

# Good equal opportunities essay example

[Business](#), [Employee](#)



Though depicted as democratic, contemporary societies are from equal in certain respects since there are gender, sexuality, and income-based inequalities that can keep talented workers from being employed or stimulate their creativity as a means of working their way from the ranks. While some types of inequality may prove beneficial, some require revising for society's sake. The point is that giving a chance for self-fulfillment particularly to poor, albeit talented lower socio-economic groups, women suffering from historically established marginalized social status, and the representatives of sexual minorities has its pros and cons.

First and foremost, social equality giving more chances to all, talented people included, tackles a string of social issues like unemployment, poverty, an artificial social regulator and eases tensions between social groups.

Pettinger (n. p.) claims that inequality in part results from the monopolized price setting ability of large producers that can have a monopsony power, by which they are in absolute position to set whatever wage they consider economically appropriate, which may turn out to be below the competitive equilibrium. It follows therefrom that the unequal distribution of wealth does not allow small entrepreneurs to set up business ventures to offer competition and address the monopoly issue responsible for cheap labor force. The monopoly on price and salary setting leave income issues to large companies to decide. If that is the case, income gap enlarges the distance between social groups and polarizes the society, now composed of the less advantaged and the wealthy. Pettinger (n. p.) argues that unequal earnings produce social issues, such as frictions and a subsequent crime rate increase and riots, to say nothing of relative poverty. Inherited wealth with implied

profit, rent, or dividend opportunities rendering people lazy (Pettinger n. p.). Following the reverse logic, equality should liquidate monopoly, redistribute wealth, and make people more actively engaged in work.

Woiceshyn (n. p.) suggests otherwise, claiming that the redistribution of income from more productive to less productive individuals is anything but moral, compromising the human ability of surviving and thriving. It deprives people of the ability to create and innovate that advantages the producers, their customer base, and employees through cheaper high-quality products, more job opportunities, and higher living standards. With extra income taken away and distributed among the population, companies cannot increase their production capacity and employ more (Woiceshyn n. p.). It appears from this that there is no better thing for employees to do than stimulate workers financially. When innovativeness goes unrewarded, people will spend no time devising something new. They get paid for doing their work anyways, whether creatively or not. It is only patriotism that can drive them in the circumstances.

The USSR is a good case in point. In the capitalistic, democracy-centered world the lack of proper stimulus will kill initiative and turn otherwise creative and hardworking individuals into time servers. It will undermine the very framework of the USA based on creativity driving the economy of the technologically superior country. The right to rise from the ranks in the land of opportunities was what urged multitalented scholars to relocate at a time when their countries were war or revolution-riven. Their intelligence and creativity made America what is currently is – a superpower. If the USA should make people equal, the country should kiss national prosperity

goodbye, so to speak. Woiceshyn (n. p.) suggests that all socialist experiments with the redistribution of unearned wealth never made people more productive creating misery in the long run.

Of course, no one suggests inequality should have a polarizing effect on a society as it does in Russia, an heir to the USSR and a mafia state in its own right, in which social contrasts allow no opportunity to work one's way from a social pit. The lack of power accountability, corruption, and autocracy take an opportunity away from poor, albeit creative people, whose mind could serve the common wealth. It does not unless it is in line with the elites' intents. Third world developing and autocratic states like Russia should not be home to income inequality impoverishing the population. In capitalistic first world states, there should be an anti-monopoly committee of some kind created to look to it that monopoly does not hurt the interests of employees. If lower social classes are the smithy of talents, unequal wealth encouraging and cultivating initiatives should keep stimulating the new breed of millionaires who are taxpayers and job-givers. As is the case in the USA, the lack of sharp contrasts, unhealthy monopoly, the thriving middle class, and the chance of using creativity as a springboard for success all prove income inequality does allow talents to fulfill themselves as equalized income otherwise never would.

Women, the vehement fighters for equality and emancipation, is another indicator of social equality, which may have different outcomes depending on how to look at things. Gender equality gives chances to talented women to pursue professional careers, which does not necessarily ruin the major social institution responsible largely for children's upbringing. Covert (n. p.)

cites a review of 50 researches conducted in 2010 suggesting that neither behavioral issues nor unsatisfactory academic performance was the case in families, with both parents in the workforce. A 1970s study points to no essential distinctions in social skills, language, intelligence or attachment between children raised by daycare employees or mothers (Covert n. p.). However proved, the argument has its opponents who see otherwise. According to McDonough (n. p.), Fox News journalists stated 40% of women in the USA were major breadwinners. Juan Williams noted that the tendency could spell the disintegration of marriage, damaged one to children, and impact on future generations (McDonough n. p.). This opinion makes a lot of sense for a number of reasons. With both parents in the workforce, children may be left uncared for, which increases the risk of them going delinquent and adopting asocial life patterns. Worse, there may no longer be nucleus families, children raised fatherless by fully emancipated women. Some women will remain unwilling to set up a family while in pursuit of career goals, which can create a demographic crisis and the aging of a nation due to sub-replacement fertility.

Overall, inequality proponents seems more logical since every gender should perform roles where he or she exceeds most on efficiency grounds. No one claims household maintenance to be a trade of mediocre importance; this is just an area, in which women traditionally are superior to men. No one says the one performed by women is a trivial family role while that of men is largely the financial maintenance of the family. With financial position filled by men, traditionally more effective in the breadwinning function, women need to focus on equally important household duties that, if left

unperformed, may render the moneymaking function nearly useless. The distribution of roles and functions made at the dawn of human society means every role and function required a careful focus and skillful performance by each gender. Thus, talent males may have another opportunity to fulfill themselves to their full potential.

Equal opportunities for homosexual people, inclusive of talented individuals, is a debatable issue. Employees decide on terminating the labor contracts of whatever workers are homosexual in the belief that they may be less efficient in their capacity and that their presence on the staff may ruin or demoralize the working microclimate and alienate customers and skilled applicants. According to Medland (1), the UK Office for National Statistics noted that gay individuals were better educated, 38% holding a scientific degree. They are more likely to be in professional or managerial occupations than straight employees are, with 49% and 30% of workers engaged in such respectively. An inclusive environment helps draw the best. The bigger number of role models makes employees feel more comfortable at the workplace. Supportive employers generate loyalty helpful in retention and by recruitment. Developing products for all customers, homosexual or otherwise, meets the needs of all client categories (Medland 1-2). The presence of homosexual individuals is hardly to be treated with hostility in societies legalizing the marriages of such people. More importantly, the possibility of being served by such employees may draw homosexual customers. Overall, the social inequality faced by homosexual people is counterproductive since a large number of them are talented people whose

presence can ensure retention and recruitment as well as urging homosexual customers to use the services of a tolerant, supportive company.

## **Works Cited**

Covert, Bryce. “ No, Working Moms Are not Ruining Their Children.” Think Progress. 23 June 2014. n. p. Web. 28 Dec. 2014.

McDonough, Katie. “ Fox News: Rise of Female Breadwinners Will Destroy Society as We Know It.” Salon. 30 May 2013. n. p. Web. 28 Dec. 2014.

Medland, Dina. “ The Business Case: wherever They May Be, the Challenge is to Find the Best.” Community Business. 22 October 2013. 1-3. Web. 28 Dec. 2014.

Pettinger, Tejvan. “ Pros and Cons of Inequality.” Economics Help. 18 October 2011. n. p. Web. 28 Dec. 2014.

Woiceshyn, Jaana. “ Income Inequality Is Moral.” Capitalism Magazine. 13 January 2013. n. p. Web. 28 Dec. 2014.