

An Exploratory Analysis of Culinary Educators' Constructs of Gender Equality

by

Nancy Aala

Department of Food Systems and Society

Marylhurst University

A thesis submitted on partial satisfaction of the
requirements for the degree of

Master of Science in Food Systems and Society

June 15, 2015

Advisor Jessica Spayde

(Committee page)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS.....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vi
ABSTRACT.....	vii
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
Chapter 2: Background and Significance	5
2.1 Pursuing Gender Equality Through Education.....	6
2.2 History of Culinary Schools	7
2.3 The Changing Shape of Culinary Education and Industry	9
2.4 Gender Inequality in the Restaurant Industry	10
2.5 Marginalization.....	12
Chapter 3: Methodology and Methods	16
3.1 Epistemology.....	16
3.2 Methodology.....	20
3.3 Methods	21
Chapter 4: Results, Analysis, and Contribution.....	25
4.1 Results and Analysis.....	26
4.2 Discussion of Diversity and Equality	36
4.3 Contributions and Future Study.....	39
Chapter 5: Conclusion.....	43
REFERANCE	46
APPENDIX Table of Data Collection of Text and Photo	54

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AAC	American Academy of Chefs
ACF	American Culinary Federation
CIA	Culinary Institute of America
EEOC	Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
HRSM	Human Resources of Southern Maine
NRA	National Restaurant Association
SHRM	Society of Human Resource Management
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WEF	World Economic Forum

To my parents and to my children

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank all of the people who have guided me and helped me through the thesis writing process. Thank you, Dr. Patricia Allen, for heading the incredible program and visioning with such inclusion, teaching with such kindness, and making Minkki Allen a part of the program. Thank you to Dr. Sean Gillon for the ease of attitude you impart into your teachings of complicated and complex ideologies. The “You can do this” method of teaching may be the best invention yet. Thank you Dr. Jessica Spayde, my fearless advisor, for capturing completely abstract thoughts and repeating them back to me so that I nearly understood what I just said. I could not have finished my thesis without your bold approach of laughing and then telling me its time to work more and deeper. Thank you Emily Burrueel for being the contractor who has all the answers for how the moving parts of the program work. Your work and knowledge has made all of our work possible. Literally. I would like to thank Kirk Howard for being always available and able to help. Thank you Dr. Debrah Bokowski for your “Bokowski’s Five Stages of Thesis” that hangs taped above my desk. I think it deserves a space in my References. Thank you to my Cohort, for challenging me to think deeper, read more, stay up later, and step outside of my own box; And for the laughter.

Thank you to Dr. Leslie Ann Savage, a great mentor, a great woman, and an inspiration. To Amy Noelle for taking time to read and care. And certainly, thank you to Julian, Corinne, Phoebe, and Ingrid for pretending like you understand why your mom wants to go do homework in quiet. Thank you for seeing me through the process with your unconditional understanding. I just want to be as smart as you. Dad, thank you for your support from here. Mom, thank you for the inspiration, motivation, and support from there.

ABSTRACT

It is commonly understood that gender inequality exists in society. The workplace is one area where gender inequality is prevalent. Women are paid less than men and promoted into positions of prestige less often. The restaurant industry mirrors this phenomenon. Women comprise the vast majority of restaurant industry workers, working in the least-skilled and lowest-paid positions. Opportunities for women to obtain high levels of skill and education have failed to advance women in the restaurant industry. For these reasons, it is important to investigate the relationship between gender inequality, culinary education, and the restaurant industry to discern possible areas of mitigation. I investigate this relationship using qualitative exploratory research methods to analyze the websites of culinary educational programs. My main research question is: How are culinary educational programs addressing gender inequality in the restaurant industry? The findings show explicit attempts to promote gender equality through scholarships. However, despite increased numbers of women on culinary campuses, gender inequality persists in the organizations' faculty, boards, and committees. I find that culinary education programs address gender implicitly by promoting diversity through Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which protects against discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, age, and national origin. Even though the restaurant industry is diverse in these areas, diversity has failed to create equality for women. Therefore, I argue that gender equality in the restaurant industry would benefit from more explicit measures. Such measures include grounded theory research and systemic approaches modeled after policies of Nordic countries.

Keywords: gender, equality, diversity, food system, chef, education

Chapter 1: Introduction

When *Time Magazine* released its “Gods of Food” issue (Chua-Eoan, 2013) it chose three male chefs for the cover. The three internationally known male chefs, each responsible for recent major shifts in the culinary industry, are posed with their arms crossed; they are smiling and leaning on each other. Inside the magazine, there is an illustration resembling a family tree detailing the professional lineage of over 50 world famous and influential chefs. The graphic represents the ways the chefs are interconnected as descendants of each other’s training and mentorship. The 50 chefs are represented as the creators of cuisine and the bearers of the knowledge of food through time (Arizepe, 2013). There are no women listed.

The “Gods of food” (Chua-Eoan, 2013) article could be considered disturbing for many reasons; one reason is that women are publically erased from the history of food. In actuality, women, worldwide, produce 60 to 80 % of the food in developing countries and over half the overall production for the world (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations [FAO], 1996). Across the globe, women are tasked with the work of procuring and preparing food, as well as looking after the nutritional needs of their families (Devine et al., 2009; Allen & Sachs, 2007). And in the restaurant industry, they make up the sector of the lowest-paid workers in America (Allegretto et al., 2013; Sachs, Allen, Terman, Hayden, & Hatcher, 2014).

Additionally, women workers in the food system are caught in cycles of poverty necessitating public assistance (Allegretto et al., 2013). Many women food workers on farms navigate dangerous work conditions, including the daily threat of sexual violence (Human Rights Watch [HRW], 2012). The invisibility of women in the food system is a serious symptom of gender

inequality.

In an effort to address the inequality of women in the food system, I investigate gender inequality in the restaurant industry. Specifically, I look at the relationship between women, culinary education, and gender equality outcomes in the restaurant industry. Though gender inequality exists throughout all positions in restaurants, I look specifically at inequality in the kitchen faced by women chefs. I focus on the position of chef because this is a position in restaurants where women and men both receive formal education for skill development in equal numbers, yet women remain under-employed and receive little professional acknowledgment. In the face of such apparent and explicit gender inequality, this study asks: What is being done? This research investigates culinary education programs and the chef certifying organization, the American Culinary Federation (ACF), in order to understand how they respond to gender inequality in the restaurant industry, so that the extent to which these programs mitigate or replicate gender inequality can be understood and engaged in an effort to promote equity in the field.

Although considerable research has investigated women workers in the restaurant industry (Allegretto et al., 2013; Jayaraman, 2013), less attention has been paid to inequality despite education and advanced skill. Current research focuses on the need for higher wage, better benefits, and increased opportunities for advancement (Jayaraman, 2013), but it is also necessary to address the fact that accessibility to higher wage and higher prestige positions through education have yet to alleviate gender inequality in the restaurant industry. To address gender inequality in the restaurant industry and the role of education, my thesis is structured in the following way. In the Background and Significance section I discuss the role of education in equality, and then I detail the history of culinary education and gender inequality in the

restaurant industry. The Methods and Methodology section focuses on collecting data from websites specific to analyzing how culinary education responds to gender inequality in the restaurant industry. And the Results, Analysis, and Contribution section discusses the methods used by culinary schools to diversify their student population.

I investigate culinary schools and the ACF – the largest chefs organization in the United States — because education and skill development is a prime opportunity to prepare women for equal standing in the culinary field relative to male graduates. I looked at two culinary schools, specifically, Le Cordon Bleu and the Culinary Institute of America (CIA). I chose these two culinary schools and the ACF because of their impact on education, certifications, and accreditations relevant to the field. These organizations provide scholarships, continuing education, skill development, and industry guidance. The culinary schools and the ACF also count among their faculty, boards, and committees industry professionals. Because Le Cordon Bleu, the CIA, and the ACF are comprised of both student and industry professionals, they provide a snap shot of future industry professionals (students), and current industry professionals (faculty, boards, and committees).

Data collection comes from the websites of these organizations, and qualitative methods of coding for patterns and themes are used to understand the organizations' representations of gender. The data consists of images and text that show or discuss gender equality or inequality, either explicitly or implicitly. After exploring the data, I discuss the findings in a discussion about diversity and equality. This discussion explores culinary educators' practice of promoting diversity rather than equality. Diversity is a focus on valuing the differences among people. Equality is a focus on people enjoying the same rights of representation, power in decisions, and opportunities in all areas of society. The CIA, Le Cordon Bleu, and the ACF promote diversity

through the use of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act 1964 and its amendments. The findings support a need for greater understanding and future research of how the promotion of diversity in culinary education, rather than equality, impacts gender inequality in the restaurant industry.

The restaurant industry represents a very diverse workspace, which leads me to the question: Is promoting diversity creating equality? Further study of the restaurant industry is recommended.

Studies on both the macro level of policy and the micro level of the socio-cultural organization are a good place to start.

Chapter 2: Background and Significance

Inequality exists when there is a lack of equal representation, power in decisions, and opportunities in society (Sen, 2001). It is widely accepted that women suffer worldwide from inequality in many areas including education, job opportunities, and pay (Sen, 2001). However, few people consider the impact of the inequalities women suffer in the food system. Gender inequality in the food system is apparent both in food access and food system labor conditions. Allen and Melcarek (2013) state that of the 925 million people globally who are hungry and chronically malnourished most are women and children. Women also face inequality as laborers in the food system on farms (HRW, 2012) and in restaurants (Jayaraman, 2013; Sachs et al., 2014). The goal of this section is to situate culinary education and the restaurant industry in the analysis of food system gender inequality by mapping connections between women, culinary education, and inequality issues in the restaurant industry. I make these connections by providing historical background of culinary education and industry. I will use a gender equality framework, which takes into consideration the underlying structures of inequality, to provide an overview of the embedded nature of gender inequality in the continuum from culinary education to industry. I will do this by first explaining the importance of education to gender equality. Second, I will detail the history of culinary education in the United States and overview its current state. Third, I will explore equality in the restaurant industry. And last, I will explain how structuralized marginalization occurs in organizations. Understanding the connections between education, equality, and industry are important to understanding why it is significant to ask how culinary education is responding to gender inequality in the restaurant industry.

