Ramsay, H.E. and Scholarios, D.M. (2005) *Organisational participation and women - an attitude problem?* In: Participation and democracy at work: Essays in honour of Harvie Ramsay. Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 113-145. ISBN 9781403900043

Introduction

For all that has been written on the subject of worker participation, there is remarkably little consideration of how the prospects of exerting influence and control vary across the 'worker' group. The tendency in theoretical discussions is to treat the workforce as an homogeneous group (Acker and van Houten, 1974), and empirical investigations have made almost no effort to correct this. Once made explicit, it is evident that this position is untenable. A concern for democratisation should attend to any factors which: (a) divide the disadvantaged and so weaken the pressure for progressive change; and (b) might entail that any advances will apply to some only. This chapter will examine aspects of this issue as it applies to gender disadvantage in particular.

As the literature on gender inequalities has developed, numerous aspects of disadvantage have been explored. Many of these have evident implications for the issue of democratic control, but the connections have rarely been addressed directly (notable exceptions include Pateman (1983) and Phillips (1991)), and the consideration of evidence to refine our understanding of the question has been minimal and fragmentary. This is true particularly of work organisation, where attempts to address how gender inequalities impact on women's attitudes to industrial democracy are about as common as paperless offices (again see Kaul and Lie (1982), Baldwin and Walpole (1986), and Maddock (1994) for exceptions). Yet most of us would be aware of competing, if largely unspoken, assumptions. For example, do women feel relatively excluded from influence over decisions at work? If so, is this despite a desire equivalent to men’s in participation? Or is it a consequence of a relative disinterest in work and workplace decisions? And if the latter, is that disinterest a

false consciousness, due to socialisation within a patriarchal system, or an expression of more fundamentally different priorities and attitudes? To take the highly controversial claims of Hakim (1995) at face value, for instance, could lead by extrapolation to the view that women are less likely to want to participate in decisions or be involved at work.

The lack of focus on such questions is likely to be debilitating in itself, in that power inequalities are themselves barriers to progress, and constitute a key variable in the disadvantaging of women as well as in their experience of disadvantage. However, there may be as much of a risk in *presuming* gender to be *the* variable as in ignoring it, since this both takes difference for granted (rather than similarity in the usual gender-blind discussions) and homogenises afresh, this time within genders, rather than examining the differential impact of other variables such as age, ethnicity or occupation. As such it may potentially encourage managerial stereotypes of women as passive and disinterested in participation *en bloc*, for instance.

This chapter makes only an initial foray into this issue. It begins with a consideration of different emphases in explanations of inequality, distinguishing a focus on attitude differences from those which attribute greater importance to structural conditions and processes. The empirical analysis uses a secondary dataset based on a large-scale survey to test for gender differences in employee work attitudes, perceptions of control, perceptions of participation mechanisms, and issues of communication, consultation and representation. The findings from the attitude survey make a case for avoiding homogenisation of employees in discussions of organisational participation and challenge the various stereotypes of female employees which are prevalent in much management thinking and practice. Factors such as age, occupational position, hours worked, relations with one's manager, and union membership have all emerged as significant variables explaining differences in responses at

various points in the analysis. Thus, the chapter emphasises the danger of oversimplified generalisation on responses within as well as between genders and considers the implications of these results for more

.

Organisational Participation and Gendered Inequality

The question of workplace democracy and power is arguably an indivisible one in principle, with everything affecting everything else, and control analysed as both process and structure. Thus, payment systems, skills grading, performance assessment and competency measurement systems, selection and recruitment, training and development, and all aspects of employment practice could be seen as impacting upon opportunities and perceived capacity to participate in decisions at different levels. It has been established that levels of education or recognised skill influence people's felt efficacy and levels of participative activity, for instance (Wall and Lischerson, 1977).

If anything which impacts on workplace inequality has possible implications for democracy and control, as argued above, then it follows that the analysis of gendered disadvantage quickly dissolves the presumption that only factors within the employment relationship itself should be the subject of study. We would have to consider socialisation in the family, domestic responsibilities and pressures, and wider patriarchal relations in society in order to make sense of what happens with regard to worker participation. Perhaps the discomfort this creates by cracking the closure of industrial democracy debates helps to explain the reluctance of writers in the field to tackle the gender question - or potentially race, age, and wider class issues, it might be added. In many ways it was Pateman's (1970) exposure of the political/industrial democracy link which opened up this issue, though few have explored it, possibly diverted by the fact that her initial prime interest was in the link

from work *to* the wider socio-political sphere rather than vice versa. Her later self-correction (1983) introduced gender, and in the process considered the importance of the link in the other direction.

Whilst one of the most significant and consistent findings of research on gendered disadvantage is the mutually conditioning and reinforcing nature of different aspects of disadvantage, it is possible to characterise different emphases in explanations of inequality. The empirical work presented in this chapter provides a test of *attitude differences.* On this account women's own attitudes are important in their disadvantaging. Women, or at least a significant proportion of them, are seen as preferring and prioritising homebuilding, child raising and other domestic roles over work. They may only work reluctantly, or they may choose to work part-time and take maternity career breaks to mix the benefits of competing claims on them. This fits human capital or orthodox dual labour market approaches which suggest that women's disadvantages lie in their own decisions about investing in training and seeking jobs, for instance (Mincer, 1966; Polachek, 1981). This viewpoint rests amongst other things on an assumption that women do have distinct attitudes to work in general and participation in particular.

Alternative explanations emphasise different primary sources of disadvantage and imply different responses to achieve greater democratisation. Hegemonic patriarchy emphasises the process by which gendered attitudes are formed positing an hegemony of masculine values in socialisation concerning work roles (i.e. on a kind of female false consciousness). As long as opportunities are provided, reluctance to get democratically involved on the part of women should be taken at face value and respected. Other perspectives are less accepting of attitudinal, individual-level explanation. The presence of masculine organisational cultures, for instance, imply disadvantaging structures which shape

women’s actions and act as powerful subtexts to organisational decision-making and interaction. Patriarchal management practices may restrict women's access to influential or skilled positions through implicit stereotyping and discrimination, resulting in more deliberate and visible prejudices and actions, and segmentation of labour markets. Similarly, patriarchal practices among workers may produce intra-class divisions through gender bias by unions, other representative bodies, or powerful groups of male employees; e.g., in monopolising training for new technology, or in grading of jobs. And explanations based on domestic patriarchy and material constraint stress the domestic division of household and childcare labour and the power distribution in the domestic sphere (control of money, decisions, task allocation) as shaping the 'decision' to work or not, and whether to get involved in unions or participation channels.

None of these alternatives predict particularly different attitudes by gender. Rather, the process of democratisation requires a challenge to male hegemony over socialising institutions and values, exposure of masculine, undemocratic organisation itself, or practical reforms such as proper support and benefits/taxation for single mothers, child care facilities, and training access and support. Patriarchal practices imply that women feel greater distance from decision-making and so powerlessness, while explanations based on domestic patriarchy suggest that union membership may not correct, or may even exacerbate, any perceived power differentials between men and women.

The Evidence

The empirical analysis in this chapter focuses on testing the proposed distinctiveness of women's attitudes using a large-scale survey. We recognise the limited discriminatory power of attitude surveys particularly as the one used here was not designed for the purpose at hand and cannot provide a test of the alternative perspectives outlined above. The beginning of explanation, nevertheless, is better than continued neglect, and the findings are of sufficient interest to guide future research, and in the meantime to challenge some powerful presumptions on the issues under examination. We, therefore, first outline the empirical findings before returning to consider the implications of these for the alternative explanations of inequality presented above.

The dataset was made available by the Department of Trade and Industry and compiled from a large survey of employees' experience of employee involvement. An earlier summary of some of the findings may be found in Tillsley (1994). Unlike many such surveys, numbers are large enough for both sexes (799 women and 721 men) to allow analyses to be conducted with acceptable levels of statistical confidence[i]. The original survey was in fact larger than this, but it was decided to focus on employees for the purposes of the analysis here, and have excluded those who are classified as self-employed (15% of the original sample) or on government-sponsored training schemes (2%). In addition, the chapter refers to evidence drawn from a variety of fragmentary sources on the relationship between gender, work attitudes and participation (see Ramsay (1996) for a detailed review). These other findings, when drawn together, can clarify the consistency or variation in patterns of observations from available research, and also fill certain gaps in the DTI survey data.

