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ABSTRACT

A number of studies have established that women in managerial positions are more likely to be participative (involving subordinates in their decision-making) than their male counterparts. The present research was designed to address the question of whether certain antecedent conditions -- in particular, features of organizational culture -- affect the degree to which women and men differ in participative behaviour. This question is important for several reasons: scientific understanding (since gender-based differences, especially behavioural ones, are little understood), development of organizational theory, and greater understanding for practitioners of how participative managerial styles can be fostered.

The research design is a field study, utilizing a combination of quantitative and qualitative measures. While this design created a number of constraints, I believe that it was useful in terms of trustworthiness of the findings. The naturalistic setting and the opportunity to triangulate the findings were among the advantages of the research design; disadvantages included a necessarily small sample size, and purposive sampling limited by the ability and willingness of organizational gatekeepers and members to take part in the research. The central focus of investigation was whether and how organizational culture influences participative behaviour for women managers. The initial model proposed that in traditional organizations, gender salience is heightened for women in managerial roles because of their scarcity and because managerial stereotypes tend to involve traits generally perceived (in North American culture) as masculine. Findings showed that heightened gender salience
accounted for at least part of the observed gender difference in participative behaviour.

The findings of the research at first seemed paradoxical, since the organization which was the least traditional (i.e., the most woman-friendly in its policies) was also the one in which gender salience seemed to be high compared to the rest of the sample. This finding led to a modification of the original model to a more complex, time-dependent understanding of the process under study.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Over the past decade, some researchers have claimed that women, by virtue of their gender, bring unique strengths to positions of organizational leadership (Bass & Avolio, 1994; Helgesen, 1990; Rosener, 1990). Although evidence for some gender differences is anecdotal, one particular discrepancy in leadership style has been observed across a number of studies: women in authority are more likely to adopt a participative approach — including subordinates in their decision-making — than their male counterparts (Eagly & Johnson, 1990).

Use of participation by managers is associated with development of subordinate capabilities (Vroom & Jago, 1988). As organizations downsize, shedding managerial layers and functions, and as work teams and task forces increasingly replace hierarchical structures, the ability to develop subordinate judgement and decision-making capability is an important attribute for a manager (Kanter, 1989). Hence, the finding that women seem to have higher levels of this attribute is seen as one of their strengths in the current work environment (Rosener, 1990). At the same time, it raises the question of whether this difference is innate and universal, or culturally induced.

Studies of gender differences have emerged from varying theoretical perspectives (Fagenson, 1990). This particular study adopts the assumptions of what
Fagenson calls the "gender-organization-systems" approach: gender is not treated as an invariant property of individuals, but as situated in a particular social context (the work organization). This approach and its implications for the study will be discussed in more detail below, in the literature review.

Purpose of the Study

In describing the purpose of the study, I am to some extent describing myself and what motivated me to do the research. Because little is known about the relationships investigated in this study, the research discussed here is aimed more at discovery than at verification (McCall & Bobko, 1990). Therefore personal motivation and experience can come into play as "a source of insights, hypotheses, and validity checks" (Maxwell, 1998, p. 78).

My interest in the issue of gender differences in participative behaviour arose from my experience in organizations, as a woman manager and subordinate. Having experienced both male and female bosses whose behaviour ran counter to the "female as more participative" stereotype, I was sceptical that the difference described in the literature derived from gender alone. Furthermore, the studies cited as evidence for the difference were quantitative in nature (Eagly & Johnson, 1990) and seemed to provide few clues as to why such a difference might exist.

Personal experience, combined with some knowledge of the managerial literature, suggested to me a possible role for organizational culture in influencing
decision-making, and perhaps for influencing it in somewhat different ways for men and women. The purpose of the study was to address several broad research questions:

1. Are there facets of organizational culture (for example, values such as "respect for people") that may predispose managers to be more participative?

2. Are there facets of the organizational culture that influence men and women managers differently? If so, might the influence play a part in determining participative behaviour?

3. Assuming that the questions in 2 can be answered in the affirmative, what is the link between organizational culture and the observed gender gap in participative behaviour?