2.1 Pursuing Gender Equality Through Education

One way of facilitating the social equality of men and women is to address gender inequality in education. There is a correlation between gender equality in education and gender equality in society (Sen, 2001; Karam, 2013; Subrahmanian, 2005). The United States Agency for International Development (USAID) is an example of an organization that employs a focus on gender equality in education to create transformative social change. USAID (2008) defines “transformative change” as change that addresses the attitudes, norms, and social structures that support inequality (United States Agency for International Development [USAID], 2008, p.9). USAID not only strives for gender equality by focusing on equality in education, they measure outcomes of gender equality in education with job opportunities and earnings. They link equality in education to equality in industry and society. One method USAID uses to measure the achievement of gender equality in education is by measuring the “Equality of External Results” (USAID, 2008, p.7). This measurement correlates the success of gender equality in education directly with indicators of social equality, such as equality in job opportunities and equal pay. It is also the measurement determining if men and women are able to fulfill their “full potential” (USAID, 2008, p.6).

USAID states that gender equality in education is important because schooling and classroom dynamics reinforce skills, attitudes and knowledge that are transferred to industry and society, affecting career choice, beliefs about abilities, and future earnings (USAID, 2008). Education is a means to create opportunities and equality because it is a space where ideologies about abilities based solely on gender can be challenged (USAID, 2008).

Though the role of education in gender equality has been studied generally (Karam, 2013; Subrahmanian, 2005; USAID, 2008), there is a gap in literature specifically addressing how

culinary education intended to populate the food system with trained men and women addresses gender equality. If education is a viable avenue for transforming gender inequality in society, then it is important to examine food systems education as a way to address food systems inequality. As previously discussed, women suffer disproportionately the consequences of inequality in the food system (Sachs et al., 2014), are overwhelmingly its workforce (FAO, 1996; Devine et al., 2009; Allen & Sachs, 2007; Allegretto et al., 2013; Sachs et al., 2014; HRW, 2012), and comprise almost 50% of food system specific education, such as culinary schools. Often opportunities to overcome poverty and inequality come through education. For these reasons food system education should not be overlooked. I now narrow my focus to food system education by detailing the history of gender inequality in culinary schools.

2.2 History of Culinary Schools

Originally, culinary degree programs began to flourish in the 1940's as part of the G.I. Bill that was meant to retrain World War II veterans and prepare them to re-enter the American workforce. Therefore, in the beginning, culinary degree programs were populated solely by men (Dornenburg & Page, 1995). In 1970 the CIA opened its doors to women, but women in culinary degree programs were rare. Though culinary programs serve as the entrance into the restaurant industry for many women, the programs were originally designed by men and for men.

Culinary programs were designed to train students using the standardized methods of the classic French kitchen and cuisine. To be considered a "classically trained" chef in western culinary schools means to be trained in the classic French Brigade system, created by Escoffier (Dornenburg & Page, 1995). The French Brigade system is an organizational system that aids kitchen operation. It is a hierarchical system and historically favors men because of its roots in the professional French kitchen of the past, where women did not cook (Dornenburg & Page,

1995; Bartholomew et al, 1996).

As in the past, culinary schools and educational programs still represent an influential entrance point into the restaurant industry because formally educated restaurant workers experience 7% greater pay overall and experience greater opportunity for advancement (ACF, 2012). Culinary schools play a significant role in the restaurant industry. There is a correlation between the number of years educated and the amount of money a person earns (Batt, Lee, & Lakhani, 2014). Culinary degree programs also offer opportunities for mentorship, which increase career advancement opportunities (Batt et al., 2014; Dornenburg & Page, 1995). In addition, formal training increases the likelihood of success in the professional kitchen because the curriculum educates beyond cooking and reaches into the areas of finance, food safety, restaurant law, and organizational management (Dornenburg & Page, 1995).

Although there is a recognizable overall pay increase for both men and women formally educated in culinary programs, women with training equal to men trail behind men in both salary and promotion to upper-level positions. This occurs across all positions in the restaurant industry, up through management and into the corporate level (Batt et al., 2014; ACF, 2012). Allen and Sachs (2007) found women's work to be marginalized across many areas of the food system: in restaurants, in the home kitchen, and on farms, resulting in the deskilling of women and exclusion of women from food system decisions. In light of this structural marginalization of women's food work, culinary education programs are an important focus of study for two reasons. First, culinary education programs invest in women's skill building and provide tools necessary to empower their future career opportunities through education. And second, culinary education programs train the future worker of the restaurant industry and could be a space where gender inequalities are mitigated in the restaurant industry. Therefore, it is important to ask: Are

culinary schools responding to gender inequality in the restaurant industry? Are there apparent or obvious actions to mitigate inequality and gender oppression through their programs and curricula? In order to illustrate the extent of the interaction between culinary education and industry, and how changes in one creates changes in the other, next I discuss recent industry changes that are having an impact on culinary education.

2.3 The Changing Shape of Culinary Education and Industry

It can be argued that the restaurant industry is in a state of change since the advent of molecular gastronomy, also known as modernist cuisine. The advent of molecular gastronomy is creating debate in the culinary industry about gender equality, and is an example of how gender equality, education, and industry interact in the food system. Molecular gastronomy, which relies heavily on chemistry, is meant to capture the senses through the use of food science to create unsuspected textures and transformations of flavor, and it has driven culinary schools to rethink tradition. Some believe this shift away from tradition is creating potential for gender equality in education (Collins, 2012) and restaurants (Shapiro, 2007). The director of a prominent culinary program discussed his views of molecular gastronomy in a *New York Times* interview, “I don’t think this mode of cooking is skewed by gender.” (Shapiro, 2007, para.19). The CIA closed their historic Escoffier restaurant in order to focus on this new modern cuisine, service structure, and kitchen configurations. The president of the school calls it a shift “[A]way from kitchen servitude and toward creativity and collaboration” (Collins, 2012, para. 4). This could represent a significant opportunity for equality in the professional kitchen as restaurants and educational programs shift away from the traditional Escoffier-focused French Brigade system.

Others consider this sciencing of food to be a step away from gender equality in the food system because the science of chemistry has traditionally been considered the domain of male

intellectual strength. When addressing the need to embrace the new food science in the name of equality, a female chef quotes to the *New York Times*, “Historically, when women move into men’s work it loses value, maybe we’ll see the pay drop and the science suddenly called soft” (Shapiro, 2007, para. 25). Allen and Sachs (2007) discuss the place of science in the food system by stating, “Agricultural and food-related sciences are historically extremely gendered with men predominating in agricultural science and women finding a place in nutrition or home economics” (p.8). It is possible that the more food is framed as a science, the more gender inequality will increase in culinary training programs and in the professional kitchen. The framing of food as molecular gastronomy is changing industry, and in turn education, in ways that only time can define. However, the restaurant industry is currently considered an industry that exhibits gender inequality in many forms.

2.4 Gender Inequality in the Restaurant Industry

The inequality women face in the restaurant industry occurs both explicitly and implicitly. Inequality is expressed explicitly through wage discrepancy (American Culinary Federation [ACF], 2012), lack of equal representation in management and director positions (ACF, 2011; Jayaraman, 2013), and sexual harassment (Jayaraman, 2013). Inequality is also expressed implicitly, reflected, for example, in the ideology that a professional kitchen is a man’s world and that women lack the physical and emotional strength to succeed at top levels of the industry (Selby, 2014). This discrimination is significant because the restaurant industry is one of the largest employers in the United States (Batt et al., 2014; National Restaurant Association [NRA], 2014).

Restaurants in the United States employ over 13 million people in a variety of positions (NRA, 2013) with women representing more than two-thirds of its overall workforce (Alpert,

1986; Brownell, 1993; Glynn, 2012; Smith, 2012; Jayaraman, 2013). In terms of numbers, women workers dominate the food service landscape (Glynn, 2012). However, they work in the lowest positions with the least pay. Recently, the National Restaurant Association (NRA), the largest foodservice trade association by membership in the world, launched the *America Works Here* campaign. They state, “Our restaurants are a place where Americans of all backgrounds have the opportunity to rise from entry-level work to management and ownership, and create their personal version of the American Dream” (NRA, 2013, para.3). However, this construct of the restaurant industry stands in stark contrast to the facts that most women in the restaurant industry work for poverty wages and many rely on food assistance programs to supply food for themselves and their families (Jayaraman, 2013; Allegretto et al., 2013). Men have greater advancement opportunity and represent the highest earners within the field (ACF, 2012).

There is a significant pay gap between men and women in the restaurant industry (Glynn, 2012; Allegretto et al, 2013; Jayaraman, 2013). The ACF, which certifies chefs and is the largest chef organization in the United States, found in a salary study of over 2,700 members that women are paid less than men in both the restaurant corporate environment, as well as within the restaurant as chefs. The survey found that women made \$38,000 a year less than men as corporate level executives and managers. Women made \$18,000 a year less than men as executive chefs (ACF, 2012). The average chef salary for all types of restaurants reported by the ACF is \$66,000 (ACF, 2012). Fine dining chefs represent a category of livable wage within the restaurant industry, which means they are representative of the top 20% of wages in the restaurant setting (Batt et al., 2014). There are few women in these positions; women occupy only 6.3%, or 1 out of every 16, chef positions in fine dining restaurants (Sutton, 2014).

Women are most prominent in the lowest-paid positions in the restaurant industry

regardless of skill set or specialized education. Women employees make up 90% of the lowest-paid positions in restaurants (Alpert, 1986). Despite possessing skills equal to men, such as equivalent culinary training, women are underrepresented in positions with livable wages (Batt et al., 2014). The lack of women present in restaurant positions with the highest earnings, such as chef, is not reflective of the abundance of skilled and educated women prepared for these positions. The number of skilled women graduating culinary schools is almost equal to men (Moskin, 2014).

Culinary degree programs are training more women than ever before for a career in the restaurant industry (Moskin, 2014; Dornenburg & Page, 1995). For example, the French Culinary Institute (now The International Culinary Center) graduated 41 women in 1992, compared with 202 women in 2012; a 493% increase in women graduates. Women graduates doubled at Johnson and Wales University over two decades, and currently women graduates slightly exceed men graduates. Likewise, women graduates increased at the CIA from 21% of all graduates in 1992 to 36% in 2012 (Moskin, 2014). There are increasing numbers of women in culinary schools, however, culinary education programs are historically patriarchal and train under the French Brigade system. The French Brigade system is organized around male-dominant kitchen hierarchies (Dornenburg & Page, 1995).

