

INDICATORS OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN IN FARM HOMES AND IN THE AGRICULTURAL LABOR MARKET*

Marieta Bañez-Sumagaysay**

Introduction

Women and men construct and reconstruct their daily social and material lives. These experiences reflect a way of life that finds meaning as women and men play their roles and tasks. This gender-based system is interrelated and interwoven within the context of a dynamic political, economic and social order which further translate into more patterns of meanings, that is, an ideology of gender.

An ideology of gender is manifested as an ideology of familialism, involved in the assignment of appropriate roles for women and men within the household and outside of it (Eviota, 1992). Women are relegated to a way of life that is defined by maternalism, nurturance, caring and emotional spheres. Masculine protection, financial security and socio-political status/prestige are assigned to men. These socially-dictated gender-based structures are clearly revealed in the division of labor and the reproduction of labor power both at home and in the capitalistic labor market. In this set-up, where women and men define

**Revised version of a paper delivered as a Roberto S. Benedicto Professorial Chair Lecture in the Social Sciences, at UP Tacloban College on the occasion of UPVTC's 27th Founding Anniversary.*

***The author is Dean of UP Tacloban.*

their tasks, roles, power and positions in a hierarchy of varying intensities, it is most likely that there exists gender discrimination against women in favor of men.

In rice production systems in the Philippines, women's role is invisible (Paunlagui, 1997). Aside from relatively lower wages, the selective and limited farm work open to women, there are other discriminatory practices that lead to the underestimation of women's economic worth. Unpaid farm work, though productive, is perceived as part of women's domestic and housework. Women's work tend to be intermittent and perceived as less worthy as men's, hence, does not need to be valued separately.

This paper attempts to contribute to this literature by identifying socio-economic indicators of discrimination against women in their homes and the workplaces. Coping mechanisms are determined, and policy variables that may serve as entry points for gender development planning are suggested.

A descriptive survey research was undertaken in 1999 covering four key rice-producing barangays in Leyte, namely: San Diego and San Vicente in the municipality of Alang-alang; and Tibak and Milagrosa in the municipality of Sta. Fe. One hundred twenty married women who were working for pay or profit were randomly selected to become the survey respondents. Husbands of 50% of the women in each study area were also chosen for purposes of comparing perceptions between women and men. Focus group discussions were conducted to capture more information that were inadvertently missed during the interviews/survey. Data drawn from the four study areas reveal a homogeneous pattern.

Discussions in the succeeding sections are organized as follows: gender discrimination in farm homes using a gender activity profile, an identification of gender power points in farm homes, and a comparison of husband's and wife's perception

given researcher-identified hypothetical scenarios that commonly transpire in the life of a farm household. The same treatment is used in the discussion for gender discrimination in the agricultural labor market.

Actual survey data and actual responses of the research subjects are analyzed in the context of the traditional ideology of gender. Among other experiences revealed by the primary data, the author derives and proposes in this paper the various modes of discriminatory perception in farm homes and in the agricultural labor market.

Discrimination Defined

The literal definition of discrimination is “to distinguish.” When a person has a discriminatory taste for wine, then he has a desirable trait since he can judge the quality of things (Filer, et al., 1996). However, when the term is used to refer to treating two identical individuals in a different manner because of the sex/gender factor, then it takes on a negative connotation. How is gender discrimination manifested in farm homes and in the agricultural labor market? How realistic is the “good old picture” where women were women, men were men, and both knew their proper place?

Gender Discrimination in Farm Homes

Farm homes are the basic production-cum-consumption unit in an agricultural economy. Family members behave in conformity with socially-defined roles. Their attitudes are shaped and influenced by socially-perceived notions of what a wife must be and do, what a husband must be and do. Children are not found outside these socially dictated constructs. Daughters are assigned tasks which prepare them and affirm their femininity. On the other hand, sons are assigned to tasks which train and turn them

out into dominant positions in the family homes during their adult lives.

Division of Labor.

An indicator of gender discrimination in farm homes stems from the adherence of wives and husbands to the traditional division of labor which results in the wife being financially dependent on the husband. Wives are perceived to have a comparative advantage in housework because they do the tasks better than men. They become household system maintainers, husband carers, and child rearers. That is to say, women have comparative advantage, or a higher value of time spent at home relative to market earning power as compared to men (Blau and Ferber, 1992).