From the outset, I believed that a qualitative research design in a naturalistic setting would be the most appropriate way to tackle these questions. However, because of constraints in time, resources, and access to respondents, I was hesitant to design a wholly qualitative study. In addition, reliable and valid quantitative instruments existed for several of the variables that I was interested in: the Vroom-Yetton problem sets to measure decision-making style along the participative-directive dimension, and the Organizational Culture Profile to measure relevant aspects of organizational culture. Therefore, I decided to combine quantitative and qualitative approaches in the interests of triangulation (Janesick, 1994; Jick, 1979). The research design which resulted will be described in greater detail in Chapter 3.

While the research deals with specific questions, it also can be seen as theory
building. The broad question of how organizational culture shapes the social construction of gender is being actively investigated (Chatman, Polzer, Barsade & Neale, 1998; Gherardi, 1994; Harlow & Hearn, 1995) but little is actually known about how specific behaviours might result from these processes. The nature of the questions being pursued here requires an interdisciplinary approach, combining insights from sociology, management theory, and psychology. This creates certain difficulties in terms of how variables are constructed and measured. These will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 3.

Significance of the Study

These issues are important for a number of reasons. First, the finding that women are more participative than men is the only consistently observed difference in leadership style between men and women (Eagly & Johnson, 1990). Whether this is a result of gender alone, or gender interacting with other factors, needs further investigation.

Second, a number of management theorists (e.g., Lawler, 1986; Pfeffer, 1994) and consultants (e.g., Peters & Austin, 1985) have claimed for some years that command and control management is out of fashion, and employee involvement and participation are necessary ingredients for success in the modern workplace. If participative management is an important ingredient for success in business, we need to understand how organizational culture may either foster or discourage it.

Third, following on the second point above, these findings could be useful in stimulating positive organizational change. Such change is particularly relevant for
Canadian firms: Wright (1995) notes that "companies that are innovative leave decisions increasingly to front-line employees", but that in Canadian companies surveyed "only a minority (5% of management respondents and 11% of union respondents) described themselves as ...sharing decision-making on a wide range of issues" (Wright, 1995, p. 7). This finding suggests that Canadian organizations and managers stand to benefit from research that increases our knowledge of what factors lead to a participative decision-making style on the part of individual managers.

The Research Framework

This study could be described as an example of basic research (Miller, 1991). As such, it seeks to explore phenomena that are not well understood, rather than to solve a particular problem or aid in policy formulation. A qualitative field study is a good vehicle for examining processes, perceptions, and attitudes (Miller, 1991) all of which are potentially implicated in the questions outlined above.

However, the study does not use qualitative data in isolation. Rather, it is an example of how quantitative and qualitative data collection can work together. The strengths of quantitative approaches are well known: they often enable researchers to obtain clearcut answers to carefully bounded questions; they tend to be located within the dominant positivist paradigm, guaranteeing respectability and understanding by a wide audience (academically speaking); and they may rely on measures whose reliability and validity has been previously established (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994).

On the other hand, while quantitative research is often good at telling us what happens, it tends not to be so good at explaining why: "quantitative researchers seldom
are able to capture the subject's perspective because they have to rely on more remote, inferential empirical materials" (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994, p. 5). Among the strengths of qualitative data is the ability to contextualize findings -- an important consideration when organizational culture is one of the major factors under consideration (Denison, 1996).

Thus the research strategy employed in the dissertation relies on the logic of triangulation: collecting both qualitative and quantitative data and looking for convergence in the findings (Rossman & Wilson, 1985). The success and limitations of this strategy will be addressed in connection with the discussion of those findings.

Organization of the Thesis

The thesis is organized as follows. The preceding introduction explained the research problem and its importance. Chapter 2 reviews relevant literature in the context of a conceptual framework that shows how the variables being examined can potentially be linked. The third chapter outlines the research design and methodology. Chapter 4 describes the results; Chapter 5 discusses how the findings extend previous work in the area of gender and organizations and proposes a modification of the model that was tested, based on the results obtained. The thesis concludes with a discussion of limitations of the present study and some suggestions for future research that could be undertaken to confirm and extend the findings presented here.
CHAPTER 2

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to review literature relevant to the pieces of a conceptual framework for understanding gender differences in participative behaviour in the organizational context. Thus, the review does not intend to "cover the field" (Maxwell, 1998) in terms of concepts such as organizational culture and decision-making; rather it focuses on empirical and theoretical studies that helped me to formulate the assumptions on which my model (to be discussed in Chapter 3) was based.