Table 1 summarises the characteristics of the respondent sample. Although 77% of respondents worked over 30 hours per week, 42% of women and only 3% of males worked

less than 30 hours. Males were significantly more likely to have managerial or supervisory responsibility, and longer tenure. A trade union or staff association existed in 40% of organisations, and within these, 10% more men than women reported being union members. The sample was evenly distributed by age and there was no difference in male versus female participation in share ownership schemes.

With respect to the characteristics of the organisations employing these respondents, Table 2 shows that the sample is broadly spread across sectors and different sized organisations, and across types of work. This helps to a degree in getting around one of the perennial problems in assessing differences of work-related attitudes between men and women: that approaching half of all jobs are effectively gender segregated. This is apparent from this survey also: some occupational classifications are dominated by women - clerical/secretarial (74% female), and personal and protective service occupations (75%), for instance; craft and related occupations, and plant and machine operatives, are predominantly male (93% and 78%, respectively). Sectorally, women were also particularly prevalent in local government, health, and charities, which together represented 30% of the female sample. Sectoral and occupational variables may well affect work control and experience, but such differences might themselves be traced back to gender assumptions and impact on gendered cultures in different loci. The chapter, therefore, avoids the presumption that an analysis such as that presented here fully comprehends the impact of gender as a variable.

Table 1 about here

Table 2 about here

Work Attitudes and Perceptions of Control

Work orientations

The salience of democratic control at work may be expected to be lower to the extent that work itself is of less importance in an individual's priorities and identity relative to other activities. If objectives are primarily monetary, social, or security-oriented, for instance, participation might be expected to be viewed instrumentally or marginalised. Similarly, if a person's priorities are outside work, most obviously in the home with family, one might again expect workplace influence to be less important to them, though if they do work they might place greater emphasis on some aspects of workplace relations. Stereotypes would suggest that work is less central to women's lives, and that they are more likely to prioritise convenience of work (in allowing them to meet domestic needs), peer relations and relations with management. Meanwhile men, it may be argued, will be more work-centred in their identity and focus, and at the same time, as 'breadwinners', will tend to be more economistic.

The supposed marginality of work content to women has been criticised by Feldberg and Glenn (1979) as applying a 'gender' model to women's employment, whilst a 'job' model is applied to men. They are scornful of this essentialist assumption, and argue that women, too, are affected by job content and rewards. Yet Hakim's recent intervention (1995) appears to tip the argument back towards expectations that the priorities of at least a large proportion of women will be dictated by other factors than those related to paid employment.

Evidence suggests that women are less different to men in their priorities at work than stereotypes would suggest (Whirlpool Foundation, 1995, 1996; Clark, 1997; Sloane and Williams, 2000); but this in turn is countered by other sources, including findings from the Workplace Employment Relations Survey series, showing generally more positive attitudes amongst women except at the highest skill levels (Beynon and Blackburn, 1972; Gallie and

White, 1993; Rose, 2000).

The DTI study asked respondents to identify a single most important factor influencing them in taking their present jobs. As shown in Table 3, women cited convenient working hours, interesting work making use of their skills, and job security most often; while men cited interesting work, job security and no other available job, respectively, with few mentioning convenient hours. The relative figures for hours and job security seem to confirm women's emphasis on non-work commitments. Further analysis of the female sub-sample showed that this was particularly so for those working less than 30 hours, of whom 75% selected convenient hours, compared to just 12% of full-time women (χ^2 (2) = 154.61, $p<.001$) and in occupations such as clerical/secretarial, personal/protective, and sales, which tended to be female-dominated.

However, this does not tell us whether the priority is seen as a matter of practicality or preferred role. Other results in Table 3 seem to disconfirm as much as confirm stereotype notions, with women at least as likely to be concerned with job content as men, for instance. Exploring this further, a logistic regression of the likelihood to choose interesting work rather than any of the other factors in Table 3 entered all the variables and their interactions with gender into the equation, excluding hours worked because of the few part-time males. Gender did not enter as a significant variable, either on its own or in interaction with other variables. For both men and women, as more responsibility was gained at work, if they were in managerial/professional occupations, and if they were employed in the public rather than private sector, interest in the job became more prominent. This tends to confirm the similarities in orientations among working men and women observed in other studies, although it leaves open the possibility that the number of hours worked reflects a key division of attitudes among women as Hakim argues. This point is examined later in the chapter.

Table 3 about here

Satisfaction, commitment and management relations

Table 4 summarises several attitude variables by gender and shows that women reported a slightly higher level of satisfaction with the job factor most important to them. The analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) F test in this table also indicates that gender differences which are significant in the one-way ANOVA remain when the effects of other personal and organisational covariates are controlled for; in this case, age, job level, hours worked, tenure, organisation size, organisation type (public or private sector) and trade union membership.

Table 4 about here

Some versions of stereotype gender images would predict that women will be more cooperative with management and less likely to take a conflictual position by nature. However, the countervailing notion that women are less tied to employment than men makes hypotheses concerning their organisational commitment less clearly derivable from such a portrait. Marston, et al. (1993) suggest that organisational commitment is slightly higher among men, but that this can be largely accounted for by the less attractive nature of women's jobs. Other evidence (Mathieu and Zajac, 1990; Cohen and Lowenberg, 1990) suggests little or no difference in organisational loyalty between men and women, apparently disposing of both versions of the difference thesis. Age has been found to be more important, with commitment increasing over time, particularly steeply for women (Gallie and White, 1993).

The results in Table 4 show that women tended to be more positive than men about relations with their boss and that this gender difference survives the analysis of covariance. In a review of evidence from a number of European countries, good relations with management were found to be positively correlated with job satisfaction, this applying equally to part-time

and full-time male and female workers (Curtice, 1993). The table also shows, however, that men and women exhibit almost indistinguishable reported levels of commitment to success of their employing unit, whether defined as department or the whole organisation. Generally, commitment to department is higher than to the organisation as a whole.

Explanations of commitment were explored further in two multiple regressions. The results in Table 5 confirm that different variables influence commitment for men and women. Only good relations with one's boss was a significant predictor of both types of commitment for both sexes. For men, commitment to the organisation increased with tenure and personal control in the job or department, while commitment to the department increased with level of responsibility and the same personal control variables. For women, commitment to organisational success also increased with age, and as perceived control at organisational levels increased. Enhanced feelings of control in the job did not seem to transfer to organisational commitment as they did for men. In addition, working in the public sector, which encompasses a large proportion of women in this sample, was also likely to be associated with increased levels of organisational commitment. Job level did not predict increased commitment to the department for women as it did for men. In other words, female managers do not have much more commitment to their own department's success than other female employees unless some other factor, such as good relations with their boss, enables them to have increased feelings of job control. Finally, the effect of age on organisational commitment is significant only for women, and persists regardless of number of hours worked. This may reflect different life-cycles, especially for those in the older age groups, for whom it has been less typical for women to work almost throughout their adult lives, so that unfettered escape from the home may mean more to the oldest group.

Table 5 about here

The reciprocal of good relations with management and organisational commitment is arguably attachment to a union or degree of militancy. Notwithstanding possibilities of dual commitment (Guest and Dewe, 1991; Angle and Perry, 1986), the extent to which men and women differ on these issues does offer possible insights reflecting on images of female quiescence and submission to authority. It also relates to the question of worker patriarchy raised above, which adds a complicating twist to possible interpretations. While unionisation and shop floor militancy are often associated with traditional male-dominated industries, this may not be due to gender itself although employment relations history and gender cultures are connected in some way. Case studies suggest that women are no less 'unionate' than men, nor less willing to act where required, but also demonstrate that unions themselves are often felt to be unresponsive to women either as individuals or to women's particular demands (e.g., Wajcman, 1983; Findlay, 1989; Pollert, 1981; Cavendish, 1982; Cockburn, 1983).

In the DTI sample, union membership was markedly higher (70.1%) than it is known to be for the working population as a whole; this reflects the disproportionate numbers of larger companies in the sample, and our focus on employees. Women in the sample were less likely to be union members than men (65.6% as against 74.2%), a finding consistent with known differentials in propensity to join unions, but largely explicable in terms of the different employment settings and circumstances of the two genders (Sinclair, 1995).

