210, 221, 230, 255, 329, 342, 343, 345, 375, 416 (see also 417), 435, 442, 444, 492,

534, 536, 538, 555, 565, 573, 575, 578, 579, 618, 630, 636, 637, 640-642, 644, 645, 646, 649, 747-754, 757, 772, 779, 786, 787, 867, 890, 896, 901, 990, 993, 1007, 1008, 1010, 1012, 1013, 1017, 1030, 1034, 1040, 1123, 1131 and 1153.

See the following EEOC Finding nos. for identification of "male" job classifications: 225, 230, 290, 309, 334, 375, 417 (see also 416), 547, 548, 549, 572, 591, 611, 613, 618, 649, 664, 678, 679, 815, 834, 867, 904, 940, 961, 1092-1094, 1104, 1110, 1123, 1131, 1132 and 1153.

¹⁶ See the following EEOC Finding nos. for identification of "female" job classifications: 443, 483, 489, 570, 730, 926, 927, 963 and 1145.

See the following EEOC Finding nos. for identification of "male" job classifications: 90, 104, 172, 273, 510, 512, 587-589, 603, 606, 607, 608, 614 and 936.

¹⁷ See the following EEOC Finding nos. for identification of "female" job classifications: 96, 467 and 472.

See the following EEOC Finding nos. for identification of "male" job classifications: 88 and 96.

¹⁸ See the following EEOC Finding nos. for identification of "female" job classifications: 615, 700, 701, 703 and 884.

See the following EEOC Finding no. for identification of "male" job classifications: 615.

¹⁹ See the following EEOC Finding nos. for identification of "female" job classifications: 153, 186-189, 698, 699, 755, 762, 980, 995 and 1002.

See the following EEOC Finding nos. for identification of "male" job classifications: 507 and 995.

²⁰ See the following EEOC Finding nos. for identification of "female" job classifications: 124-126, 268-271, 346, 349, 351-354, 533, 864 and 918.

See the following EEOC Finding nos. for identification of "male" job classifications: 91, 92, 134, 272, 592 and 864.

²¹ See the following EEOC Finding nos. for identification of "female" job classifications: 250, 302, 303, 311, 430, 704, 706, 715, 746, 760, 761, 767, 777, 874, 882, 921, 923, 983, 984, 1009, 1124 and 1127.

See the following EEOC Finding nos. for identification of "male" job classifications: 311, 816, 874, 1124 and 1127.

²² EEOC Finding nos. 843, 920 and 928.

²³ EEOC Finding nos. 480, 531, 707, 732 and 773.

²⁴ EEOC Finding no. 785.

²⁵ EEOC Finding no. 469.

²⁶ See the following EEOC Finding nos. for identification of "female" job classifications: 97, 98, 402, 705, 706 and 1126.

See the following EEOC Finding nos. for identification of "male" job classifications: 97, 98, 402, 508, 705, 706 and 1126.

²⁷ See the following EEOC Finding nos. for identification of "female" job classifications: 708-710, 1028, 1029, 1133, 1134, 1140 and 1152.

See the following EEOC Finding nos. for identification of "male" job classifications: 828, 829, 830, 1074-1076, 1133, 1134, 1149, 1152.

²⁸ See the following EEOC Finding nos. for identification of "female" job classifications: 31-33, 35-39, 41, 44, 45, 49, 50, 54, 56, 78, 222, 362, 441, 468, 493, 494, 625, 626, 729 and 977.

See the following EEOC Finding nos. for identification of "male" job classifications: 42, 43, 48, 53, 57, 58, 60, 87, 441, 458 and 499.

²⁹ EEOC Finding no. 47.

³⁰ EEOC Finding no. 46.

³¹ EEOC Finding no. 34.

³² EEOC Finding no. 40.

³³ EEOC Finding no. 686.

³⁴ EEOC Finding nos. 497, 1049 and 1147.

³⁵ EEOC Finding no. 43.

³⁶ EEOC Exhibit 1, Table 437.

³⁷ EEOC Exhibit 1, Table 444.

³⁸ EEOC W-659.

³⁹ EEOC W-659. See also EEOC Exhibit 1, Table 448.