2.5 Marginalization

Looking at these inequities through a feminist lens (Harding, 2004), it is apparent that this marginalization and oppression of women in the food system, including the restaurant industry, is the result of a structural constraint (Young, 1990; Gonzalez Yuen, 2000). This constraint is not cured by merely having more women represented in food system positions, or greater numbers of women in education; the restaurant industry is already populated with skilled

women who remain underrepresented in positions of power (ACF, 2012; Alpert, 1986, Brownwell, 1993). The assertion of this thesis is that the restaurant industry operates under a patriarchal framework — that is to say that there is a general assumption that the professional kitchen, especially the most elevated positions in the kitchen, is a man’s domain (Brownell, 1993; Dornenburg & Page, 1995).

Ironically, many male chefs attribute their skills to women (Dornenburg & Page, 1995), yet continue to manage professional kitchens void of female talent (Selby, 2014; Sutton, 2014). Women, commonly mothers and grandmothers, are acknowledged for their role in sharing and teaching cooking methods and cultural food traditions with men. However, male chefs, while acknowledging the contribution of women to their own talent, often diminish women to the sidelines in the professional kitchen. Women in restaurants often manage cool, well ventilated stations such as garde manger — which is the domain of the salad and cold appetizers chef — rather than obtaining the more coveted positions of saucier (sauce chef) or sous chef (second chef in command). Often the reason given is that women are useful in kitchen positions that require an artistic or delicate touch, and they may not be able to handle the rigors of other parts of the professional kitchen, emotionally or physically (Selby, 2014; Shapiro, 2007). It remains unrecognized and unacknowledged that women’s food work in home kitchens is difficult and “involves physical, mental, and caring labor” (Allen and Sachs, 2007).

The image of a woman, such as a grandmother, spending an entire day in the kitchen cooking for her family is not difficult to imagine, as women have been tasked with food procurement, fabrication, cooking, serving, cleaning, and guiding the nutrition of their family members as a matter of cultural fact (Allen and Sachs, 2007; De Vault, 1991). It is a common practice to disconnect women’s food preparation skill set from the professional work force. What

contributes to the perception that women cannot handle the rigors of the professional kitchen?
How do culinary education programs construct their perspective of the woman chef?

This marginalization is not necessarily intentional oppression, but rather ingrained attitudes and norms that, in turn, create systemic oppression. Young (1990) differentiates between the definition of “oppression” as the intent of a singular tyrant based on policies and laws, versus “structural oppression,” which rises from “unquestioned norms, habits, and symbols” within the institutions we inhabit in daily life. In *Five Faces of Oppression* (1990) she states, “The conscious actions of many individuals daily contribute to maintaining and reproducing oppression, but those people are usually simply doing their jobs or living their lives, and do not understand themselves as agents of oppression” (Young, 1990,p.56). Gonzalez Yuen (2000) also addresses the subtle process of oppression by group association. People oppress when “by dint of their group associations [they] are socially conditioned to, expected to, and then empowered to be oppressive” (p.14).

Though women suffer injustice in many areas of the food system, in order to fill gaps in research addressing the relationship between women, culinary education, and equality outcomes in the restaurant industry, I will limit the focus moving forward to the professional restaurant kitchen, chefs, and their training. There are three reasons a restaurant kitchen is useful to a study that focuses on gender inequality, culinary education, and restaurants. The first reason is that within the professional kitchen there exists certain standardizations, such as unisex chef wear and skill acquisition through co-ed culinary programs, that should reflect equalized opportunity beyond traditional gender roles (Brownell, 1993). The second reason is that the French Brigade system strongly influences restaurant operations, especially fine dining. Restaurant chefs who went to culinary school learned under this system or a system influenced by it (Dornenburg &

Page, 1995). Like restaurants, culinary schools, through the French Brigade system, have their roots grounded in a patriarchal framework. The third reason is because there is commonality between how culinary education programs teach the skills of the professional kitchen and how professional kitchens run in day-to-day operations. By limiting the gender exploration to professional kitchens there is a direct link back to the culinary education programs that supply industry workers. This connection between restaurants and culinary education programs underscores the importance of the question: How are culinary education programs responding to gender inequality in the restaurant industry?

In a large industry representing many different categories of restaurants (fast food, fast casual, fine dining), and many different types of employee positions (front house, back house, server, bar tender, food and beverage management, dishwasher), looking at gender inequality in terms of female chefs and culinary education serves to narrow the scope for the purpose of study. In this way the study is limited to an area of the restaurant that correlates strongly with education programs.

As we have seen through research, restaurants are one of the largest employers in the nation, but also consist of the lowest paying jobs, staffed mostly by women (Allegretto et al., 2013). Inherent in the restaurant industry are the normalization of problems such as sexual harassment and discrimination against women. Culinary education programs have an important place in both the history and future of the restaurant industry. There continues to be a significant increase of women in both culinary education programs and in kitchen positions in the restaurant industry. My research investigates how culinary educators and certification programs respond to gender inequality in the restaurant industry in order to identify if these programs are explicitly addressing gender inequality and, if so, in what areas.

Chapter 3: Methodology and Methods

A phenomenon exists where women are at once everywhere in the food system, producing food and engaged in cooking outside the restaurant, yet seemingly nowhere in the professional kitchen, especially in positions of management (Allen & Sachs, 2007; Jayaraman, 2013; Allegretto, 2013; Sutton, 2014). The goal of this research is to explore gender equity in the restaurant industry by examining the implicit and explicit gender messages portrayed by culinary educational institutions and chef certifying organizations.

Specifically, the research asks: *How do culinary education programs and the chef certifying organization, the ACF, respond to gender inequality in the restaurant industry?* This study also addresses the following questions: *Are culinary schools and the ACF responding to gender inequality in the restaurant industry? And, Are there apparent or obvious actions to mitigate inequality and gender oppression through their programs?* Generally, the data identifies the degree to which gender equity is addressed by culinary educators and chef certifying agents through themes, images, and statements on their web pages. The justification for these research questions is that they address the constructs of the educational institutions and certifying bodies of the restaurant industry. The research questions address gaps in academic research regarding the interactions between women, culinary training programs, and the industry. Additionally, the research questions help develop a background for future research.

3.1 Epistemology

My epistemological approach is an interpretivist constructionist approach (Lazar, 1998; Burns & Walker, 2005; Creswell, 2014). From an interpretivist point of view I believe that there

is meaningfulness behind action that must be understood to fully understand the action; that there is intentional content behind every human action (Schwant, 2000). From a constructionist point of view I believe that people invent their idea of the world around them by integrating their experiences and social surroundings into their understanding of their world (Schwant, 2000). In this way, individuals construct their idea of the world. There are many versions of constructed reality based on an individual's personal experience and position in social relations. There are also group constructs. In the case of this research, I research the constructs of Le Cordon Bleu, the CIA, and the ACF; these are group constructs. As a chef impassioned by the food system, and particularly the culinary arts, my research will not be fully objective. I do not strive for my research to achieve objectivity, but instead use my own personal experiences to guide the analytic categories in which I am interested. Because of my experiences in the culinary arts, I have insights that other social researchers do not. As an interpretivist constructionist, this personal experience strengthens my research. Many believe that situated knowledge reinforces research (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003; Harding, 2004). Nevertheless, I do not wish for my experiences to bias my findings, and therefore I use the technique described by Weber, separating my values from the evidence (Lazar, 1998).

Weber acknowledges that it is not possible to extinguish personal values in a complex world, and that values often lead to an interest in study (Lazar, 1998; Blum, 1944). Weber also, however, distinguishes between two things, *relevance of value* and *value freedom* (Lazar, 1998). Relevance of value can reflect a personal interest; we study what we recognize as relevant to us. Value freedom, however, is the freedom of choice to put aside personal values, and the ability to bring objectivity to the outcome of study by relying on the topic and framework of the study to determine facts (Lazar, 1998; Blum 1944). My research is driven by the desire to address the

complexities of the industry and the people within it. As a chef, it is possible to bring objectivity to the outcome of study and analyze the organizational constructs and themes presented by the culinary institutions. My examination is guided, not by my skills as a chef, but rather by the problem of gender inequality in the restaurant industry that is not relieved by education, skill development, or increased numbers of women in education.

The method used to organize data aids clarity to the identification of the constructs presented by the culinary institutions. The method I use isolates general references to gender, and then codes further into repeated ideas that are represented in the text and images of the organizations (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003). Through careful coding of text and images, and taking care to acknowledge repeated ideas and themes, consistencies in the organizations' constructs toward gender equity surface. The goal is to methodically and systematically code gender references in order to recognize how the organizations represent themselves, rather than highlight my experiences as a woman chef in the restaurant industry.

3.1.1 Constructs and cultural organization.

The constructs of the culinary educational programs are the constructs of an organization rather than a single individual. Beyond individual constructs there are social constructs, or social identities, which create organizational cultures (Aaltio & Mills, 2002). The word *culture* is complicated and has multiple meanings and insinuations, such as “civilized” or “high-art” (Williams, 1976); however, for the purpose of this research, culture is defined as a group identity or belief system, often referred to as *cultural identity* (Aaltio & Mills, 2002). Therefore, when considering how organizations, such as the culinary schools and the ACF, choose to represent themselves, I see those choices representing the dominant belief system within the organization; their cultural identity. In the setting of the organization, dominant themes prevail and become

representative of group culture (Aaltio & Mills, 2002). Because webpages are intentionally created by the organizations they represent, they are, in turn, a reflection of the organizations' belief system (Saldana, 2011).

Content analysis of the websites of culinary schools and the ACF aims to reveal the beliefs these organizations construct about gender equality issues in the restaurant industry, and if they take steps to mitigate these issues. This is in keeping with the viewpoint that positionality and constructs are important elements of social organizations and institutions, as well as contributing factors to equality (Creswell, 2014; Harding, 2004; Burns & Walker, 2005). This study examines the belief system that is communicated by culinary education programs as it pertains to gender equality, and also interrogates the culture, or belief system, of these organizations as expressed by their documents and created images. Under this consideration, my research of the constructs of culinary educators and chef certifiers is ethnographic in spirit. Ethnographic research seeks to understand the beliefs and social relations of a culture through observation of "patterns of behaviors, language, and action..." (Cresswell, 2014, p. 14). In the case of this study, the spirit of ethnographic research is found in the study of the beliefs and social relations of culinary educational organizations by the observation of the images and documents they use to represent themselves on their websites.