Husbands, on the other hand, are perceived to have a comparative advantage in market work. At home, they are expected to do less housework. They are raised not as homemakers, and their potential homemaking skills are not honed for not being trained as such since birth.

Children are treated in a similar manner. That is, according to gender rather than individual talents (Blau and Ferber, 1992). Girls specialize in homework while boys go fishing, hunting and join war games. Their respective skills continue to diverge along a continuum as they get more socially-accepted "on the job training" in the home from their parents. Gender discrimination is strengthened as basis for assigning domestic tasks and roles rests not on any other factor but on gender differences.

This traditional and discriminatory division of labor is revealed in farm household's everyday family dynamics. The completion of a household task depends on three aspects: its control, responsibility, and labor. Control lies on the decision-maker who determines how the task is to be done, who will do

the task, and when to do it. Responsibility lies on the family member who is supposed to do the task by virtue of his position in the family and/or his gender. Labor, on the other hand, lies on the family member who consummates the activity. These assignment of tasks and roles are culturally reinforced as wives and daughters are socio-culturally perceived of having comparative advantage in homework. Meanwhile, husbands and sons are perceived of having comparative advantage in the more physical and masculine constructs/roles.

The Gender Activity Profile (Figure 1) of farm homes in the study areas show that carpentry work, gathering firewood, fetching water, mopping the floor and feeding pets/poultry are assigned to husbands and sons. Husbands control and are responsible for these activities. Sons are responsible too. Both provide labor. Mothers and daughters help when time permits. They are assigned to cook, wash dishes/clothes, sweep the yard, mend/take care of clothes, preserve food, do the marketing and budgeting. Husbands and sons take part based on their convenience. It is not uncommon though, to cross gender-role-borders, but only to lend a hand or provide labor, and not as a form of primary responsibility or control.

The same traditional and discriminatory division of labor reflects unequal access to resources and is likely to generate differences in productivity which may not necessarily bring optional results for the family. However, the farm homes seem to happily live this traditional way of life. The impact of rapid technological change and globalization have not as yet correspondingly and significantly changed the farm households' ideology of gender.

Figure 1.
GENDER ACTIVITY PROFILE
 (Alang-alang and Sta. Fe, Leyte, 1999)

<i>Budgeting</i> ÀCRL	
<i>Decision Making</i> ÀCRL ÆCRL	
<i>Cooking</i> ÀCRL ÆL ©RL	<i>Fetching water</i> ÀRL ÆCRL ©L §RL
<i>Washing Clothes</i> ÀCRL ÆL ©RL	<i>Carpentry Work</i> ÆCRL §L
<i>Sweeping the Yard</i> ÀCRL ©RL	<i>Gathering Firewood</i> ÀL ÆCRL ©L §RL
<i>Mending clothes</i> ÀCRL ©RL	<i>Feeding Pets/Poultry</i> ÀL ÆCRL ©L §RL
<i>Childcare</i> ÀCRL ÆRL ©L	<i>Mopping the Floor</i> ÆCRL §RL
<i>Marketing</i> ÀCRL ÆL ©RL	
<i>Cleaning the House</i> ÀCRL ÆL ©RL §L	
<i>Washing dishes</i> ÀCRL ÆL ©RL §L	
<i>Preserving Food</i> ÀCRL ÆL ©RL §L	

Legend: C — Control R — Responsibility L — Labor
 À — Wife Æ — Husband
 © — Daughter § — Son

Gender Power Points at Home

Survey data show that most decision making activities in farm homes are done by both husbands and wives. These include domestic concerns such as number and spacing of births, children's schooling, family leisure activities, children's marriages, to let or not to let children work for pay or profit. These areas of concern are perceived to be gender-fair. However, if the assumption of a financially dependent wife is to be pursued, it can be surmised that even if both husband and wife ultimately make common decisions, chances are she may be under greater pres-

Figure 2
GENDER POWER POINTS IN FARM HOMES
 (Alang-alang and Sta. Fe, Leyte, 1999: N=120)

Domestic Concerns	Major Decision-maker		
	Husband	Wife	Both
• Children's schooling	5	14	101
• Menu for the day	22	87	31
• Number and spacing of births	25	40	55
• Family leisure activities	15	28	77
• Working children	15	23	82
• Housing materials used	57	30	33
• Where babies are delivered	17	81	22
• Animals to domesticate	78	17	25
• Choice of residence	65	10	45
• Purchase of non-food items	13	68	39
• Children's marriage	15	8	97
• Community organizations to join	61	34	25

sure to subordinate her wishes to her husband's (Blau and Ferber, 1992). Hence, his claim of dominating familial decisions.