Beyond this, the DTI study affords only limited leverage on an examination of militancy or critical/conflictual attitudes to the company. It does confirm the need for caution on assuming that trade unionism entails less support for the employing unit, however, as shown by the non-significant coefficients for both men and women in Table 5.

Perceived personal control

The DTI study focused on perceived personal influence on decisions at four levels of

participation: (a) the job, (b) immediate physical working conditions (c) department or branch operation, and (d) the overall organisation. Respondents were invited to locate their position on a four-point scale ranging from 'none at all' to 'a great deal'. Previous studies (e.g., Ramsay, 1976; Wall and Lischerson, 1977) suggest that perceived personal control should decline as respondents work through this list from job to organisational-level decisions. So it proves to be with the DTI sample also. At the job level, 67% report a great deal or quite a lot of control; for work conditions the figure is 46%; at departmental level, 40%; and for the organisation as a whole, 22%. This pattern was evident across all occupational groups and for both men and women.[ii] Those with managerial responsibility were far more likely than those without to report the top two levels of control on all four types of decision, and both males and females in managerial or administrative posts reported higher feelings of personal control in their jobs relative to other occupations, both male- and female-dominated. Intriguingly, however, females in managerial and supervisory positions were markedly more likely to be disadvantaged relative to males at their own level in terms of personal control than were other groups of women. This could be consistent with Wajcman's finding (1996) that management were more, not less prone to sex-role stereotyping, and that women felt forced to adopt male styles in order to succeed. The relative enhancement of perceived control afforded by managerial and supervisory status was markedly greater than the gender differentials though. Women supervisors report almost identical control to their male counterparts, and their differential over female non-supervisory staff was particularly sharp at this level (2.53 to 1.87 mean score).

Separate multiple regression analyses for men and women predicting perceptions of control at different levels of decisions are shown in Table 6 and reveal that associations between level of responsibility and relations with one's boss are positive and significant at all

levels for both sexes. The effect of the latter variable is greatest for job control and declines as the focus moves away from this immediate point.

An important characteristic of the sample was the proportion of women (41%) who worked part-time. This group was less likely to report high levels of personal control at all levels, as indicated by the positive regression coefficients for hours worked in Table 6. This probably indicates their recognition of the lower defined skill and quality of part-time work. Too few men worked part-time to allow a confident comparison controlling for other factors. One-way ANOVA tests comparing males' and females' mean perceived control scores only for those working more than 30 hours per week found no persisting differences, affording an important elaboration of the gender comparisons above. Other variables which were important for perceived levels of control were organisation size, particularly for women on whom it exerted a negative influence, and longer tenure, which, for men, increased perceived control in the department and organisation as a whole.

Thus, to summarize, while gender has some explanatory significance with respect to satisfaction and management relations, it is not a powerful independent variable in its own right for drawing conclusions about employee commitment. Rather, gender effects may be a reflection of other variables, most obviously, job level, hours worked and perceptions of personal control within the workplace. Perceptions of control especially are influenced by job level and relations with one's boss for both men and women alike.

Table 6 about here

Communication, Consultation and Representation

The incidence of participation mechanisms in UK organisations (i.e., downward and upward communication, financial involvement and representative participation) has been well

documented (see for example Daniel, 1987; Marchington, et al., 1992; Millward, et al., 1992; McNabb and Whitfield, 1999) and on the whole reveals wide variation in practice and fairly low levels of consultation and involvement by British management. In the DTI survey, public sector organisations tended to inform employees significantly more often about health and safety issues, the organisation's overall plans, and career opportunities. Private sector employers communicated more on the organisation's overall efficiency and the performance of individual departments, although this amounted to only 40% of private sector organisations in both cases. Moreover, 20% and 18% of private and public sector employers, respectively, were reported as using no methods of communication at all.

We saw earlier that on average women reported slightly better relations with their immediate boss than men. Despite this, women seemed less likely to say they had received information about these aspects of their work from management than were men. This difference largely vanished, however, after controlling for the predominance of females among those working less than 30 hours per week (those few males in this category also reporting lower levels of information).

The DTI survey also asked employees to rate the effectiveness of different types of communication. These ratings are shown for men and women in both unionized and non-unionised organisations in Table 7.The primary means of communication for learning about events in the workplace or making employee views known were circulars/internal memoranda (downward communication only), meetings between groups of employees and managers or supervisors, staff appraisals, and most prominently informal conversations with managers/supervisors or colleagues. These were rated very or fairly effective for both purposes by the majority, as evidenced by the ratings of around 3 for unionised and non-unionised organisations in Table 7. For most of these mechanisms, there were no significant

differences by gender: women were more favourable only for suggestion schemes and informal conversations with managers. In non-unionised organisations, there was a significant interaction effect between gender and job level for ratings of conversations with managers; women managers and supervisors were more favourable towards informal conversations with superiors or colleagues than either their male managerial counterparts or female non-managerial employees ($F=3.91$, $p<.05$ for conversations with superiors and $F=4.67$, $p<.01$ for conversations with colleagues).

Thus, informality was more highly rated by women as a vehicle for participation in non-unionised organisations, particularly if they were supervisors or managers. The effect of the union appeared to be the same for both men and women, with no major gender differences in perceptions of effectiveness. Where trade unions or staff associations negotiated with management on pay, formal methods of communication were also more likely, in keeping with an expected institutionalisation of employee relations. Informal mechanisms remained the most common means of communication in all organisations, however.

Table 7 about here

Fourteen per cent of the overall sample claimed no consultation prior to new initiatives being undertaken, these being chiefly new staffing levels (in 48% of cases), the introduction of new working methods or conditions (44%), quality control measures (36%) and changes in equipment (31%). Those who acknowledged any consultation reported mostly notification of all employees (40%), but also discussions directly with employees (34%) or employee representatives (24%).

Among those individuals reporting that changes had taken place, 6-7% fewer women than men said they were aware of consultation thereon, whether through general notification,

directly from management, or through representatives, but none of these differences were statistically significant. However, two groups where women were prevalent - among part-time employees and in feminised occupational categories – reported lower levels of consultation. For instance, in personal and protective services over 75% reported no discussion prior to changes, compared to an average of 63% in other occupations.

These observations were confirmed in three stepwise regressions predicting the likelihood of consultation (i) between managers and employees; (ii) between managers and employee representatives; and (iii) through notification to all employees. The predictors were gender, job level, age, occupation, years with the organisation, trade union membership, organisational size, organisational sector (private or public) and interactions of each of these with gender. Job level emerged as a significant predictor of (i) and (iii); i.e. the greater the level of responsibility, the more likely employees were to report direct employee/management consultation (β=.43, $p<.001$) and general notification (β= .27, $p<.01$). The two other variables to emerge were, firstly, tenure, which was significant for awareness of management/employee representative consultation (β=.16, $p<.01$) and general notification (β=.17, $p<.01$), and, secondly, size of organisation, where the larger the organisation the more consultation of all types was reported (β values of .19, .18 and .13, all $p<.01$. for each regression, respectively). Belonging to a trade union seemed to provide no advantage in terms of increased awareness of consultation. Even in unionised firms, at least half the sample perceived that there had been no discussion or prior notification before changes.

In short, in the reported evaluations of communication or consultation channels, gender differences were rare. This challenges the expectations of opposing established views on gender differences**.** Other findings here, however, have suggested that on average women find themselves to be less well consulted or informed than men, suggesting that there may be

structural differences in experience related to gender. We therefore consider the implications of gendered organisation theory for interpretation of some of the findings in the next section of the paper.

Gendered organisation?