Since website pages contain the documents and images of the organization they represent, analyzing the organizations' websites provides insight into their constructed beliefs. Saldana (2011) states, "[D]ocuments contain texts and images that reflect and metaphorically represent their creators' ideologies and system" (p.54). Knowing that the culinary educators have created websites that market their ideologies, it is possible to ask: What is their engagement with the issue of gender equality in the restaurant industry? I address the use of the website and

individual webpages further in the Methods section of this paper.

3.2 Methodology

The methodology of research is descriptive and exploratory due to the need for early stage direct investigation into the production of gender inequality in the restaurant industry, culinary education programs, and certifying bodies (Joyner et al, 2013). A goal of this research is to be a useful first step toward greater gender equality. One way to create a more equitable restaurant industry is through changing the gendered culture taught in culinary schools. To begin working on making this change, this research explores and examines the gender policies and messages communicated by culinary institutions and certifying bodies. Examining these messages gives valuable insight that may aid efforts to improve gender equality within the restaurant industry in the future. This study is an effort to lay the groundwork for further investigation of inequality in the restaurant industry. Based on literature cited in the Background and Significance section of this paper, I argue that there is a gap in academic research addressing interactions between women, culinary training programs, and the restaurant industry.

The complexity of organizational structure, variety of job positions, and numerous categories of business establishments within the restaurant industry necessitate the narrowing of focus. Because the restaurant industry includes workers with a wide variety of skills, opportunity, and prestige, there are different levels of gender inequality among different positions within the restaurant industry. The fairly low-opportunity and low-prestige position of server in non-fine dining restaurants tends to be dominated by women (Jayaraman, 2013), but the highest position of prestige and opportunity in a restaurant, the chef position, tends to be dominated by men (Sutton, 2014; ACF, 2012). Therefore, this study focuses on the chef position in which women are disadvantaged by a lack of opportunity and underrepresentation despite

equal training and skills.

I analyze data collected from two culinary education programs, the CIA and Le Cordon Bleu. I also analyze data from the chef and curriculum certifying organization, the ACF. I have selected these three organizations because of their prominence as leaders in their categories, the large number of people that they graduate and certify into the restaurant industry, and their reach across the United States. These three organizations have close affiliations with industry by providing continuing education to industry workers, hosting industry events, and retaining restaurant industry professionals on their boards.

Data collection is of textual phenomenon, but also includes images from the websites. The text and images are analyzed using qualitative techniques. Qualitative analysis is used to isolate conceptual patterns and resulting themes of gender in images and text. Quantitative analysis serves as the method to organize and count key terms referencing gender, but because the analysis of this study is based primarily in identifying themes, I consider the method of study qualitative rather than mixed-method. I systematically collected data for content analysis from specific pages of the organizations' websites; this is discussed in more detail below.

3.3 Methods

This section explains how I answer the main research question: *How do culinary education programs and certifying agents respond to gender inequalities in the restaurant industry?* The methods are designed to determine how women are represented in relation to men and to answer the question, *What do the culinary schools and the ACF construct as the role of women in the restaurant industry?* To answer these questions, I systematically gathered, organized, coded, and analyzed text and image content for number counts and themes. The data was also organized within tables.

The data was collected from the CIA, Le Cordon Bleu, and the ACF websites. Primary coding of data took place in columns (Saldana, 2008) beginning with text from the site areas: Home Page; About; Mission/Intent/and Diversification Statements; Funding and Scholarships; Distinguished Alumni and Certified; Faculty and Board. Each site was selected for a corresponding reason facilitating the answer to the research questions. I selected these site areas to determine how the organizations generally construct their image (Home Page); How they construct their identity and differentiate themselves from others (About); How they identify their goals and purpose (Mission, Intent, and Diversification Statements); If they strive to create gender diverse campuses (Diversification Statements; Funding and Scholarships); How they see themselves as impacting the restaurant industry (Distinguished Alumni and Certified); and How they reflect gender diversity as an organization (Faculty and Board).

I gathered a sampling of text from the webpages and sorted them into columns. Text was chosen based on the presence of a reference to gender. Areas referencing gender in more than five sections were limited to the first five references. The four columns of the table have a heading from left to right reading *Raw Data*, *Preliminary Code*, *Explicit*, and *Implicit*. The first column of the table reads *Raw Data* and under this title are sections of words or phrases exactly as they appear in the webpage text. The second column reads *Preliminary Code* and contains the singled out word choices referring to gender. Specific words are limited to those referring specifically to the gender of people in the organization, professionals in the field, and students being addressed through the website materials. The third and fourth columns read *Explicit* and *Implicit* and contain the determination of the raw data as explicit or implicit. The operational definition of the term *explicit* is defined as a direct reference to gender (woman, man, he, she, female, male, and their plurals). The operational definition of *implicit* is terms of implied general

inclusion (diverse student body, equality, inclusive, equal opportunity). Explicit terms are labeled *explicit m* (male) or *explicit f* (female) in the final code (see Appendix for example of the four-column table of research data). The purpose of determining if gender terms are used explicitly or implicitly in the different sections of the website is to answer the questions: *To what degree are these organizations addressing gender? And, In what areas are they addressing and engaging gender equity?*

Photos and images were also collected from the aforementioned areas of the website. The photos and images were entered into the four-column spreadsheet below the text in order to keep photos in context with text. The headings of the columns also read: *Raw Data, Preliminary Code, Explicit, and Implicit*. The first column *Raw Data* contains the visual description and caption of the image, for example two men and two women sitting in class, captioned “learning lab.” The second column, *Preliminary Code*, contains a description of the theme, for example “students learning.” The third and fourth column denote if the image is male or female and what the role of gender is. Roles are labeled and defined as *Leadership, Secondary Leadership, Non-Leadership, and Non-Specific*.

The definition of each role follows: Leadership is a depiction of faculty, management (chef, front house management, food and beverage director, sommelier, executive pastry chef), board member, and identified student body leadership. *Secondary Leadership* depictions include pastry chef, bar tender, and restaurant captain. *Non-Leadership* includes servers, cooks, and student life depictions of no hierarchy. Lastly, *Non-Specific* contains categories that are undeterminable by their vague and non-specific nature. Leadership and Secondary Leadership positions are considered explicit for gender equality, while Non-Leadership and Non-Specific are considered implicit for gender equality. Male and female images were counted and given the

identity of their depicted role. An example of an entry might read: Leadership 1f (female), 1m (male); Non-Leadership 2f (female), 2m (male). They were then placed in the Explicit or Implicit column.

While the *Raw Data* column of the collected images reveal how the webpage depicts women in the setting of restaurants and culinary schools, the *Explicit* and *Implicit* images reveal what is determined as success relative to men in the photos. This is how I answered the questions: *How do culinary educators and chef certifying agents represent gender equality through themes, photos, and statements on their webpages?* And: *How do culinary educators construct their role as providing women with opportunity for a successful career in restaurants?* Additionally, *Which gender is depicted as successful on campus and in the restaurant?* The text and image results are combined to give an overall impression of how culinary schools and certifying agents construct their position on gender equality in the restaurant industry and in education.

Chapter 4: Results, Analysis, and Contribution

This research asks the main question of inquiry: *How do culinary education programs and the chef certifying organization, the ACF, respond to gender inequality in the restaurant industry?* I answer this question by exploring gender equality¹ in the restaurant industry, and by examining the implicit and explicit gender messages portrayed by culinary educators and the ACF. In order to understand the response of the ACF and culinary educators to gender inequality with greater detail, I also investigate these sub-questions: *What (if any) are the apparent or obvious actions culinary programs take to mitigate gender inequality? And, In what areas of their programs do these mitigations occur?* In this section I will discuss the analysis of text and images and the finding that culinary educators promote gender equality both explicitly, through scholarships, and implicitly by focusing on diversity. This is followed by a discussion about how these organizations are using diversity and policies of inclusion as an alternative to promoting gender equality. To conclude this chapter, I suggest the contribution of future research with a focus on alternative and explicit policy for creating gender equality in education and restaurants.

¹ The measurement of equality is dependent on how equality is defined. This thesis differentiates between the measurements of three types of equality: *equality of opportunity* – or the equality of access to the necessary elements to compete; *distributive equality* – or the equality of the distribution of resources and people; and *equality of outcome* – the equality experienced as the outcome of opportunities. Though there is scholarly debate about the nature of equality and how it is best measured (Phillips, 2004; Roemer, 1998; Sen, 1979), the engagement with this meaningful debate is beyond the scope of this thesis.

4.1 Results and Analysis

The findings of my research indicate that the CIA, Le Cordon Bleu, and the ACF respond both implicitly and explicitly to gender inequality. They respond explicitly by awarding increasing numbers of scholarships to women, in turn, promoting increased numbers of women in culinary programs. There is no text or image specifying that gender equality is the goal of certain scholarship awards, so in this light scholarships could be seen as an implicit sign. Scholarships, however, are the area of greatest mitigation against gender inequality in the educational setting. The CIA, Le Cordon Bleu, and the ACF also respond implicitly by forwardly promoting diversity without specifying explicitly in text or image the desire to create gender equality on campuses or in the restaurant industry.

4.1.1 Context for findings.

It is significant to explore how culinary schools and the ACF respond to gender inequality in the restaurant industry because schools are an entry point into the restaurant industry for a workforce acquiring foundational skills (Simon, 2014). Additionally, outcomes of equality in industry and in society have been directly correlated with equality in education (USAID, 2008; Subrahmanian, 2005). It is also significant to explore the areas of their programs where mitigations of inequality occur, if they do occur, because these programs are instrumental in many areas of the industry through partnerships and continuing education. Areas of mitigation of inequality in education may be measurable in industry and be useful to future research.

Culinary schools and the ACF grant certifications of continuing education (U.S. Bureau of Labor and Statistics [BLS], 2014). These organizations not only build the skills of the workforce, they interact and influence the restaurant industry and its participants on an ongoing basis through surveys and industry development (NRA, 2012). They produce textbooks and

learning tools. These organizations are hubs of financial support where one can acquire foundational culinary skills and obtain continuing education certifications. As one example, the ACF webpage is a main resource for scholarships in the field. Additionally, the ACF and ACF-affiliated culinary programs design, co-facilitate, and house the certification processes of the highest field achievements, such as Master Chef exams (ACF, n.d.). These exams are administered by ACF-affiliated culinary programs, such as the CIA, and granted by the ACF.