Gender discrimination exists when wives or oftentimes the husbands, dominate decision making along areas perceived to be traditionally a female or a male concern, respectively. That is, there seems to be no basis for either husband or wife to make decisions along specific concerns except that they belong to different gender groups. As reflected in Figure 2, wives decide on where babies are delivered, the menu for the day, non-food items to be bought, and dresses to wear. These are again reflective of nurturance and maternalism constructs which women are made of. Husbands decide on the choice of residence, the housing materials, animals to domesticate, and participation in community organizations. These are reflective of things ascribed to men, namely: protection, security and prestige.

Perceptions as Subtle Barriers

Gender discrimination is again reflected by the way women and men who are caught in the same scenario/situation are perceived differently solely because of gender differences. The socialization process influences the self-esteem of women and men. This includes perceptions of gender-appropriate competencies and behavior (Blau and Ferber, 1992). Family, friends and community members shape an individual's attitudes and behavior. As girls grow, they internalize what is properly female and what "unfeminine" behavior to reject. As boys grow, they internalize traditional gender stereotypes and similarly behave according to what is socially-dictated.

To determine how this traditional ideology of gender shapes the lives of farm households, the researcher pre-identified hypothetical scenarios/situations that commonly happen in a farm household's life. Figure 3 lists these scenarios/situations with the

corresponding actual responses of husbands and wives. Unsurprisingly, women and men respondents exhibit generally common perceptions to a given scenario. For example given the scenario: upon arriving home from the fields, the couple quarrels. Both women and men respondents perceive this way: HE is tired from work. SHE must keep quiet if she does not want to be mistakenly called as quarrelsome or a nagger. The similarity in perception reinforces the traditional ideology of gender and is socio-culturally reinforced by the same.

How are perceptions discriminatory? Based on the primary data, the author derives four modes of discriminatory perception. First is through the use of excuses. In the example cited above, the husband is given a good excuse to quarrel with his wife. He is tired. He is the man in the home and, therefore, all other family members must move as defined in relation to his experience. She should keep quiet. This discrimination is strengthened under assumptions of a financially dependent wife.

Second is through the use of an appeal to emotion. When a husband lends a hand to his wife who is doing a traditionally-female task, it is perceived as "*utang na loob*" of the woman for her husband's act of kindness. Example: doing the laundry. The perception is: HE is doing it for a sick wife, or a wife who just delivered a baby. SHE is doing an obligation.

Third is through the use of comparisons. When an activity is viewed as inappropriate for one who seemingly fits the role, it is labeled as bad. When the opposite sex does the same, it is labeled as worse. Example: engaging in games of chance. The perception is: It is bad for HIM to do it. It is worse if SHE does it.

Figure 3.
PERCEPTIONS AS SUBTLE INDICATORS
OF DISCRIMINATION IN FARM HOMES:
Actual Responses of Husbands and Wives to
Researcher-identified Hypothetical Situations
(Alang-alang and Sta. Fe, Leyte, 1999)