We begin with the notion that organisations are dominated by masculine cultures which innately oppress women, and devalue female individuals and feminine characteristics (Calas and Smircich, 1990; Kerfoot and Knights, 1998; Savage and Witz, 1992; Collinson and Hearn, 1996). Acker (1992) argues that four sets of gendered processes can be identified in organisations: production of gender divisions (jobs, pay, power); creation of symbols and images that justify divisions; gendered interactions embodying dominance/subordination; and the internal construction by individuals of their understanding of appropriate role behaviour. Although this model embodies disadvantaging decision-making by managers, it recasts it as part and parcel of this wider, more pervasive gendered construction of organisational rules, criteria and *modus operandi.*

In this vein, Wilson (1995) reports research showing that women's leadership styles are still generally less valued than those of males, and that the control of women managers is often compromised by aggressive male subordinates. Critical studies of organisational cultures and structures have argued that they tend to embody masculine values - although the precise version of masculinity may shift over time, e.g. from paternalism to strategic rationalism and individualistic competitiveness (Kerfoot and Knights, 1998). Bureaucracy, too, is seen as a target for feminists to attack, and in radical terms rather than within its own suffocating discourse (Ferguson, 1984). It is apparent that if we are concerned with influence, forms and experience of decision-making, and 'involvement', then a gendered organisation

perspective has profound implications.

At the same time, the notion that there are innately 'feminine' ways of managing, and that women are disadvantaged unless (and probably even if) they adopt 'male' styles is both appealing and problematical. The appeal is the strength it lends to a gendered model of power and democracy, with the additional promise of greater equality leading to a more democratic management style for women, and arguably for men too. One problem is the essentialist nature of parts of the argument, and also its exclusive privileging of gender. Wajcman's (1996) research casts doubt on the more radical claims that female managers adopt intrinsically different managerial styles, for instance.

If masculine bias is built into the relational fabric of the organisation, for instance, shaping mental work and identity as well as concrete practices, then assessing attitudes at face value will be of only limited utility. The tendency of women to see relations with their boss in better terms than men takes on a very different possible meaning within this framework, rather than offering any means to test it, to give just one example. But there is no way to judge in this survey whether, for example, male and female managers provoked differing assessments from male or female employees.

While this limitation of the evidence is accepted, there are some observations which may guide other, more interpretative research. Looking back over findings, there is a discrepancy between women on average reporting better relations with their boss while also reporting lower personal control and less frequent consultation on changes at work. These differences were particularly bound up with the predominance of women amongst those working less than 30 hours per week, as confirmed by the regressions predicting personal control. This is at least suggestive of some patterns in a gendered organisational analysis of participation.

Exploring further, firstly, we recall the findings on personal control reported earlier, wherein women managers appeared to be more disadvantaged than other women employees relative to their male counterparts in terms of perceived control. While a higher level of responsibility seemed to lead to increased commitment to work unit only for men, it did not emerge as a significant determinant of perceived control. Wajcman (1996) implied that gender influences may be strongest towards the top of the organisation; but there was no significant interaction between gender and job level in the regressions for perceived consultation.

Our second stage of exploration modifies this observation to explore potential structural determinants of perceived personal control at non-managerial levels for full-time employees. The analysis examined environments in which gendered relations might operate differently by dividing respondents into two groups: those in female-dominated occupations and those in male-dominated occupations. The mean ratings of personal control for men and women within each sub-group are presented in Table 8 alongside those for managers and supervisors. Personal control is consistently lower for women than men within both types of occupations, and, particularly noticeable, lower for females in male-dominated occupations.

Table 8 about here

Acknowledging the relatively small number of women in the latter occupations and hence the need for caution in inferring a gender effect for this data, we carried out a two-factor ANOVA using gender and occupational category, and including demographic and organisational variables as covariates. There was no significant interaction between gender and occupational category for any of the perceived control measures shown in Table 8, suggesting that women were not necessarily more disadvantaged in a male-dominated environment than in a female-dominated one. Similarly, gender did not emerge as a

significant main effect, although the small sample of women in ‘male’ occupations may have limited the reliability of this comparison. However, in all cases, there was a significant main effect for occupational category, which, as the means suggest, implies those in so called ‘male’ occupations were likely to have much lower levels of personal control. In addition, tenure was a significant covariate in all cases, with personal control increasing with longer service in the organisation. Organisational size, meantime, contributed to significantly lower perceived personal control overall, despite its association with greater provision of formal channels for consultation and communication.

Interpreting these findings any more strongly would involve a disingenuous pretence that they have clear and unambiguous implications. Nonetheless, the patterns observed are suggestive enough to indicate the need for a differentiated exploration of gendered organisational environments by other means.

Trade Unions and Gender

The impact of employee organisations relate particularly to some aspects of the worker patriarchy argument. The fear that unions will replicate and reinforce the disadvantages imposed on women by management practice and other factors would lead to an expectation that unions might be associated with no improvement in women’s experience of personal control or representative participation relative to men - and that they may even be worse off than non-unionised women, while men gain.

Sinclair (1995, 1996) offers evidence from a large-scale survey which shows that differences in propensity to unionize between men and women, and also in levels of activism, were best explained by pay levels and by how favourable attitudes to unions were. Attitudes to trade unions did not differ substantially between full- and part-time workers, nor with

differences in attachment to work. Indeed women were no less supportive of the principle of trade unionism, though they were seemingly rather less happy with their experience of unions. Sinclair speculates that domestic commitments, not measured in the DTI survey, were also likely to account for differences between the sexes, and between full- and part-timers. These findings are consistent primarily with the worker patriarchy and material constraints factors posited earlier.

The DTI data, however, appear to point to other and more complex conclusions. Firstly, it is notable that, for men, union membership is generally associated with a marked reduction in perceived control at all decision levels compared to male non-unionists; in contrast, women union members reported slightly higher control than female non-unionists at all decision levels. Because of this contrary pattern, despite the overall gender inequality in perceived control discussed earlier, gender differences among union members all but vanish. Women appear to gain most from union membership in increasing personal control for, at least, organisational level decisions.

Secondly, it is possible that these differences are accounted for in part at least by the different patterns of union membership between men and women. Moreover, union membership had little effect on perceived control or ratings of communication or consultation for either men or women.

Overall, then, the DTI data lend highly qualified support, but support nonetheless, to a claim that being in a union has some positive rather than negative effects on control for women members relative to men. This does not refute claims that unions are often male-dominated and sexist in their policies and practices, but it nonetheless invites some reappraisal of any argument that being in a union is beneficial for men but not for women.

Part-Time Workers and Feminist "Fallacies"

This final section scrutinises more closely the differences between full-time and part-time working women, and its implications for gender differences on participation. As noted earlier, this issue has been brought to prominence by the analysis of Hakim (1991, 1995, 1996) which is presented as a critique of feminist "fallacies". Hakim argues that work commitment is lower among women as a group than among men, and that this is reflected in the proportion of women who either choose not to work or, increasingly importantly, elect to work part-time. In arguing that these are preferences, not choices forced by labour market discrimination and unequal opportunities, Hakim breaks with modern feminist orthodoxies. She also argues that part-time jobs are not typically poor or marginalised jobs, made thus by employer whim and prejudice, but actually meet the needs of the women who take them. Confronting the "part-time paradox", whereby women working shorter hours consistently report higher levels of job satisfaction than full-timers (male or female) despite having lower paid and less skilled jobs on average (see Curtice, 1993), she argues that this can be explained by these women having chosen the jobs to suit their lower work commitment - hence their satisfaction.

Hakim is correct, it seems, to assert a need to examine critically any *presumption* (a) that women have the same attitudes as men, or (b) that women can safely be treated as an homogeneous group. However, it does not follow that the present conclusions as to the pattern of attitudes concur with hers. First, we share Hakim's cautious view of relying solely on quantitative analysis of what may be insubstantial data in some ways; but we would argue that if surveys have some value then the independent or interactive effects of variables should be explored. Doing so here has already led to considerable qualification of findings which might be misread from simple percentage comparisons such as those employed by Hakim.

Secondly, an alternative viewpoint remains that women work part-time because circumstances require them to, due to a lack of childcare and other support from what are seen as inescapable responsibilities. One study on which Hakim relies, by Watson and Fothergill (1993), actually reports that it is material constraints rather than normative reasons which account for most decisions to work part-time. The higher levels of satisfaction are accounted for by arguing that these women form lower expectations of jobs as a result of their experience, and so come to appreciate the relative worth of conditions of which full-timers tend to be more critical[iii] . Hakim herself does admit that: "When male and female employees are matched closely on the jobs they do, organisational environment, and full-time hours, sex differentials fade and disappear" (1991:109), but since she sees the overall lack of match as a matter of women's own choice, this is seen as reinforcing her argument rather than confirming her opponents. Sinclair (1995), however, finds no difference in work commitment between men, full-time women and part-time women in a large-scale sample.