This far-reaching influence creates an ideal space for culinary education programs and the ACF to change inequality within the restaurant industry, or, at least, initiate resistance to inequality. Therefore, it is important to assess their current position on gender inequality in the restaurant industry. It is also important, if efforts exist to advance equality, to identify where these efforts are focused. Are they focused on funding education for women? Are they focused on gender inclusion in faculty and board positions? Focusing on *how* these organizations respond to inequality and *in what areas* they respond to inequality not only results in a thorough exploration of culinary organizations; it will be useful to future research toward meaningful action.

4.1.2 Results and analysis of text.

The remainder of this paper will address the research questions by first providing an overview of the results of the data analysis of text and image. Because the results of the analysis raised questions regarding the nature of diversity versus equality, I will follow the analysis of data with a discussion about diversity and equality. The discussion focuses on how diversity and equality are promoted in institutions and framed through policy in the United States. This discussion about diversity and equality will then lead to recommendations, in the Contributions section of the paper, for future research.

How are these organizations constructing their position on gender equality? Is it implicit or explicit? Text segments were gathered from the culinary organizations website pages under the theme *Gender*, and coded for implicit or explicit reference. The findings are that the text utilizes general terms, such as *students* and *faculty*, rather than specific qualifiers of gender, such as *he* or *she*. As this section shows, a representation of general diversity is much stronger than the representation of women or gender as a specific category of importance. The Diversity and Mission section of the websites is where most of the language regarding inclusion and gender occurred.

4.1.2.1 diversity and mission section.

Content analysis of text found in the Diversity and Mission section of the websites reveal the most information about the constructs of gender equality. All three organizations use Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to state their positions on equality. This implicit response to equality has an explicit orientation toward legally protecting diversity. Only the CIA explicitly asserts the use of Title IX, an amendment of the Civil Rights Act passed in 1972 prohibiting educational exclusion based on sex. Because the CIA is the only institution of the three that explicitly asserts Title IX, a mandatory law for educational institutions receiving Federal funding, it did not become a core finding for explicit promotion or mitigation of gender equality. In all three institutions, the primary focus of explicit text reference was promotion of diversity and Title VII frameworks. This finding is repeated in the analysis of image.

Title VII is a policy of inclusion and equal opportunity. It promotes diversification and legal protection for people of all “race and color, as well as national origin, sex, and religion” (Society for Human Resource Management, n.d.). It ensures legal protection from exclusion or segregation; verbal and physical harassment; denial of advancement or equal pay; and retaliation,

based on physical disability, race, gender, sexual orientation, or religion. It is a document that protects members of organizations that have more than 25 members, and employees of businesses that employ 15 people or more (Equal Employment Opportunity Commission [EEOC], n.d.).

The three organizations have varying degrees of referencing Title VII, but they all reference it as their guiding principle for equality and diversity. The CIA and ACF reference it prominently in their Diversity and Mission section of their website, while Le Cordon Bleu has it on page 19 of their catalog. For all three organizations, this is the most prominent text reference to equality and inclusion. Though gender inequality in education historically creates exclusion of women, equality and inclusion dialogue does not mention *women or female* inclusion. People are addressed with the terms “sex” and “gender” when inclusion is discussed. This denotation is implicit for the meaning of women, as sex and gender refers to both male and female. The following paragraphs give an example of how each organization uses Title VII. Some of the pages also include additional language about women or inclusion, giving context to their construction on gender.

The CIA states, “The CIA actively promotes diversity with respect to ethnic and national origin, race, color, disability, religion, gender, socioeconomic background, age, and sexual orientation” (CIA: Diversity, n.d.). There are other references to gender on this page, coming from a profile about women instrumental in the history of the CIA. The text explicitly referencing women is part of the story of the history of the CIA, and used to explain the role of two women who founded the school in 1946. The Diversity page goes beyond the story of history to state the value of inclusion of all cultures, and how cultural diversity is an essential element of world cuisine. This section states further that cuisine and diversity are the heart of the

CIA. This page explicitly and implicitly references women. It explicitly references the gender of the two women who were instrumental in forming the school, but the diversity statement on the same page is more reflective of general diversity rather than gender equality. Taken together, a discussion about diverse cuisine as an outcome of the diversity of people describes the most explicit ideologies of the page.

The Le Cordon Bleu culinary website does not have a direct link to their Diversity and Mission statements. I found a link to a catalogue from their Chicago campus by further web research. In the catalogue, on page 19, the statement is titled “Non-Discrimination” and reads: “The school admits students without regard to race, gender, sexual orientation, religion, creed, color, national origin, ancestry, marital status, age, disability, or any other factor prohibited by law” (Le Cordon Bleu, Chicago, 2014). There is no other text specifically talking about gender equality or inclusion on this page, either explicitly or implicitly. The rest of the page uses the term “students” to refer to people as it discusses procedures and policies of the school.

On their website, the ACF was the most forward with their diversity statement, calling diversity a “fundamental strength” of the organization. The ACF describes itself as “leading by example” and states that they “aspire to make diversity a core and abiding strength in [their] organization” (ACF Diversity Statement, n.d.). The diversity statement explains, “We will support diversity in all of its forms, encompassing but not limited to age, disability status, economic circumstance, ethnicity, gender, race, religion, and sexual orientation” (ACF, n.d.). There is no other mention of gender in the text of this page.

4.1.3 Results and analysis of image.

Images, like text, were first coded generally as representing gender. Images were then noted for the number of male and female participants, and whether their role in the image is one

of leadership, non-leadership or neutral, relative to others. Images fell into two general categories. The first category is what I will refer to as *marketing images* — general photos used to promote the organization or students. The second category is what I will refer to as *industry professionals* — posed photos of faculty, board, industry members, and graduates. I will discuss the industry professional images later in the paper and turn my attention to the marketing images.

Marketing images occur more in the culinary school websites than the ACF website. These pictures are scattered among the websites' marketing material and mainly depict students on campus or in a classroom setting. One culinary school uses primarily stock photos and presents a disclaimer stating that though not all photos were taken at the institution, "they do accurately represent the general type and quality of equipment and facilities" (Le Cordon Bleu: Chicago, n.d.). Despite this statement, which could make one think that people are not the focus of the pictures, the pictures all have students in the foreground. The other culinary school does not use stock photos, and their campus is recognizable in the background. It is also clear that the point of these photos is to market the campus, as well as student life. The ACF has fewer photos in general, and their photos are marketed toward promoting the culinary profession. The photos are of individuals in the industry, food, and advertisements for restaurant-related products. The ACF primarily markets from the perspective of post certifications by depicting people in the field working.

The marketing images of the two culinary schools are in alignment with text presentation and the theme of diversity, which is the strongest theme to emerge from the text of all three organizations. Despite photographic representations of people in varying roles of leadership and non-leadership, most pictures were in groups and the pictures promoted themes occurring under the umbrella of general diversity, not specifically or explicitly gender equality. People in these

pictures, usually students or graduates, are of varying races with both men and women present in almost equal numbers. The ACF, however, shows less diversity as most of their pictures reflect male chefs working in the field, often standing alone or in a leadership position. The ACF photos are more typical of the second type of photo I will talk about. The second type of photo shows the industry professionals – the faculty, boards, committees, and graduates. These photos present a different message than the group shots of diverse culinary students. They are posed and serve the purpose of introducing specific members of the organization.

4.1.3.1 photos of faculty, boards, committees, and graduates.

The industry professional images, the photos depicting faculty and board members, are images more in alignment with the human demographics of the restaurant industry, and they lack the amount of diversity portrayed in marketing photos. They also do not align with textual statements about the diversity that the institutions state in text that they set out to achieve. In these photos of faculty and board members, men outnumber women significantly overall. This is also the area where the three organizations differed the most.

One of the culinary schools has few photos of board members or faculty. Data came from a page with one picture of a male president in the corner, which accompanied unrelated text elsewhere on the page regarding the school's National Advisory Board. The National Advisory Board has a representation of 14% women. The second culinary school has many more pictures and more women represented, however the numbers are still skewed toward male leadership. Of 21 pages of profiles and pictures of faculty, there are 137 faculty; only 29.2 % are women. The Presidents Cabinet of this same school has 16.7 % women membership.

The same findings occurred in the ACF as in the culinary schools. The board of Directors is only 10% women. Text detailing the ACF Committees, from the About: Meet Us page of their

website, found 18 committees. An example of the committee group titles are certifications, apprentices, accrediting facilities, auditing programs, nominations and elections, ethics, and finance. Of 163 positions, women held 12%. The industry professional images indicate that men heavily populate the boards, faculty, and committees of both the culinary schools and the ACF. Images of leadership positions are accompanied by text describing additional positions, not pictured, all of which are disproportionately populated by men.

Together, the marketing photos and the industry professional photos represent a contrasting reality. On the one hand, the marketing photos seek to promote a diverse student body by representing men and women, of multiple races, most often in equal numbers. Not only are women present in the photos (gender diversity), there are also equal numbers of men and women (distributional equality). On the other hand the industry professional photos of faculty, board members, and committees illustrate a low level of gender diversity, and no equality in the ratio of men to women. The images reveal that the CIA, Le Cordon Bleu, and the ACF are heavily male-centric organizations. This contrast of gender diversity and distributional equality in marketing photos, but lack of gender diversity and distributional equality in the photos of board members, faculty, and committees illustrates that though gender diversity is explicitly constructed as important in the marketing messages, it is non-existent in the actual structures of the institutes' leadership.

This finding is interesting because the numbers of women graduating culinary programs are almost equal to men. The current graduation rate of women appears to reflect the kind of diversity and distributional equality the programs are seeking to promote, but it is clear that they are promoting gender diversity in their student body that they have yet to achieve in the leadership positions within their own organizations. Marketing gender diversity has clearly

increased the number of women on campus and entering the restaurant industry as graduates, however despite marketing diversity in the student body, gender equality of outcome is not reflected in the images of their own organizations.

4.1.3.2 photos of culinary students.

Diversity in the student body of culinary school graduates reflects the schools' attempts to mitigate inequality. There is a clear construct of a desire for diverse campuses made obvious in marketing photos of both culinary schools. This construct of a diverse student body appears to align with the reality of the actual student population as illustrated by student profiles present on one of the culinary school websites. The diversity of the student-body is in contrast to the lack of diversity of industry professionals.