Situation	Husband's Perception		Wife's Perception	
	If HE does it	If SHE does it	If HE does it	If SHE does it
Upon arriving home from the fields, the couple quarrels and shouts angrily at each other	HE is tired from work HE finds out that his wife did not do her domestic duties	SHE is a nagger. (<i>suraban</i>) SHE is at fault and must not quarrel with her husband (<i>sayop han babaye</i>) SHE wants to dominate over her husband. (<i>gusto ada anderon an iya bana</i>)	HE is tired from work, but he should not quarrel with his wife that way	SHE is quarrelsome. SHE must keep quiet when her husband is angry. (<i>palaaway ada iton babaye</i>)
On a lazy Sunday afternoon, the husband or wife enjoys a drinking session with friends	HE is relaxing. If he becomes drunk, it is okay because he is a man	SHE is a drunkard. Drinking liquor does not befit her as a lady. (<i>diri naangay kitaon</i>)	HE is a drunkard. Although it is natural for him, it is not good to be a drunkard.	SHE is just socializing. If she gets drunk, then it does not speak well of being a woman.
Doing laundry; washing dishes.	HE has to do the wife's work only due to emergencies like: she is sick or has just given birth.	SHE is doing her work and obligation. (<i>mga babaye, labandera man gud</i>)	HE is helpful and cares for his wife. (<i>but-an nga bana</i>)	SHE is doing her work and obligation. (<i>natural la ito kay katungdanan man gud han babaye</i>)
Engaging in games of chance e.g. <i>tongitis</i>	HE is a bad example for his children.	SHE is a worse example if she does it.	HE is setting a bad example.	SHE is worse than her husband who does it.
Seen happily conversing with the opposite sex on several occasions	HE feels that they are just friends. Affair or no affair, it is acceptable.	SHE must be having an affair with him. Not good to see. (<i>uyab ada</i>)	HE can always do that but there might be something fishy.	SHE feels that it is not good to look at. SHE might be flirting. (<i>napikat</i>)
Getting sick.	HE is overworked. HE was not given enough care by his wife. (<i>pabaya an asawa</i>)	SHE did not take care of herself.	HE must have been overworked. HE must be a drunkard.	SHE is overworked both at home and in the fields. (<i>diri na nakakaakos kay damo iton iya trabaho</i>)
Cockfighting on Sundays.	HE is a gambler, but that is acceptable. (<i>waray sapayan</i>)	SHE should not do it. It does not befit a woman. (<i>waray angayan</i>)	HE is a gambler and it is okay, especially if he brings home his winnings.	SHE is a gambler and it is not nice for her to be one. (<i>mala-in kitaon</i>)

Figure 3. PERCEPTIONS

Situation	Husband's Perception		Wife's Perception	
	If HE does it	If SHE does it	If HE does it	If SHE does it
	HE is doing it for leisure. (<i>kalingawan</i>)			
Gathering firewood or fetching water for home use.	HE is a responsible family man. Even if he is tired from farm work, he still gathers firewood.	SHE should not let her husband do it alone. She must help him.	HE is helpful. (<i>mabinuliganon</i>)	SHE is more responsible because she still finds time to help her husband. (<i>makugi nga asawa</i>)
Looking for a store where the family can buy on credit. Or looking for a person who can lend money to the family	HE should not do it; his wife should. (<i>bangin ander de saya</i>)	SHE is supposed to take care of the family budget. SHE can do it much better than her husband.	HE is responsible. HE understands how hard it is to make both ends meet.	SHE cannot afford to be ashamed of doing it. SHE is a responsible wife/mother.
Leaving the house in a non-working attire on an otherwise working day.	HE is not going to the farm. HE is going to see the landlord in town.	SHE is trying to look sexy and beautiful. (<i>garbosa hiya</i>) SHE might flirt.	HE is lazy. He is not going to work today.	SHE is trying to look presentable because she is going to see the landlord. (<i>mukhang tao</i>)

Fourth is the through the use of a double standard. An activity is acceptable if done by males, but not acceptable if done by females. Example: cockfighting. The perception is: HE is relaxing; it is okay. SHE is a gambler, and it is not fit for a lady.

Gender Discrimination in the Agricultural Labor Market

The woman's experiences inside her home extends to her way of life in the agricultural labor market. The nature of her domestic tasks/roles and positions in the gender hierarchy has a mirror image in the workplace. As noted earlier, gender discrimination exists when two equally qualified individuals are treated differently solely on the basis of gender (Ehrenberg and Smith, 1994; Blau and Ferber, 1992).

Gary Becker (1957, rev. 1971) first formalized a theory of discrimination, most specifically the taste discrimination models which allow for employee, employer and customer discrimination (Goldin, 1990).

Employer Prejudice

In the informal agricultural labor market, the co-worker is not the source of taste discrimination. Male farmers welcome women as co-workers as the latter are viewed as appendages to the male-dominated farm work. The customer is neither the source of taste discrimination since the users of farm outputs buy the goods not on the basis of the gender of the person who produced those goods. It is then the employer who is the source of taste discrimination. Employers have a distaste or prejudice against minority groups, that is, the women because of a characteristic unrelated to intrinsic aspects of productivity (Goldin, 1990). This characteristic is the gender factor.