Our concern with this debate, meanwhile, arises from competing implications of the different positions for gendered attitudes to participation. Hakim's would tend to promote the view that some women, at least, will be more acquiescent to management and more positive about their work, and would imply that part-time women will also be likely to have less interest in participation; her opponents would see any lower interest in participation by women, and part-timers in particular, as driven primarily by poorer jobs, low self-esteem, weak influence, and possibly exclusion from the union, reinforced by the practical constraints which limit active participation as well as working longer hours. Thus, Hakim's position would logically entail simply accepting that things are as they are; others would seek changes in management and union policies, and the provision of support facilities, to allow part-timers to participate more fully.

Some of the findings in the DTI study are consistent with those that have led to these competing interpretations. It was reported earlier that part-timers were much more likely to choose convenience of working hours as their key reason for taking the job, for instance. Levels of commitment, to department or organisation, were also found to be quite similar, though a little higher for full-timers. Age, along with measures of perceived personal control in the workplace, was the predominant predictor of commitment to organisational success for women. Hours worked was, in turn, a strong predictor of perceived personal control at all levels; thus, while working part-time does not necessarily directly impact commitment, it does have negative implications for perceived personal control in different aspects of work.

The consistent perception of lower control suggests that part-timers were aware of the limited participation afforded by their jobs. Though there were few part-time men in the survey, those responding reported a similar relative control deficit to part-time women. The nature of the DTI survey questions disables us from being able to discern whether this lack of control is reflected in wider measures of satisfaction in any way.

However, the DTI data does allow the exploration of some of Hakim's assertions in a different way. In effect she partitions the female workforce into full and part-timers, treating the latter group as a bloc and as distinct from the former in their orientations. Our findings on personal control for different groups of women part-timers exhibited a clear and significant upward gradient as the number of hours worked per week increased, but hours worked was not a significant variable in the prediction of commitment. The danger of Hakim's assumptions appear in these findings: it is evident that the 16-29 hours group are more like the 30 hours and over group in their outlook than those working 15 hours or less especially with respect to commitment. This casts severe doubt on her partitioning, and so on the proportion of women who might be seen as 'different' even before the caveats above are

considered.

The tentative reading of the overall findings here is that they suggest that part-time jobs are realistically experienced by their occupants as inferior to full-time jobs. If this is a state of affairs to which expectations have been adjusted, there is no reason for such a finding not to be linked to higher recorded satisfaction levels. The lower levels of commitment of part-timers are not helpful *per se* in resolving the debate between Hakim and her opponents, since they may be seen as either consistent with a lower normative attachment to work itself, or as a reaction to inferior job content and to practical demands outside.

Moreover, the differences are not all that great in any of these findings (nor are they in Hakim's work), suggesting that, at the least, many part-timers are not so different from full-timers as Hakim suggests. She may well have been right to emphasise the need to avoid blanket generalizations about women's views, but she then appears to have resorted to more complex yet almost equally parlous generalizations. Our analysis of the differences between those working different numbers of part-time hours illustrates the need for a more textured and less absolute approach.

Conclusions

This chapter has made the case for avoiding homogenisation of employees in discussions of organisational participation, and has specifically explored the gender differentiation in outlook and experience of the employment relationship. The findings reported above challenge both the view that women can be assumed to be the same as men, and the various stereotypes of female employees which are prevalent in much management thinking and practice. Factors such as age, occupational position, hours worked, relations with one's manager, and union membership have all emerged as significant variables explaining

differences in responses at various points in the analysis. In the process, the evidence has shown the danger of oversimplified generalisation within as well as between genders.

To summarise the main findings, women do appear to display more emphasis on convenient working hours (i.e. non-work commitments), on good work relations with management, and higher levels of overall satisfaction. This confirms previous evidence. Exploring further why this pattern existed, however, revealed that women were just as likely to find interesting work important - job level, sector, and job type were more important predictors here than gender.

No differences in overall commitment between men and women were found, and generally we found the same correlations between attitude variables for both sexes, which indicates a danger in gender-stereotyping work orientations or attitudes. In any case, age, relations with boss and perceptions of control proved more important factors than gender in explaining differences in response. Certain interesting differences in the gendered pattern of experience also emerged between public and private sector organisations, with the public sector affording women better job relations and control over job and department, though we did not deviate from our main purpose to explore these issues further. Job level proved to be a strong predictor of commitment, but only for men. Women managers emerged as more disadvantaged than their female counterparts in non-managerial jobs, but on other measures (e.g. perceived consultation) and when controlling for hours worked, job level was not a major interactive factor.

Explanations of gender disadvantage based on a fundamental difference of outlook (basically the 'own worst enemies' and essentialist disadvantage models) do not appear well supported by the evidence. Limitations imposed on women by domestic circumstance, or by management patriarchal policies and practices, gain some support from this analysis.

Moreover, there were some indications that male advantages over women in terms of perceived control, and some of the differences in patterns of experience across organisations, could lend support to a masculine cultures argument, though such claims remain weak without more appropriate qualitative evidence to support them. There were some indications, nonetheless, of structural conditioning of gender differences in experience, as well as of employee perceptions more generally. The importance of organisational size, and the public/private sector contrasts for women, are examples of this. The 'structural' examination of gendered environments was restricted by the small number of females in 'male' occupations; nonetheless, we can say that females were disadvantaged in terms of perceived control in both predominantly male and predominantly female occupational categories relative to men. It is also noteworthy that the 'male' occupations generally showed lower perceived control levels for employees than the 'female' ones.

Finally, considering the worker patriarchy argument, the analysis here does not support the view that unions make things worse, not better, for women. Union membership seems to improve ratings of personal control and of commitment for women and not men. Union membership, though, has no effect on perceptions of being consulted.

It appears, then, that there are indeed important organisational participation issues which are gendered. Yet the problem is not at heart one of attitudes, but one of material constraints, structures and traditions. The next issue concerns the identification of paths of least resistance to change, and consideration of whether the heady liquor of reform has anything feasible to offer for a more democratic organisational future.

References

J. Acker (1992) ‘Gendering organizational theory’, in Mills and Tancred (eds) 1992, Gendering Organizational Analysis (Sage Publications, Newbury Park-London-New Delhi, 1992), pp 248-260.

J. Acker and D.R. van Houten, 'Differential Recruitment and Control: The Sex Structuring of Organizations' Administrative Science Quarterly, 19/2 (1974) 152-163.

C. Allen, I. Cunningham and L. McArdle, Employee Participation and Involvement into the Nineties: Company Practice, Innovation and the Trade Union Role. (Stockton: Jim Conway Foundation, 1991).

H.L. Angle and J.L. Perry, ‘Dual commitment and labor-management relationships climates’ Academy of Management Journal, 29/1 (1986) 31-50.

F. Baldwin and S. Walpole, Women, Affirmative Action and Industrial Democracy, (Canberra, AGPS, 1986).

D.L. Barker and S. Allen (eds), Dependence and Exploitation in Work and Marriage, (London: Longman 1976).

H. Beynon and R. Blackburn, Perceptions of Work: Variations Within a Factory (Cambridge: CUP, 1972).

R. Brown, M. Curran and J. Cousins, Changing Attitudes to Employment?, (Department of Employment, Research Paper no 40, London: HMSO, 1983).

J. de Bruijn and E. Cyba (eds), Gender and Organizations - Changing Perspectives, (Amsterdam: VU University Press, 1994).

M.B. Calas and L. Smirchich, 'Rewriting gender into organizational theorizing: directions from feminist perspectives' in M Reed and M Hughes (eds) Rethinking Organization: New Directions in Organization Theory and Analysis, (London: Sage, 1990), pp 227-253.

R. Cavendish, Women On The Line, (London: Routledge, 1982).

A.E. Clark, 'Job Satisfaction and Gender: Why are Women so Happy at Work?,' Labour Economics, 4 (1997) 341-37

C. Cockburn, Brothers: Male Dominance and Technological Change, (London: Pluto, 1983).

A. Cohen and G. Lowenberg, 'A re-examination of the side-bet theory as applied to organizational commitment: A meta-analysis', Human Relations, 43 (1990) 1015-1050.