The analysis of non-stock photos of student body profiles provided by one of the culinary schools reflects the most equality of all photos I reviewed on the websites. The photos are presented on a page entitled "Student Profiles." The photos consist of 22 pictures of students next to text listing their names and majors. The 22 students are made up of 46% women. Half of these women are receiving the highest degree possible at the institution, a bachelor of arts in either management or food science. This is equal to the number of men represented as doing the same. These students are both racially diverse and gender equal in representation. Diversity within the student body, including gender diversity, is the area where mitigations are occurring. It appears that the textual goals for a diverse campus are represented in the student profiles.

4.1.4 Scholarships as mitigation of gender inequality.

The student body shows that the schools are attempting to mitigate inequality by having a diverse student body. The data also shows an intentional construct through marketing of diverse campuses and a diverse industry. Scholarships are a tool that the culinary programs are

using to promote diversity. The text data shows that women are awarded scholarships at an increasing rate. Scholarships reflect the area of greatest mitigation. The ACF lists many of the scholarships awarded in the field. The ACF awarded 47 scholarships between 2012 and 2014. Of these scholarships, 62% were awarded to women. Culinary schools show the same trend. The CIA awarded 10 scholarships between 2012 and 2014; 70% went to women. Le Cordon Bleu did not list awarded scholarships, but offers a scholarship that is specifically intended for a woman recipient. Other scholarships offered are based on need, merit, or culinary competitions. The culinary schools both participate and promote scholarships awarded by the industry, which makes students eligible for scholarships awarded by the ACF.

The scholarship committee of the ACF is comprised of industry professionals who make up the American Academy of Chefs (AAC). The AAC is the main governing body behind ACF scholarships (ACF: Partnerships, n.d.). AAC membership is almost entirely male. Of the 46 past and present members listed on the website, only two are women, which is about 4.3%. Additionally, since 1954, all 16 Officers of the AAC have been men. In contrast to these numbers, data shows that most scholarships awarded by the AAC and ACF have been awarded to women. My research data supports that scholarships are the most prominent area where mitigation occurs in favor of gender equality. Yet, despite the action to award scholarships to women, the ACF's own salary study (ACF, 2011), the current board membership and faculty of both the culinary schools, and the ACF leadership demonstrate current gender inequality. As mentioned earlier, this gender inequality exists in the restaurant industry as well. These facts call into question whether the promotion of diversity and distributional equality through scholarship awards is having an impact on equality of outcome — gender equality within the restaurant kitchen.

4.2 Discussion of Diversity and Equality

I found through this research that culinary educators and the ACF are promoting diversity rather than specifically gender equality. The existence of the diversity statement, declaring the principles of Title VII, used by the institutions studied, appears at first to be a demonstrative approach to gender equality. Title VII protects against discrimination based on sex, and allows legal recourse for behaviors and actions promoting inequality, such as sexual harassment and preferential treatment based on gender in the workplace. An analysis of the statements, however, reveals it to be an implicit approach to gender equality, rather than explicit. The implicit nature of the statement is due to the fact that the words sex and gender refer to both men and women. These statements, when used by the CIA, Le Cordon Bleu and the ACF, do not represent explicit statements of intent to advance the equality of women in the restaurant industry, or in education. All businesses with more than 15 employees and all organizations with more than 25 employees have a legal obligation to adhere to the principles of Title VII by exercising organizational inclusivity regardless of race, religion, ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender, and family status (EEOC, n.d).

4.2.1 Types of discrimination.

There is clearly gender inequality in the positions of power in the restaurant industry and other culinary institutions, including education and professional organizations. Gender inequality is present despite the passing of Title VII. Gregory (2003) states, “Discrimination against women in the workplace assumes many forms, probably as many forms as there are employers” (p.47). In his book *Women and workplace discrimination: Overcoming barriers to gender equality*, Gregory (2003) categorizes three common forms of gender discrimination: overt, blatant, and disparate. All of these forms exist, and how gender discrimination is expressed in the workplace

represents a flow between these three. For example, over time, since the passage of Title VII, overt and blatant discrimination, such as not hiring a woman because she is too pretty or not pretty enough, has given way to covert forms, such as wage disparities and lack of advancement opportunities. In other words, rather than the alleviation of discrimination against women, the discrimination has evolved.

A covert form of discrimination is disparate discrimination, which results in disparate impact (Gregory, 2003; Selmi, 2006). This type of discrimination occurs when the intent to discriminate is not obvious, or treatment appears neutral, however the outcome of relations is such that a person or group remains disadvantaged. The disadvantage of this subtle form of discrimination is called disparate impact (Selmi, 2006). An example is a business or organization claiming support of gender equality, however there are few or no women in top positions. The original power of Title VII was in its ability to curb overt and blatant discrimination against women based on generalizations about their gender. It acknowledges the right of individual diversity and disallows discrimination based on generalities (Gregory, 2003). It also acknowledges women are part of a diverse workforce and protects their right to work without discrimination (Selmi, 2006). However, there are gaps left in gender equality by promoting gender equality implicitly through diversity. A focus on forming diverse communities within an organization will not necessarily simultaneously form equality between the members of the community.

4.2.2 Diversity is not equality.

The restaurant industry is currently a racially, ethnically, and gender diverse work environment where women make up two-thirds of the workforce (Jayaraman, 2013; Allegretto et al., 2013; Batt et al., 2014). This diversity has yet to create gender equality. Women are not in

high numbers in positions of power in the restaurant industry. (ACF, 2011; Jayaraman, 2013; Sutton, 2014). This gender inequality mirrors the gender inequality in all fields (Leon-Guerreor, 2014).

Promoting equality in any workplace through promoting diversity is difficult, because there is no single definition of diversity in the workplace. According to a 2007 survey by the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM), only 30% of human resource professionals said their company had an official definition of diversity (Whitelaw, 2010). The Human Resource of Southern Maine (HRSM) organization website states, “At the outset of any diversity initiative, an organization needs to decide for itself how it will define diversity. There is no single right answer to the question” (Human Resource of Southern Maine [HRSM], n.d, para.1). HRSM goes on to state that the “trend” is toward broad definitions and these include “personality,” “work style,” and “visible dimensions” (HRSM, n.d., para. 3). It is stated that the broad definitions do not seem as important as “race” or “sexual orientation” (gender is not mentioned), but in fact they are, because over time, “Among the ones that frequently damage an organization or workgroup are factors around education, socioeconomics and work experience” (HRSM, n.d., para.3). This broad and general promotion of diversity, which varies from employer to employer and is defined in-house, is not specific to gender equality. The website offers examples of diversity statements from major US and international employers, and diversity is often used in the context of celebrating it, not creating equality from it (HRSM, n.d.). These corporate statements celebrating diversity echo the diversity statements of the CIA, Le Cordon Bleu, and the ACF.

The EEOC states that discrimination is illegal based on a person’s race, color, religion, sex (including pregnancy), national origin, age (40 or older), disability or genetic information.

But, as discussed earlier, there are many forms of discrimination that continue to happen, including blatant, overt, and disparate. Therefore, a more forward approach to gender equality should be utilized in the restaurant industry and in culinary education. An example of a more forward approach to gender equality can be found in Nordic countries.

The World Economic Forum (WEF) lists the top five countries that have the least amount of gender disparity in order: Iceland, Finland, Norway, Sweden, and Denmark (World Economic Forum[WEF], 2014). What these countries have in common is an intentional promotion of gender equality as an egalitarian principle. In other words, equality is seen as a birthright. The equality of men and women is considered a social responsibility, as well as the responsibility of government and organizations. It is intended to be apparent in government and other institutions, in the workplace, and in the home (Center of Gender Equality, 2012). This view creates opportunities for policy that is supportive of family, such as maternity leave for both men and women, without valuing gender roles. In Iceland, gender mainstreaming is part of the Act on Gender Equality, proactively ensuring that there is equal representation in government and in boardrooms. By law, boards must have at least 40% women. Gender mainstreaming is central to ensuring equality in Iceland (Centre of Gender Equality, 2012). These countries represent a nation-wide proactive approach to ensuring that women are equally represented in all aspects of society, including the workplace.

4.3 Contributions and Future Study

It is necessary to create gender equality in the workplace, including in restaurants. Therefore, it is also necessary to explore the pathways leading into fields dominated by gender inequality, such as the restaurant industry. Exploratory research can garner insights into how culinary education and chef certifying bodies are engaged, or can be engaged, in matters of

gender equality. An approach to creating equality in restaurants is to consider pervasive contact points between workforce and the industry, such as culinary educators and professional organizations. Leveraging these contact points and their accessibility to industry participants presents opportunity for change. Therefore, assessing not only the organizations' current engagement with the restaurant industry, but also their engagement with the issue of gender inequality, provides valuable information.

This research can be used as an impetus or support for future research of the restaurant industry, culinary schools, chef organizations, or gender issues in the workplace. It is a snapshot of the current position of culinary schools and the ACF on issues of gender equity in the restaurant industry, as represented through the text and images on their websites.

A useful area of future study is to determine more forward approaches and methods that institutions and organizations can utilize to promote gender equality in explicit and productive ways. The simultaneous presence of women in the culinary field, paired with their lack of power, visibility, and equality shows that present efforts to create equality through diversity are not working. Creating action plans for gender equality that utilizes gender-mainstreaming ideas from Nordic countries may foster movement beyond the complacency of Title VII. The ability for culinary schools to utilize action plans to integrate women in a more forward way would differentiate the institutions goals from the pattern of inequalities and ineffective solutions existing in the industry. More research is needed to see if action plans of gender mainstreaming based on Nordic ideologies have potential to be useful in the restaurant industry and its institutions in the United States. More research is needed into other ways that equality can be defined beyond Title VII.

Another approach to making women visible in the restaurant industry is to embed their

voice and viewpoints in the study of the industry. Attention should be given to the importance of including women's viewpoints on the restaurant industry, their lived experiences, and their coping mechanisms for dealing with gender inequality. Inserting the voice and experiences of women in research and discourse is a way of countering their absence of representation in the current construction of culinary history and contribution to the food system (Josselson, Lieblich, & Mc Adams, 2003). Including women's lived experiences in research can increase the chances that they are represented in future policy and program formations in a way that benefits them. If the inability to be represented is a problem, then the ability to be represented as an individual and as a group is important (Josselson et al., 2003). What themes emerge when women express their experiences in the restaurant industry? A useful research agenda for facilitating the emergence of female-centered themes of industry experiences is a *Grounded Theory* approach.