Taste discrimination is measured by the wage the employer would offer a woman relative to an equally qualified male (Filer, et al., 1996). There are two forms of gender discrimination. First, employers pay women less than men with the same experience and working under the same conditions in the same jobs. Second, women with the same productive potential as men are shunted into lower-paying occupations or levels of responsibility by employers who reserve the higher-paying jobs for the men. These are called wage discrimination and occupational segregation, respectively (Ehrenberg and Smith, 1994).

If the employer hires male workers at wage w , said employer's discrimination coefficient, d , is

$$d = \frac{w}{wm} - 1$$

where wm is the wage the employer is willing to offer a woman. This equation means that the employer demands higher output from the woman if she is to be offered the same wage as the man. Their output must exceed by the percentage d (Filer, et

al., 1996). The larger the value of d is, the more unwilling is the employer to hire a woman no matter how low is her wage. If d is negative, it means that the employer's taste discriminates in favor of women.

Along this gender discrimination framework the primary data reveal a Gender Livelihood Map (Figure 4) where wage discrimination coefficient between gender in rice production-related farm work is zero. However, these are in only few and limited culturally-dictated gender-based activities. These include planting, transplanting, weeding, drying the palay, harvesting and winnowing.

The zero coefficient, however, must not be construed as the absence of gender discrimination, for there are subtle barriers which employers use when they prefer men over women. First, although these aforementioned types of work are open to both women and men, they have unequal access to the labor market. In the research areas, it was observed that male workers are first to be hired. Women are employed only when there is a shortage of labor. Male workers are considered the primary labor and women are merely appendages to men's work. It seems that employers have prejudice against hiring women even before they are hired.

Second, although wages are equal for both women and men in these same activities, men are more certain of being at work for a longer period than the women are. As a buffer labor, women are first to be fired. Their labor force participation can be intermittent and irregular. They compete with adult males who are perceived to be more productive in the farms, and with child laborers who accept lesser pay for the same work. In both cases, employers discriminate against hiring women.

Third, not all paid farm work is open to both sexes. Plowing the fields and other activities which are related to land/seedbed

Figure 4.
Gender Livelihood Map
(Alang-alang and Sta. Fe, Leyte, 1999)

Activity	Person Responsible		Activity	Person Responsible	
	Husband	Wife		Husband	Wife
Paid Work:			Off-farm Work:		
• Plowing the field	PhP150-160/day		• Hair styling		X
• Planting	PhP70-75/day	PhP70-75/day	• Baking bread		X
• Transplanting	PhP65-70/day	PhP65-70/day	• Banana cue vending		X
• Weeding	PhP70-75/day	PhP70-75/day	• Dressmaking		X
• Drying the palay	PhP100.00/day	PhP100.00/day	• Tending a sari-sari store		X
• Harvesting	1/5 of harvest	1/5 of harvest	• Mat weaving		X
• Winnowing	1 ganta/cavan	1 ganta/cavan	• Midrib broom making		X
Unpaid Farm Work:			• Livestock raising	X	X
• Seed selection and germination	X	X	• Gathering firewood for sale	X	
• Seedbed/land preparation		X	• Copra drying	X	
• Fertilizer application	X		• Fishing	X	X
• Pesticide application	X	X	• Vegetable farming	X	
• Storing the harvest		X	• Tuba gathering	X	
• Pounding the palay		X	• Pedicab driving	X	
• Bringing palay to the mills		X	• Contractual work as janitor	X	
• Pasturing the carabao		X	• Laundry services		X
• Cooking for farm laborers	X	X	• Domestic services		X
• Buying farm inputs		X			
• Cleaning farm tools	X	X			
• Keeping birds away from the fields		X			
• Threshing		X			
• Marketing of palay/rice					

preparation are not open to women. This is a prejudice which is influenced by perceptions of differences in levels of productivity of female and male workers. That farm work requires physical effort and women are perceived to be weak is based on the traditional ideology of gender. Women are perceived to be less productive in farm work.

Fourth, women have more unpaid farm work than the men. They are not paid for sowing the seeds, threshing, fertilizer application, pounding the palay, bringing the palay to the mills, pasturing the carabao, cooking for/feeding the farm laborers, buying the farm inputs, cleaning farm tools, and keeping the birds away from the fields. These are unpaid work, yet are important segments in the whole rice production system. Women are not paid for doing these because the work is perceived to be light, or it is a prerequisite for her to qualify as priority labor when harvest/planting time comes, or it is perceived as merely an extension of homework. The non-monetization of these activities marginalizes the woman and perpetuates her being discriminated against the men in the workplace.