D.L. Collinson and J. Hearn (eds), Men as Managers, Managers as Men: Critical Perspectives on Men, Masculinities and Managements, (London: Sage, 1996).

J. Curtice, 'Satisfying work - if you can get it' in R Jowell, L Brook and L Dowds (eds) International Social Attitudes: the 10th BSA Report, (Aldershot: Dartmouth, 1993, pp103-122.

W.W. Daniel, Workplace Industrial Relations and Technical Change, (London: Frances Pinter, 1987).

S. Dex, Women's Attitudes towards Work, (London: Macmillan, 1988).

R. Drago and M. Wooden, 'The determinants of participatory management', British Journal of Industrial Relations, 29/2 (1991) 177-204.

R. Feldberg and G.N. Glenn, 'Male and female: job versus gender models in the sociology of work', Social Problems, 26/5 (1979) 524-538.

K.E. Ferguson, The Feminist Case against Bureaucracy, (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1984).

P. Findlay, 'Fighting plant closure: women in the Plessey occupation', in D Elson, and R Pearson (eds.) Women's Employment and Multinationals in Europe, (Palgrave Macmillan: London, 1988), pp. 183-206.

D. Gallie and M. White, Employee Commitment and the Skills Revolution, (London: PSI, 1993).

J. Ginn, J. Brannen, S. Dex, P. Moss, C. Roberts, S. Archer, A. Dale, P. Elias, J. Pahl and J. Rubery, ‘Feminist Fallacies: a Reply to Hakim on Women’s Employment’, British Journal of Sociology, 47/1 (1996) 167-174.

D.E. Guest and P. Dewe, ‘Company or Trade Union - Which Wins Workers' Allegiance? A Study of Commitment in the UK Electronics Industry’, British Journal of Industrial Relations, 29/1 (1991) 75-96.

C. Hakim, 'Grateful Slaves and Self-made Women: Fact and Fantasy in Women's Work Orientations', European Sociological Review, 7/1 (1991) 101-121.

C. Hakim, ‘Five Feminist Myths about Women’s Employment’, British Journal of Sociology, 46/3 (1995) 429-455.

C. Hakim, Key Issues in Women’s Work: Female Heterogeneity and the Polarisation of Women’s Employment, (London: Athlone, 1996).

S. Horrell, J. Rubery and B. Burchell, 'Gender and skills' in R Penn, M Rose, and J Rubery (eds) Skill and Occupational Change, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), pp 189-222.

H. Kaul and M. Lie, 'When paths are vicious circles - how women's working conditions limit influence', Economic and Industrial Democracy 3/4 (1982) 465-481.

D. Kerfoot and D. Knights, 'Management, Manipulation and Masculinity: A “Man”agerial Project’, Organization, 5/1 (1998)7-26.

S. Maddock, 'Women - a democratic force within organizations' in Bruijn, J G M and Cyba, E (eds.) Women in Organizations, (Amsterdam: VU University Press, 1994), pp 105-124.

M. Marchington, J. Goodman, A. Wilkinson and P. Ackers, New Developments in Employee Involvement, (Employment Department Research Paper No 2, London: Department of Employment, 1992).

P.V. Marsden, A.L. Kalleberg and C.R. Cook, 'Gender Differences in Organizational Commitment', Work and Occupations, 20/3 (1993) 368-390.

J.E. Mathieu and D. Zajac, 'A Review and Meta-Analysis of the Antecedents, Correlates, and Consequences of Organizational Commitment'. Psychological Bulletin, 108, (1990) 171-194.

R. McNabb and K. Whitfield, 'The distribution of employee participation schemes at the workplace'. International Journal of Human Resource Management, 10/1 (1999) 122-136.

J.P. Meyer and N.J. Allen, Commitment in the Workplace. Theory, Research and Application, (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1997).

A.J. Mills and P. Tancred (eds), Gendering Organizational Analysis, (London: Sage, 1992).

N. Millward, M. Stevens, D. Smart and W. Hawes, Workplace Industrial Relations in Transition, (Aldershot: Dartmouth, 1992).

J. Mincer, 'Labor Force Participation of Married Women: a Review of Recent Evidence' in R A and M Gordon (eds) Prosperity and Unemployment, (New York: Wiley, 1966).

C. Pateman, Participation and Democratic Theory, (Cambridge: CUP, 1970).

C. Pateman, 'Some reflections on *Participation and Democratic Theory* in C Crouch and F Heller (eds.) International Yearbook of Organisational Democracy, vol 1: Organisational Democracy and Political Processes, (Cichester: Wiley, 1983) pp 107-120.

R. Penn, M. Rose and J. Rubery (eds) Skill and Occupational Change, (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1994).

A. Phillips, Engendering Democracy, (Cambridge: Polity, 1991).

S. Polachek, 'Occupational Self-selection: A Human Capital Approach to Sex Differences in Social Structure', Review of Economics and Statistics, Feb (1981) 60-69.

A. Pollert, Girls, Wives, Factory Lives, (London: Macmillan, 1981).

A. Pollert, 'Gender and class revisited; or the poverty of patriarchy', Sociology, 30/4 (1996) 639-669.

H. Ramsay 'Participation: The Shop Floor View', British Journal of Industrial Relations, 14/2 (1976) 128-141.

H. Ramsay, Engendering Participation, (Department of Human Resource Management, University of Strathclyde, Occasional Paper no 8, 1996).

H. Ramsay, N. Panteli and M. Beirne , 'Empowerment and disempowerment: active agency, structural constraint and women computer users', in R Lander and A Adam (eds), Women In Computing, (Exeter: Intellect, 1997) pp. 84-93.

H. Ramsay and D. Scholarios, 'Organizations, Democracy and Gender Analysis: Questions of Theory and Method', (ISA Research Committee 10 Conference on Theoretical Approaches towards Democracy in Organizations, Copenhagen, 11-14 June, 1996).

M. Rose 1994, 'Job satisfaction, job skills and personal skills' in R. Penn, M. Rose and J. Rubery (eds) Skill and Occupational Change, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994) pp 244-280.

M. Rose, How Far Can I Trust It? Job Satisfaction Data in the WERS98 Employee Survey, (Working Paper 6: ESRC Future of Work Programme, Swindon: ESRC, 2000).

M. Savage and A. Witz (ed) Gender and Bureaucracy (Oxford: Blackwell, 1992).

D.M. Sinclair, 'The Importance of Sex for the Propensity to Unionize', British Journal of Industrial Relations, 33/2 (1995) 173-190.

D.M. Sinclair, 'The Importance of Gender for Participation and Attitudes to Trade Unionism', Industrial Relations Journal, 27/3 (1996) 239-252.

J. Siltanen, Locating Gender: Occupational Segregation, Wages and Domestic Responsibilities, (London: UCL Press, 1994).

P.J. Sloane and H. Williams, 'Job Satisfaction, Comparison Earnings, and Gender', Labour, 14 (2000) 473-502.

C. Tillsley, 'Employee Involvement: Employees' Views', Employment Gazette, 102/6 June (1994) 211-216.

J. Wajcman, Women in Control: Dilemmas of a Workers Co-operative (Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1993).

J. Wajcman, 'Desperately Seeking Differences: Is Management Style Gendered?', British Journal of Industrial Relations, 34/3, September (1996) 333-349.

T.D. Wall and J.A. Lischerson, Worker Participation: A Critique of the Literature and Some New Evidence (London: McGraw-Hill, 1977).

R.E. Walton, 'From Commitment to Control in the Workplace'. Harvard Business Review, 63, March-April, (1985) 76-84.

G. Watson and B. Fothergill, 'Part-Time Employment and Attitudes to Part-Time Work', Employment Gazette, May (1993) 213-220.

Whirlpool Foundation, Women: The New Providers (New York: Whirlpool Foundation (US survey), 1995).

Whirlpool Foundation, Women: Setting New Priorities (London: Whirlpool Foundation (European survey), 1996).

F. Wilson, Organizational Behaviour and Gender (Maidenhead: McGraw-Hill, 1995).

L. Witt, A. Nye and G. Lendell (1992) 'Gender and the Relationship between Perceived Fairness of Pay or Promotion and Job Satisfaction.' Journal of Applied Psychology, 77/6 (1992) 910-917.