An inductive — or theory building approach — with grounded theory methods can utilize interviews with women to accomplish three important results. The first result is that it creates a space for women to participate in research and solutions to the problems they face in the restaurant industry (Josselson et al., 2003). The second result is that it counteracts the possibility of women being essentialized — of becoming a broad homogenous category — in research about gender in the restaurant industry. And third, it advantageously grounds the voice of women in an industry that is currently very fluid and experiencing change of historic practices and institutionalized ideologies (Shapiro, 2007; Collins, 2012). The following are some useful questions for embedding the voice and experience of women in the restaurant industry and the food system. Asking the question: *What is the lived experience of women in restaurants?*, contributes to the accurate portrayal and individuality of women's experiences in

the restaurant industry. Asking the question: *How do women compensate for, cope with, and internalize issues of inequality?*, creates a space where the issues women face can come to light and mitigations can be focused in the most useful or emergent areas. Asking the question: *Is there equality among women, for example is a woman with a family promoted as often as a woman without?*, can address opportunities for women while acknowledging diversity and seeking to forward equality and mentorship for all women.

Chapter 5: Conclusion

The purpose of this research is to explore gender inequality by investigating how culinary schools and the ACF acknowledge and respond to gender inequality in the restaurant industry. The finding of this study is that both culinary schools and the ACF promote diversity through the use of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, but none of the organizations promote gender equality specifically. This leads to the main finding that diversity is not equality, and that diversity does not necessarily lead to equality. The restaurant industry, as explored earlier, has a very diverse population composed of many women; however, gender inequality in the industry still exists.

There are equal numbers of men and women graduating from culinary schools. However, men far outnumber women in top chef positions and top restaurant positions in general. Men also outnumber women on the boards, in faculty, and in the skill accrediting committees of both culinary schools and the ACF. The culinary schools and the ACF promote diversity but do not specifically promote equality, gender or otherwise. Their own board and faculty mirror the inequality of the industry.

Promoting a general diversity instead of addressing inequality gives a false sense to women and men that equal opportunity among citizens in the work place and in education is being addressed. Looking at the positions of power, prestige, and opportunity within the restaurant industry and the culinary educational organizations, one can see how gender inequality persists even in this extremely diverse field. Promoting diversity in fields that have even less diversity than the restaurant industry leaves, still, a very long journey to equality. And the path to

equality is left unclear, because diversity and equality are not on the same continuum. In other words, increasing diversity in ever expanding numbers can still result in gender inequality.

As explained earlier in this research, creating an expectation that there will be equal opportunity simply because there is diversity is misleading and can lull people into thinking there is equality and opportunity for all simply because diversity exists in an organization. I argue that the greater numbers of women in schools and in the restaurant industry is not enough, as it simply means that an increasing number of highly skilled women are working in the bottom positions of the industry. They are laboring for the profits of the restaurants but receiving no personal opportunity or reward in return. This leads to the deskilling of women who do not advance in the industry despite their high level of education and accomplished skillset. Though it is outside the scope of this thesis, one can question if the same illusion of the equality of opportunity is also relevant to men and women of varying races, ethnicities, religions, ages, and sexual orientations. These are some of the areas that Title VII legally protects through its promise of equal opportunity. Using Title VII to promote diversity instead of equality is underutilizing its legal power and can have far reaching implications for all people seeking equality in the workplace.

Additional study needs to be done to fully understand how and to what extent Title VII may not be working to promote equality in the restaurant industry. Understanding how women experience, interpret, and compensate for gender inequality in the field also needs further study. An approach to research that brings women to the forefront of study in order to make them visible in an industry of gender inequality is an important next step. Research approaches such as grounded theory and interviews could be utilized as a way of highlighting the lived experience of women. Also useful, a multi-level analysis of the restaurant industry that addresses policy, as

well as micro cultural social analysis to investigate how gender inequality is produced and reproduced within the industry. What are the organizational and social structures that produce and reproduce inequality? How do women navigate and experience inequality in these organizations and society?

This study is limited in that it does not investigate the complexities of women's experiences in their own words. The study is contained to a general overview of gender equality issues within education and industry, such as how women are represented in text and image. In order to get beyond essentializing women and homogenizing their experiences, women's input is needed to give dimension to the study of the issues they face. Another limitation of this study is that it does not investigate each campus of the multi-campus culinary schools separately to see if there are differences between campuses that are not addressed by the main institutions' website.

Equality is about having equal opportunity that is actualized, not simply offered. Equality cannot exist alongside marginalization without being negated. Removing the illusion that promoting diversity is equal to promoting equality is the first step to creating a space for actual gender equality. Removing the illusion that equality exists by promoting diversity through Title VII could benefit the entire restaurant industry and the institutions that support it. It would also benefit 13 million people in the restaurant industry of different races, ethnicities, religions, ages, and sexual orientations. Even though this research focuses on gender, there is no need to stop at the promotion of gender equality. By understanding the limitations of how equality is promoted in organizations and education, new methods of promoting equality can arise. The result of these methods may lead to equality for all.

REFERANCE

- Aaltio, I., & Mills, A. J. (Eds.). (2002). *Gender, Identity, and the Culture of Organizations*. London: Routledge.
- Allegretto, S., Doussard, M., Graham-Squire, D, Jacobs, K., Thompson, D., & Thompson, J. (2013). *Fast food, poverty wages: The public cost of low-wage jobs in the fast food industry*. University of California, Berkeley Center for Labor Research & University of Illinois at Urban Champaign.
- Allen, P. & Melcarek, H. (2013). *The human face of sustainable agriculture: Adding people to the environmental agenda*. Santa Cruz, CA: center of Agroecology and Sustainable Food Systems. University of California, Santa Cruz.
- Allen, P., & Sachs, C. (2007). Women and food chains: the gendered politics of food. *International Journal of Sociology of Food and Agriculture*, 15, 1-23.
- Alpert, W. T. (1986). *The Minimum Wage in the Restaurant Industry*. New York: Praeger.
- American Culinary Federation. (2008, October 6). *Code of professional ethics*. Retrieved from http://www.acfchefs.org/download/documents/certify/certification/code_ethics.pdf
- American Culinary Federation. (2011). *ACF salary study 2011*. Retrieved from <https://www.acfchefs.org/ACF/Resources/Salary/Survey/ACF/Resources/Salary/Survey/>
- American Culinary Federation.(n.d.). *ACF diversity statement*. Retrieved from https://www.acfchefs.org/download/documents/diversity_statement.pdf
- American Culinary Federation. (n.d.) *ACF partnerships: American Academy of Chefs*. Retrieved from <http://www.acfchefs.org/ACF/Partnerships/AAC/ACF/Partnerships/AAC/>
- American Culinary Federation. (n.d.). *National officers and board of directors*. Retrieved from <http://www.acfchefs.org/ACF/About/Meet/Officers/ACF/About/Meet/Officers/>

- American Culinary Federation. (n.d.). *Meet us*. Retrieved from <http://www.acfchefs.org/ACF/About/Meet/ACF/About/Meet/>
- Arizpe, A. (2013, November 7). Coming to you from a restaurant far away. *Time*. Retrieved from <http://time100.time.com/2013/11/07/coming-to-you-from-a-restaurant-far-away/>
- Auerbach, C. F., & Silverstein, L. B. (2003). *Qualitative Data: An Introduction to Coding and Analysis*. New York, NY: University Press.
- Bartholomew, P., & Garey, J. (1996). An analysis of determinants of career success for elite female executive chefs. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 20:125. Doi: 10.1177/109634809602000209
- Batt, R., Lee, J., & Lakhani, T. (2014, January 15). *A national study of human resource practices, turnover, and customer service in the restaurant industry*. Retrieved from <https://www.ilr.cornell.edu/workerinstitute/initiatives/upload/National-Study-of-Human-Resource-Practices-High-Turnover-and-Customer-Service-in-the-Restaurant-Industry.pdf>
- Blum, F. (1944, July). Max Weber's postulate of "Freedom" from value judgments. *American Journal of Sociology*, 55(1), 46-52.
- Brownell, J. (1993). Women hospitality managers: Perceptions of gender-related career challenges. *Hospitality Review*, 11(2), 19-31. Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.fiu.edu/hospitalityreview/vol11/iss2/3/>
- Bureau of Labor and Statistics. (n.d.). *How to become a chef or head cook*. Retrieved from <http://www.bls.gov/ooh/food-preparation-and-serving/chefs-and-head-cooks.htm#tab-4>
- Burns, D. & Walker, M. (2005). Feminist methodologies. In B. Somekh & C. Lewin (Eds.), *Research Methods in the Social Sciences* (pp. 66-73). London, UK: Sage.
- Centre for Gender Equality Iceland. (2012). *Information on gender equality issues in Iceland*.