The seasonality of farm work means that the farm cannot provide a stable and regular job. It affects men. The effect is worse on women. Secondary off-farm work is resorted to. Based on the Gender Livelihood Map (Figure 4), gender discrimination exists in terms of the type of work that are open to women and men. Whatever are socially-perceived as appropriate for either sex are extensions of the division of labor in the homes. Dressmaking, tending sari-sari stores, vending, food processing and hair styling perfectly fit maternal constructs for which wives were prepared for. On the other hand, men raise livestock, gather firewood, go fishing, gather tuba, drive pedicabs, and dry the copra. These are perceived to be physically straining, therefore, masculine.

Power and Status Inequalities

Parallel to gender power points in farm homes are gender inequalities in power and status in the workplace. In Figure 5, gender discrimination is revealed by the nature of decisions either women or men make. Those that directly affect farm production are reserved for the men. They decide on the farm technology used, the farm inputs, use of fertilizers/pesticides, and hiring farm labor. On the other hand, decisions made by the woman are limited to those which concern herself and those which are extensions of her domestic roles/tasks. These include the extent of her labor force participation, the marketing of farm output, and the budgeting aspect of farm operations. This pattern of gender specialization to specific tasks reaffirms the traditional ideology of gender. This does not exclude areas where decision making is increasingly now being done by both women and men. These are the types of off-farm work to engage in, seeking financial/technical assistance, and the farm rituals performed.

The aforementioned findings further lend credit to the traditional gender ideology framework where men are perceived to be the breadwinner, a position where power resides. It is the "power of the purse" which proves his claim to dominate familial decision making. Consequently women are perceived to be weaker and therefore, must follow.

Biased Evaluation

The family itself strengthens stereotypical views of appropriate occupations for women and men. It trains daughters and sons towards gender-appropriate productive activities. It teaches the children to aspire for gender-appropriate lines of work. These social forces find reinforcement in the workplace. Similar socio-economic processes and relationships are perceived differently

when done by a woman or a man. Since the rice farming sector is viewed as male-dominated it is unsurprising to find subtle indicators of discrimination against women, as revealed in the study.

Figure 5.
Gender Power Points in the Workplace
 (Alang-alang and Sta. Fe, Leyte: N= 120)

	Decision Maker		
	Husband	Wife	Both
• Extent of wife's labor force participation	39	69	12
• Farm technology used	84	15	21
• Type of farm inputs	86	14	20
• Use of fertilizer/pesticide	90	15	15
• Marketing of crops	31	67	22
• Hiring of farm labor	70	34	16
• Off-farm work to engage in	22	24	74
• Budgeting for farm operations	21	83	16
• Seeking financial/technical assistance	35	17	68
• Farm rituals performed	11	38	71

Figure 6 shows actual responses of husbands and wives to hypothetical situations identified by the researcher. The similarity of the responses across gender implies that the farm household is still caught in the traditional gender ideology. There is discriminatory perception manifested in the workplace. From the primary data, the author derives four more modes of discriminatory perception. First, through the use of gender-appropriate traits as frame of reference. Women are socialized to em-

phasize appropriate “feminine” personality traits such as being nurturant and emotional. Men are stereotyped towards “masculine” personality traits such as competitiveness and rationality (Blau and Ferber, 1992). Example: the landlord gets angry because of a poor harvest. The perception is: HE will take it lightly, and promise to work harder next time. SHE will feel sorry, worried, and will even cry.

Another example: talking with co-workers about her/his family. The perception is: HE is motivated to work harder because he is concerned about the welfare of the family. SHE is disturbed about family matters and will not be able to work well.

Second, through the use of perceived gender-appropriate competencies. Women and men are oriented towards the idea of what is properly female or male. Girls are reared to believe that they lack “masculine” competencies and should not try to develop one. An example is seeing one riding on a carabao. The perception is: HE is hardworking. SHE is not fit to do it; but she can do it anyway because she has to help her husband.

Third, through the use of biased evaluation. When women venture into a male domain like displaying an otherwise “masculine” characteristic, the woman may find it difficult to deconstruct traditional gender-based perceptions. Example: carrying a sack of rice/palay on top of her/his head. The perception is: HE is industrious. SHE must have been forced by circumstances. Where is her husband? This is not part of her work.