Table 1
Employee characteristics by gender

Variables	Total sample		Men		Women			
	N`	%	n	%	n	%	χ^2	
Total sample	1520	100	721	47.4	799	52.6		
Occupational classifications [a]							-----	
Managerial/professional	413	29.1	214	32.9	199	25.9		
Clerical/secretarial	336	23.7	86	13.2	250	32.6		
Personal/protection	261	18.4	64	9.8	197	25.7		
Plant & machine op.	177	12.5	139	21.4	38	5.0		
Craft & related	119	8.4	111	17.1	8	1.0		
Sales	111	7.8	36	5.5	75	9.8		
Hours worked/week							307.3	***
0-8 hours	29	1.9	2	.3	27	3.4		
8-15 hours	109	7.2	6	.8	103	12.9		
16-30 hours	217	14.3	16	2.2	201	25.2		
>30 hours	1162	76.6	696	96.7	466	58.5		
Level of job responsibility							23.6	***
Managerial	364	23.9	213	29.5	151	18.9		
Supervisory	227	14.9	118	16.4	109	13.6		
Neither	929	61.1	390	54.1	539	67.5		
Years with present employer							12.4	**
5 years or less	781	54.2	327	49.2	454	58.4		
More than 5 years	661	45.8	338	50.8	323	41.6		
Trades union/staff association							6.5	*
Member	520	70.1	285	74.2	235	65.6		
Non-member	222	29.9	99	25.8	123	34.4		
Share ownership scheme							2.5	*ns*
Participant	120	46.7	84	50.3	36	40.0		
Non-participant	137	53.3	83	49.7	54	60.0		
Age [b]							5.1	*
15-24	232	15.3	121	16.8	111	13.9		
25-34	439	28.9	211	29.3	228	28.5		
35-44	374	24.6	165	22.9	209	26.2		
45-54	308	20.3	131	18.2	177	22.2		
over 54	167	11.0	93	12.9	74	9.2		

Notes.

a Only the most common standard occupational classifications are shown in the table. Managerial/professional includes managers/administrators, professional and associate professional occupations. The higher proportion of males in management/professional occupations is significantly different from the higher proportion of females in clerical/secretarial ($\chi^2(1)=53.05$, $p<.0001$), personal/protective ($\chi^2(1)=49.17$, $p<.0001$) and sales ($\chi^2(1)=13.18$, $p<.005$). These occupations with more females also form a statistically different group from those with more males (craft & related and plant and machine operatives ($\chi^2(1)=287.67$, $p<.0001$).

b The χ^2 for age represents contrasts between males and females aged 15-34 or 35-54. 53% of females as opposed to 46% of males comprised the older age band.

* $p<.05$ ** $p<.01$ ***$p<.001$ *ns* not significant

Table 2
Organisation characteristics by gender

Variables	Total sample		Men		Women	
	N`	%	n	%	n	%
Total sample	1520	100.0	721	47.4	799	52.6
Type of organisation[a]	447	29.5	257	35.6	190	24.0
public limited company	537	35.5	275	38.1	262	33.0
other private firms	220	14.5	67	9.3	153	19.3
local government	109	7.2	20	2.8	89	11.2
health authority	60	4.0	26	3.6	34	4.3
central government	51	3.4	43	6.0	8	1.0
nationalised industry	90	5.9	33	4.6	57	7.2
other [b]						
Major SIC groups [c]	572	38.2	168	23.6	404	51.5
general service sector	276	18.4	118	16.6	158	20.1
distribution/hotels	195	13.0	121	17.0	74	9.4
general manufacturing	154	10.3	66	9.3	88	11.2
banking & finance	122	8.1	98	13.8	24	3.1
metal goods/engineering	89	5.9	69	9.7	20	2.5
transport/communications						
Size (number of employees)	251	17.0	86	12.1	165	21.4
1-9	241	16.3	92	13.0	149	19.3
10-24	365	24.7	185	26.1	180	23.3
25-99	340	23.0	188	26.6	152	19.7
100-499	283	19.0	157	22.2	126	16.3
500 or more						
Ownership (private company)	664	43.7	349	74.3	315	84.2
wholly UK	104	6.8	69	14.7	35	9.4
partly UK/partly foreign	76	5.0	52	11.1	24	6.4
wholly foreign						
Existence of:	742	48.8	384	54.7	358	47.8
trades union/association	257	16.9	167	36.9	90	24.1
share acquisition scheme	93	6.1	68	16.0	25	6.9
profit-related pay scheme						

Notes.
a Overall, a greater proportion of women (40% compared to 20% of men) were employed in public sector organisations, including central and local government, health authorities and universities.
b 'Other' types of organisation include higher education, charity and voluntary organisations
c Overall, a greater proportion of women (50% compared to 29% of men) were employed in the service sector than in any other SIC

Table 3
Most important reason for taking present job: men and women

	Total		Men		Women	
Reasons in order of overall popularity	N	% of total	n	% of males	n	% of females
Interesting work/makes use of skills	398	26.2	185	25.7	213	26.7
Convenient working hours	251	16.5	19	2.6	232	29.0
Job security	249	16.4	163	22.6	86	10.8
No other job available	170	11.2	116	16.1	54	6.8
Good rates of pay	140	9.2	84	11.7	56	7.0
Location	69	4.5	35	4.9	34	4.3
Opportunity to work in own way[e]	58	3.8	30	4.2	28	3.5
Possibility of promotion	52	3.4	30	4.2	22	2.8
Good fringe benefits	28	1.8	17	2.4	11	1.4
Friends worked there	20	1.3	11	1.5	9	1.1
Clean/pleasant working conditions	14	0.9	6	0.8	8	1.0
Total	1449	100.0	696	47.4	753	52.6

Note. All χ^2 tests are conducted on the basis of 2x2 contingency tables with all other responses
** p<.01 *** p<.001 ns not significant

Table 4

Attitudes and perceptions of personal control: men and women

	Total sample			Men			Women			ANOVA	ANCOVA
Variable [a]	N	Mean	S.D	n	Mean	S.D.	n	Mean	S.D.	F	F
Overall job satisfaction	1437	4.11	1.04	688	3.95	1.08	749	4.24	.98	28.47***	12.65***
Commitment to org. success	1474	3.39	.70	704	3.36	.70	770	3.41	.69	1.74	
Commitment to dept. success	1471	3.51	.66	703	3.51	.67	768	3.50	.65	.01	
Perceived control/job	1520	2.80	1.01	721	2.89	1.02	799	2.72	1.01	10.02**	.06
Perceived control/working conditions	1520	2.34	.99	721	2.44	1.01	799	2.25	.98	13.71***	.62
Perceived control/dept.	1520	2.22	1.05	721	2.31	1.06	799	2.15	1.03	7.98**	1.01
Perceived control/organisation	1520	1.82	.90	721	1.88	.92	799	1.76	.89	7.12**	.35
Relations with boss	1485	4.39	.84	699	4.32	.89	786	4.45	.79	9.69**	4.21**

Notes.

a Overall job satisfaction and relations with boss were rated on a 5-point Likert scale. All other variables were rated on a 4-point Likert scale. The higher the rating the greater intensity of feeling.