- Retrieved from http://www.althingi.is/pdf/wip/Gender_Equality_in_Iceland_2012.pdf
- Chua-Eoan, H. (2013, November 7). The 13 gods of food. *Time*. Retrieved from <http://time100.time.com/2013/11/07/the-13-gods-of-food/>
- Collins, G. (2012). Culinary school's dining room to get fresh air. *New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/07/04/dining/culinary-institute-to-renovate-a-teaching-restaurant.html>
- Creswell, J. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method approaches*. London, UK: Sage.
- Culinary Institute of America. (n.d.). *CIA: Diversity*. Retrieved from <http://www.ciachef.edu/diversity/>
- De Vault, M. (1991). *Feeding the family: The social organization of caring as gendered work*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Devine, C.M., Farrell, T., Blake, C.E., Jastran, M., Wethington, E., Bisogni, C.A. (2009). Work conditions and the food choice coping strategies of employed parents. *Journal of Nutrition Education and Behavior*, 41(5), 365-370.
- Dornenburg, A., & Page, K.(1995). *Becoming a chef*. New York, N.Y.: John Wiley & Sons.
- Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (1996, November). *World food summit: Women feed the world*. Retrieved from <http://www.fao.org/docrep/x0262e/x0262e16.htm>
- Furnish, H.A. (1982, March). A path through the maze: disparate impact and disparate treatment under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 after Beazer and Burdine. *Boston College Law Review*, 23(2:2), Article 3, 419-445
- Glynn, S.J (2012, April 16). The gender wage gap double whammy: Lower pay and lack of paid

- leave slams working women. *Center for American Progress*. Retrieved from <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/women/news/2012/04/16/11428/the-gender-wage-gap-double-whammy/>
- González Yuen, N. (2000). Oppression and democracy. In N. González Yuen (Ed.), *The politics of liberation* (3rd ed.)(pp.12-15). Dubuque, IA: Kendal/Hunt.
- Gregory, R. F. (2003). *Women and workplace discrimination: Overcoming barriers to gender equality*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Harding, S. (2004, 1987). Is there a feminist method? In Seale, C (Ed.), *Social Research Methods* (pp.456-464). London, UK: Routledge.
- Human Resource of Southern Maine (n.d.). *Defining diversity*. Retrieved from <http://hrasm.shrm.org/defining-diversity>
- Human Rights Watch. (2012). *Cultivating fear: The vulnerability of immigrant farmworkers in the US to sexual violence and sexual harassment*. Retrieved from http://www.hrw.org/sites/default/files/reports/us0512ForUpload_1.pdf
- Jayaraman, S. (2013). *Behind the kitchen door*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.
- Josselson, R., Lieblich, A., & McAdams, D. P. (Eds). (2003). *Up close and personal: The teaching and learning of narrative research*. Washington , DC :American Psychological Association.
- Joyner, R., Rouse, W., & Glatthorn, A. (2013). *Writing the winning thesis or dissertation: A stop-by-step guide* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Kantor, J. (2013, September 7). Harvard business school case study: Gender equity. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2013/09/08/education/harvard-case-study-gender-equity.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0

Karam, A. (2013, December). Education as the pathway to gender equality. *UN Chronicle*, L(4).

Retrieved from <http://unchronicle.un.org/article/education-pathway-towards-gender-equality/>

Lazar, D. (1998). Selected issues in the philosophy of social science. In Seale, C. (Ed.),

Researching Society and Culture (pp.7-21). London: Sage.

Le Cordon Bleu College. (2013). *Le Cordon Bleu College of Culinary Arts Austin and Dallas*

2013-2014 Catalog. Retrieved from

<http://catalog.careered.com/~media/catalogs/109/catalog.ashx>

Le Cordon Bleu. (2014, July). *Le Cordon Bleu college of culinary arts Chicago: 2014-2015*

catalog. Retrieved from <http://catalog.careered.com/~media/catalogs/32/catalog.ashx>

Le Cordon Bleu. (n.d.). *Le Cordon Bleu national advisory board*. Retrieved from

<http://www.chefs.edu/student-life/career-services/national-advisory-board>

Leon-Guerrero, A. (2014). *Social problems: Community, policy, and social action* (4th ed.).

Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publication, Inc.

Meriläinen, S., Tienari, J., Katila, S., Benschop, Y. (2009, September). Diversity management

versus gender equality: The Finnish case. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*.

26:3. 230-243. DOI: 10.1002/CJAS.105

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark. (2014, August). *Strategic framework for gender*

equality, rights, and diversity in Danish development cooperation. Retrieved from

http://um.dk/da/~media/UM/Danish-site/Documents/Danida/Det-vil-vi/Strategier/4985%20DANI%20Strategi%20Ligestilling_UK_5NY.pdf

Moskin, J. (2014, January 21). A change in the kitchen. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from

http://www.nytimes.com/2014/01/22/dining/a-change-in-the-kitchen.html?_r=0 .

- Mühlau, P. (2011). Gender inequality and job quality in Europe. *Management Revue*, 22(2), 114.
- National Restaurant Association. (2014). *Research: Facts at a glance*. Retrieved from <http://www.restaurant.org/News-Research/Research/Facts-at-a-Glance>
- Phillips, A. (2004), Defending equality of outcome. *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 12: 1–19.
doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9760.2004.00188.x
- Roemer, J. E. (1998). *Equality of opportunity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Sachs, C., Allen, P., Terman, A.R., Hayden, J., & Hatcher, C. (2014). Front and back of the house: Socio-spatial inequalities in food work. *Agriculture and Human Values*, 31, 3-17.
DOI 10.1007/s10460-013-9445-7
- Saldana, J. (2011). *Fundamentals of qualitative research: Understanding qualitative research*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Schwandt, T. (2000). Three epistemological stances for qualitative inquiry: Interpretivism, hermeneutics, and social constructionism. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Loncoln (Eds.), *The handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.) (pp. 189-213). Sage: Newbury Park, CA.
- Selby, J. (2014, October 17). Tom Kerridge: Female chefs don't have fire. *The Independent*. Retrieved from <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/people/tom-kerridge-female-chefs-dont-have-fire-to-make-it-to-top-level--but-girls-in-the-kitchen-i-like--it-makes-it-not-so-aggressive-9779878.html>
- Selmi, M (2006). Was the disparate impact theory a mistake? *UCLA Law Review*, 53, 701-782.
Retrieved from http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=881606
- Sen, A. (2001, November 9). Many faces of gender inequality. *Frontline*, 18(22). Retrieved from <http://www.frontline.in/static/html/fl1822/18220040.htm>

- Sen, A. (1979, May 22). *Equality of what?* Lecture at the Tanner Lecture on Human Values, Stanford University, Stanford, CA.
- Simon, C. (2014, March 17). Culinary schools speed the rise of hopeful chefs. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2014/03/18/education/culinary-schools-speed-the-rise-of-hopeful-chefs.html?_r=0
- Shapiro, L. (2007, February 28). Kitchen chemistry is chic: But is it a woman's place? *New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2007/02/28/dining/28avan.html?ei=5090&en=ca9faea1193e4dfc&ex=1330318800&partner=rssuserland&emc=rss&pagewanted=all&_r=0
- Society for Human Resource Management. (n.d.). *Federal statutes, regulations, and guidance: Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964*. Retrieved from <http://www.shrm.org/legalissues/federalresources/federalstatutesregulationsandguidance/pages/titleviiofthecivilrightsactof1964.aspx>
- Smith, D. (2012, August). The female touch: Women making inroads into restaurant industry leadership. *FSM magazine*. Retrieved from <http://www.fsrmagazine.com/female-touch-women-making-inroads-restaurant-industry-leadership?page=2>
- Subrahmanian, R. (2005). Gender equality in education: Definitions and measurements. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 25, 395-407.
- Sutton, Ryan. (2014, March 6). Women everywhere in food empires but not head chefs. *Bloomberg News*. Retrieved from <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2014-03-06/women-everywhere-in-chang-colicchio-empires-but-no-head-chefs.html>

- United States Agency International Development. (2008, May). *Gender equality framework*. Retrieved from http://www.ungei.org/resources/files/Education_from_a_Gender_Equality_Perspective.pdf
- United States Bureau of Labor and Statistics. (2014, January 8). *Chefs and head cooks: How to become a chef and head cook*. Occupational Outlook Handbook. Retrieved from <http://www.bls.gov/ooh/food-preparation-and-serving/chefs-and-head-cooks.htm#tab-4>
- United States Equal Opportunity Employment Commission (n.d.). *Overview*. Retrieved from <http://www.eeoc.gov/eeoc/>
- United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (n.d.). *Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964*. Retrieved from <http://www.eeoc.gov/laws/statutes/titlevii.cfm>
- Whitelaw, K. (2010, January 13). Defining diversity: Beyond race and gender. *NPR*. Retrieved from <http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=122327104>
- Williams, R. (1976). *Keywords: A vocabulary of culture and society, revised edition*. New York, NY: Oxford University.
- World Economic Forum. (2014). *Gender gap report: Rankings*. Retrieved from <http://reports.weforum.org/global-gender-gap-report-2014/rankings/>
- Young, I.M. (1990). Five faces of oppression in *Justice and the politics of difference*. (pp.39-65). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

APPENDIX Table of Data Collection of Text and Photo

Raw Data = Direct phrase indicating reference to gender or discussing equity	Preliminary Code: Word Choice	Explicit = direct reference (woman, man, he, she, female, male, plurals).	Implicit =generalized reference (equality, inclusive, diverse student body)
STUDENT: But when it gets right down to it, it's the amazing <i>people</i> (emphasis in text) who have made- and will continue to make- the CIA experience something truly unique and special.	People		I- m or f
FACULTY: The person leading your class could be an acknowledged master of the culinary or baking and pastry arts, or an expert in management or liberal arts studies. That person might also be a winner of the Culinary World Cup or a Culinary Olympics Gold Medal, a published author of textbooks or cookbooks, or featured chef in the media.	Person x2		I- m or f
Alumni Text			
Our 46,000- strong network of alumni can testify to the exceptional value of a CIA education.	Alumni		I
The list of celebrated CIA alumni is as diverse as it is extensive.	Alumni, Diverse		I
Alumni Photos and Descriptions Categories below:		E-fx6,mx24:	

Executive Chef		fx0,mx4	
Research and Development Chef		fx0,mx4	
Pastry Chef		fx1, mx4	
Food and Beverage Management		fx1, mx3	
Entrepreneur		fx2,mx2	
Stylist		fx1	
Writer		fx0 ,mx1	
Caterer		fx0, mx1	
Sommelier		fx2, mx2	
Photo Alumni Section top of Page: Photo of Female and Male chefs		fx1, mx1	
Photo In STUDENT Section:			
Male restaurant owner and TV personality. Photo changes. When checked back was a photo of male Faculty member from baking department; Three additional photos at bottom of page; 1)male student, 2)female faculty member, 3) female alumni restaurant owner and TV personality.		E-mx2 E-fx2 *all photos except for male student position of authority or leadership. Mx2 Fx2	
Student Profiles: Photo 22 total students			
BA in Management		E-fx5,E-mx7	
BA in Science		E-fx1	
Associates Degree		E-mx5, E-fx4	
Photo at top of page: 11 students in chef jackets posed on stairs		E-fx6, E-mx5	
Photos in FACULTY Section			
Photo at head of page male faculty member teaching male student		E- mx1 leadership E-mx1 non	

		leadership	
Staff by Department:			
Educational Admin.		E- fx6, mx5	
Applied food science		E-fx5, mx2	
Business Management		E-fx6,mx9	
Culinary Science		E-fx1, mx4	
Liberal Arts and Writing		E-fx16, mx5	
*Culinary Arts		E-fx6, mx46	
*Baking and Pastry Arts		E-fx8, mx15	
Presidents Cabinet:		E-fx2,mx10	
Photo top Page Presidents Cabinet: School, no people			