Fourth, is the use of double standards. Bringing a radio set or a popular tabloid to the workplace solicits the perception that: HE needs it in order to be able to relax in the workplace. SHE is interested in the latest showbiz gossip; she will not be able to work well.

Figure 6.
 PERCEPTIONS AS SUBTLE INDICATORS OF
 DISCRIMINATION IN THE WORKPLACE
 (Alang-alang and Sta. Fe, Leyte)

Situation	Husband's Perception		Wife's Perception	
	If HE does it	If SHE does it	If HE does it	If SHE does it
Seen riding on a carabao before the sun rises.	HE is on his way to work. It is a natural/common sight among farmers. (<i>waray kaso</i>)	SHE should not ride on a carabao. But it is okay because she is helping her husband.	HE is doing what he is supposed to do. (<i>natural lang</i>)	SHE was instructed by her husband to pitch in for him. Where is the husband.?
The landlord is very angry because of a poor harvest.	HE will take it lightly, but will feel sorry HE might promise to work harder next time. (<i>unsaon man</i>)	SHE will feel sad, sorry and will look pitiful. SHE should not be scolded	HE will not really care and will even reason out. (<i>diri man kita an nagbubuot ban panahon</i>)	SHE will be disturbed. SHE will look pitiful and will even cry.
Carrying a sack of rice/palay on top of her/his head.	HE is doing a part of his work anyway. (<i>natukdo man gud an lalaki</i>) HE is industrious.	SHE is not fit for it. Where is her husband? But it is good that she is helping her husband.	HE is responsible and hardworking.	SHE must have been forced by circumstance. Pity her. This is not her work. Where is the husband? (<i>dako nga insulso ha bana</i>)
Harvesting or threshing in the farms.	HE is doing what is expected of him.	SHE has to help her husband to augment the family income.	HE is expected to do that.	SHE wants to help her husband earn for the family's upkeep.
On the way to the farm, s/he is carrying a radio set and/or a popular tabloid.	HE needs the radio and the tabloid to be able to relax. (<i>pagtambal han kagul-anan</i>)	SHE is not going to work well because she will listen to the newest showbiz gossip.	HE needs it to while the time away. (<i>lingaw-lingaw</i>)	SHE will not work well. (<i>langan ha trabaho</i>)
Talking with his co-workers about family matters.	HE will be motivated to work harder in order to earn more for the family.	SHE will opt to concentrate on family matters rather than those which are work-related.	HE is concerned about family welfare.	SHE will be disturbed about family problems. She will not be able to work well.

Coping Strategies

The traditional ideology of gender in farm homes and the agricultural labor market continually reinforces gender discrimination. Within this experience which has almost always taken a negative connotation are farm homes which remain intact, and farm production units which seemingly do not declare bankruptcy the way the industrial sector does.

Two main coping strategies are identified in the study. First is the adherence of women and men to the traditional division of labor. This is the existing, most common strategy used. Allocation of responsibilities, definition of tasks and power positions, and the assignment of roles are based on cultural norms which are unrelated to individual skills and interests. These functions/processes are carried out according to what is perceived as gender-specific and gender-appropriate.

The greater is the husband's contribution to family income, the more the wife gives him the power to make decisions for the family. A more financially dependent wife will find herself putting in greater psychic investments for the welfare of the family. These are in terms of greater self-sacrifice and altruism in favor of her husband's desires and definition of norms in domestic and work-related concerns.

An alternative coping strategy for gender discrimination against women is to venture into a nontraditional way of life. This, connotes assigning tasks and functions at home and in the workplace not on the basis of gender roles, but on the basis of individuality. That is a recognition of an individual's talents, skills, expertise and limitations as a person, not as a husband or a wife; son or daughter. This, however, is viewed as radical and less likely to succeed since it does not find support from the basic social institutions like the family, the church and the educational system.

The Prospects

Discrimination results from the perception that a woman does not “fit in” with the group as well as a man does (Blau and Ferber, 1992). Women are less preferred because of their gender which automatically carries with it traditionally-nurtured stereotypes. To venture outside the feminine sphere is to face sanctions from existing institutions. (This may not necessarily be as true in the urban counterparts.) Women occupy lower positions at home and in the workplace because of their gender, not because of their competencies and skills. Women who are equally qualified with men are treated differently solely on the basis of gender.