* p<.05 ** p<.01 *** p<.001

Table 5
Standardised regression estimates for prediction of commitment: men and women

	Commitment to organisational success				Commitment to department/area			
	Men (n=320)		Women (n=310)		Men (n=320)		Women (n=310)	
Variable	b	SE(b)	b	SE(b)	b	SE(b)	b	SE(b)
Intercept	1.79 ***	.28	2.06 ***	.29	1.96 ***	.26	2.20 ***	.27
Level of job responsibility	.04	.05	.05	.05	.13 **	.05	.04	.04
Hours worked/week	-	-	.03	.05	-	-	.05	.05
Years with present employer	.12	.09	-.03	.08	.01	.09	.07	.08
Age	.01	.04	.07 *	.04	.02	.03	.03	.03
Organization size	-.01	.04	-.02	.02	.002	.03	-.004	.03
Organization type (1=public sector)	-.06	.09	.03	.03	-.06	.09	.08	.07
Perceived control/job	.02	.05	.18 ***	.07	.11 *	.05	.18 ***	.05
Perceived control/conditions	.05	.05	.03	.05	-.03	.05	.02	.05
Perceived control/department	.08	.06	-.07	.05	.05	.06	-.04	.05
Perceived control/org	.12	.07	.14 *	.06	.08	.07	.09	.06
Relations with boss	.18 ***	.04	.10 *	.05	.19 ***	.04	.08	.04
Trade union membership (yes=1)	-.003	.09	.04	.08	.13	.09	-.07	.07
Equation characteristics								
R squared	.21		.19		.23		.21	
Adjusted R squared	.17		.15		.20		.17	
F	6.48***		5.50***		7.35***		6.22***	

.Notes.
Hours worked, occupation and participation in company schemes were excluded from these regressions because of restricted sample sizes
* p<.05 ** p<.01 ***p<.001

Table 6
Standardised regression estimates for prediction of perceived personal control: men and women

	a) Job				b) Physical /working conditions			
	Men		Women		Men		Women	
Variable	b	SE(b)	b	SE(b)	b	SE(b)	b	SE(b)
Intercept	1.20 **	.36	.31	.40	1.67 *	.38	.47	.41
Level of job responsibility	.29 ***	.06	.34 ***	.06	.20 **	.07	.23 ***	.06
Hours worked/week	-	-	.28 ***	.08	-	.29	.34 ***	.08
Years with present employer	.30 *	.12	.10	.11	.16	.13	-.03	.11
Age	-.04	.05	-.002	.05	-.06	.05	.04	.05
Organisation size	.05	.05	-.03	.04	-.01	.05	-.002	.04
Organisation type (1=public sector)	.07	.12	.27 **	.10	-.04	.13	.05	.10
Relations with boss	.23 ***	.06	.29 ***	.06	.15 **	.06	.14 *	.06
Trade union membership (yes=1)	-.21 †	.12	-.04	.11	-.12	.13	-.04	.11
Equation characteristics								
R squared	.18		.24		.07		.14	
Adjusted R squared	.16		.22		.05		.12	
F	8.88***		11.72***		3.25**		6.15***	

	c) Department				d) Organisation			
	Men		Women		Men		Women	
Variable	b	SE(b)	b	SE(b)	b	SE(b)	b	SE(b)
Intercept	.84 *	.34	.38	.40	.49 †	.28	.37	.35
Level of job responsibility	.48 ***	.06	.43 ***	.06	.26 ***	.05	.28 ***	.05
Hours worked/week	-	.26	.29 ***	.08	-	.21	.20 **	.07
Years with present employer	.16	.11	-.01	.11	.21 *	.09	-.01	.10

Age	.07	.05	.09 †	.05	.02	.04	.09 *	.04
Organisation size	-.03	.05	-.03	.04	-.001	.04	-.03	.03
Organisation type (1=public sector)	-.14	.12	.05 *	.10	-.03	.10	.04	.09
Relations with boss	.19 ***	.06	.13	.06	.18 ***	.05	.08	.05
Trade union membership (yes=1)	-.17	.12	-.06	.11	-.11	.10	.09	.10
Equation characteristics								
R squared	.26		.22		.18		.15	
Adjusted R squared	.24		.20		.17		.13	
F	14.48***		10.73***		9.30***		6.80***	

† p<.10 * p<.05 ** p<.01 ***p<.001

Table 7

Mean ratings of sources of information or methods of participation in unionised and non-unionised organisations: men and women

Information source/method of participation	Unionised organisation						Non-unionised organisation					
	Men			Women			Men			Women		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
Company												
Company report	136	2.88	.88	95	2.96	.89	67	3.16	.79	64	2.98	.86
Company videos	**105**	**2.91**	**.87**	**75**	**3.27**	**.81**	33	2.91	.95	35	3.20	.87
Company newspapers	188	2.83	.84	154	2.86	.92	74	2.80	.91	82	2.84	.88
Circulars/memos/notices	277	3.12	.80	251	3.18	.77	165	3.11	.79	192	3.15	.79
Management												
Mgt-employee meetings	188	3.21	.79	176	3.22	.69	118	3.34	.79	131	3.39	.74
Mgt-rep. meetings(egJCCs)	132	3.08	.75	114	3.01	.74	**37**	**3.08**	**.96**	**67**	**3.36**	**.67**
Staff appraisals	126	3.03	.89	119	2.96	.92	75	3.09	.81	86	3.23	.93
Employee attitude surveys	69	2.63	.87	63	2.85	.78	29	2.86	.79	28	2.82	.98
Letters/memos	81	2.68	.89	75	2.65	.85	45	2.96	.67	45	2.93	.86
Suggestion schemes	140	2.69	.88	107	2.86	.85	57	2.86	.83	61	2.97	.88
Staff appraisals	138	3.02	.81	128	3.05	.78	80	3.10	.74	91	3.08	.74
Trade unions/staff assoc												
Meetings w/ employees	161	3.11	.78	114	3.06	.92						
Circulars, newssheet etc	163	2.93	.83	146	2.84	.89						
Through staff reps	186	2.96	.78	136	2.83	.77						
Informal conversations												
With managers/supervisors	213	3.23	.81	190	3.26	.75	**189**	**3.27**	**.83**	**217**	**3.42**	**.72**
With other colleagues	205	3.11	.84	175	3.19	.85	165	3.10	.89	187	3.18	.84

Note. Only the one way ANOVA tests for those in bold are significant: company videos in unionised organisations ($p<.001$); management-representative meetings in non-unionised firms ($p<.10$); and informal conversations with managers/supervisors in non-unionised firms ($p<.05$).

Table 8

Effects of occupational type and gender on perceived personal control: men and women

Perceived personal control	Managers & supervisors				Non-managerial occupations								Two-factor ANOVA main effects & interaction (gender (G) and occupation type (O)) [a]		
					'Male' dominated				'Female' dominated						
	Men (n=328)		Women (n=203)		Men (n=186)		Women (n=29)		Men (n=87)		Women (n=182)				
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	G	O	G x O
Job	3.29	.78	3.24	.79^{ns}	2.41	.99	2.21	1.21^{ns}	2.82	.93	2.67	.97^{ns}	3.05^{ns}	9.15**	.01^{ns}
Working con.	2.75	.91	2.71	.93^{ns}	2.14	.97	1.86	.92^{ns}	2.24	1.01	2.16	.94^{ns}	3.12^{ns}	3.18^{ns}	.76^{ns}
Dept/branch	2.82	.97	2.83	.91^{ns}	1.74	.85	1.55	.91^{ns}	2.01	1.01	1.91	.94^{ns}	1.75^{ns}	10.36**	.04^{ns}
Organization	2.24	.94	2.20	.93^{ns}	1.53	.74	1.48	.79^{ns}	.79	.79	1.57	.78^{ns}	.81^{ns}	1.43^{ns}	.17^{ns}

Notes. Variables were measured on a four-point Likert scale (1='none at all'; 4='a great deal'). 'Male' dominated occupations were: craft & related and plant & machine operatives; 'female' dominated occupations were: clerical/secretarial, personal & protective, and sales

a Non-managerial occupations only. Main effects and interactions allowed for the effects of covariates tenure, age, organization size and organization sector (public or private). Tenure was a significant covariate for all measures of perceived control ($F(1,7)=7.94$, $p<.01$; $F(1,7)=6.52$, $p<.05$; $F(1,7)=14.66$, $p<.001$; $F(1.7)$, $p<.01$, respectively) and organization size for perceived control overall in the organization ($F(1,7)=7.73$, $p<.01$).

** $p<.01$ ^{ns} not significant

Endnotes

[i] The sample was drawn from the electoral registers, seeking representativeness through a complex formula taking respondents from a range of constituency types, and adding a sample of non-electors aged over 15.

[ii] The DTI questionnaire did not allow examination of desired levels of control. This would have allowed testing of debates whether women express less desire for participation (Wall & Lischerson, 1977; Drago & Wooden, 1991; Allen, et al., 1991).

[iii] Curtice (1993) argues this, as do Rose (1994) and Horrell, et al., (1994), the latter two both analyzing the data from the Social Change and Economic Life Initiative (SCELI) data. See also the reply to Hakim by Ginn, et al., (1996).