The extent of gender discrimination is difficult to accurately measure (Filer et al., 1996). Differences in earnings between gender does not provide much information regarding true discrimination. It does not provide information regarding how much results from discrimination prior to entry into the labor market, and how much results from nondiscriminatory tastes in workers’ tastes, preferences, and abilities. Discrimination takes subtle forms within the context of a traditional ideology of gender in farm homes and the workplace. Non-pecuniary vectors such as perceptions cannot be ignored in a gender discrimination model.

The division of labor that exist in farm homes actively prepares/trains girls and boys to become “feminine” and “masculine,” respectively. As adults, they affirm their femininity and masculinity by playing roles and occupying positions accordingly as dictated by tradition and norms. These behaviors are reinforced when they seek employment in farm production systems. The type of work engaged in are extensions of homework and the domestic division of labor. Employers perceive women and men based on gender stereotypes. Since the men get better

work terms, the family responds by placing priority on the husband's work and encourages the household to prepare sons to aspire for better work terms in future adult life in the labor market.

This is called the feedback effect, or more commonly termed as the "vicious cycle." Discrimination against women in the labor market reinforces traditional gender roles in the family while adherence to traditional gender roles in the family reinforces gender discrimination in the labor market (Blau and Ferber, 1992). The ideological reproduction of gender is, therefore, a reciprocal and reinforcing cycle of relations between the ideology of gender and the specific structures and institutions within which it revolves (Eviota, 1993).

Gender discrimination is widespread and persistent. Its persistence is the result of forces or motivations that are either non-competitive or very slow to adjust to competitive forces (Ehrenberg and Smith, 1994). Breaking the vicious cycle requires a redefinition of the traditional ideology of gender and the redirection of market forces towards more competitive practices.

On the demand side of the market, equalization of labor market conditions and incentives will encourage women to venture into traditionally male-dominated market activities. Mechanizing farm work and the use of female-friendly farm technologies means that an activity is carried out not on the basis of physical strength that males provide, but on individual skill and competence where women can fairly compete.

Another policy variable is the equalization of access to economic resources and factors of production. Social institutions like the school, the church, and the mass media can serve as effective vehicles for this purpose. A non-sexist media, a gender-fair curriculum, and gender-sensitive religious sector and gov-

ernment are needed towards a redefinition of the gender ideology that will encourage employers, co-workers, and customers to use nondiscriminatory labor policies.

On the supply side of the market, more women role models in major sectors of the farm production systems will attract younger women and girls towards previously male-dominated work. This will induce changes in the division of labor in farm homes. When more female workers get better working conditions and status, households will start preparing/training daughters to be like them. Women will invest in their human capital in an attempt to compete equally with men in the labor market.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, Michael; Bechhofer, Frank and Gershuny, Jonathan (eds). 1994. *The Social and Political Economy of the Household*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Blau, Francine D. and Ferber, Marianne A. 1992. *The Economics of Women, Men, and Work* (2nd ed). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Ehrenberg, Ronald G. and Smith, Robert S. 1994. *Modern Labor Economics: Theory and Public Policy*. New York: Harper Collins College Publishers.
- Eviota, Elizabeth U. 1993. *The Political Economy of Gender*. Philippines: Raintree Publishing.
- Filer, Randall K.; Hamermesh, Daniel S. and Rees, Albert E. 1996. *The Economics of Work and Pay*. (6th ed). New York: Harper Collins College Publishers.
- Goldin, Claudia. 1990. *Understanding the Gender*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Paunlagui, M. 1997, May. The Invisibility of Women's Work. *Policy Forum*. Laguna: UPLB-CPDS. 12(5).
- Rola, A. and Elazegui D. 1997, May. What a Difference Gender Makes. *Policy Forum*. Laguna: UPLB-CPDS. 12(5).
- Rosero, Mary Alice 2000. The Household as a Workplace. *Review of Women's Studies*. 10 (1&2).

Sumagaysay, Marieta B. 2000. Women, Work and Wages in a Paddy Economy. *Review of Women's Studies*. 10 (1& 2).

Tapales, P. 1993-94. Women and Sustainable Development: The Case of the Philippines. *Review of Women's Studies*. 1(1).