Participative management: A definition

Although the term "participation" has been used in various ways in the organizational literature (Heller, Pusic, Strauss & Wilpert, 1998) in this study it is defined as the degree to which a manager gives subordinate(s) power over the decision-making process. In theoretical terms, this is informal participation (Heller et al., 1998) since it is not mandated by the organization but results from an individual manager's choice. It is important to recognize, as Tannenbaum and Schmidt argued (1958), that "participation" in this sense is not a dichotomous variable. Rather the manager's leadership style can be placed on a continuum ranging from "autocratic" on the one hand to "democratic" on the other (see Appendix A, Figure A1). The
autocratic manager (or leader; Tannenbaum and Schmidt use the terms interchangeably) tends to retain most of the decision-making power, perceiving that as an essential aspect of her role. The democratic manager, on the other hand, provides maximum room for subordinate judgment in the decision process (Tannenbaum & Schmidt, 1958).

The Vroom-Yetton Model

In the early 1970s, Vroom and Yetton developed a contingency model of decision-making, designed to aid managers in choosing how much input they want subordinates to have in the final decision (Vroom & Yetton, 1973). Their model was distinct from other contingency approaches such as Fiedler's (Fiedler, 1967) in that they placed no emphasis on the leader's personality as a factor in choosing one's problem-solving style: rather, the decisive elements in their model were situational variables such as leader information, importance of subordinate commitment to the decision, and potential conflict among subordinates.\(^1\)

Like Tannenbaum and Schmidt, Vroom and Yetton saw the leader's decision-making behaviour as falling on a continuum. They identified five specific points

\(^1\)While Vroom and Yetton styled their model a "leadership" one, in fact it deals only with one aspect of leadership. How a leader decides on degree of participativeness is certainly an important aspect of leadership, but it provides a much narrower focus than many other models. Therefore, this review concentrates on the literature related to decision-making, which is more directly relevant to Vroom and Yetton's central concern. For detailed comparisons of the Vroom-Yetton model with other leadership models, see Bass, 1990; Yukl & Van Fleet, 1990.
along the spectrum, from autocratic (A) through consultative (C) to group consensus (G). (Vroom & Yetton, 1973. See Appendix A, Figure A2 for the actual wording of the five decision styles.)

Vroom and Yetton argue that these decision styles represent a spectrum of willingness by the manager to include the subordinates in the decision-making process. Which style a manager should select is determined by a set of "problem attributes" which includes the importance of a quality decision, how much information the manager has, how much additional information subordinates have, etc. (For a complete list of problem attributes in the model, see Appendix A, Figure A3.)

Vroom and Yetton based their model to a large degree on the work of Maier (1963). According to Maier, there are two crucial ingredients to a successful solution of an organizational problem: the decision must be high quality (effective and/or efficient -- it must solve the problem) and it must be accepted by organizational members (particularly those who will bear some responsibility for carrying it out). In effect, the problem attributes of the Vroom-Yettton model are designed to enable a manager to weigh the relative importance of decision quality and decision acceptance in various situations. While decision quality depends on information, decision acceptance depends, generally speaking, on the degree to which the manager empowers subordinates in the decision-making process. Unless the subordinates cannot be trusted to buy into organizational goals (one of the contingencies addressed in the problem attributes), the prescriptions of the Vroom-Yetton model favour more participative
decision processes, because these tend to increase decision acceptance (Maier, 1963; Vroom & Yetton, 1973).

How important is an individual manager's preference for participative decision-making in influencing a choice of decision method? Vroom and Yetton came to the conclusion appropriate for a contingency model: that managers varied their behavior depending primarily on the situational attributes. Over eight trials involving 551 managers, they found that the proportion of variance explained by individual differences was 7.2% whereas the proportion explained by situational attributes was 27.2% (Vroom & Yetton, 1973, p. 105). Of the remaining variance, Vroom (1984) stated that as a general rule about 20% could be explained by looking at person-situation interactions.

Although Vroom and Yetton examined gender differences in preference for participation, they paid no particular attention to organizational culture as a possible source of variation. The relationships among these variables -- participation, gender, and organizational culture -- will be examined in the next few sections of the literature review.

**Gender and Participation**

When examining preferences for participation, empirical evidence suggests that women managers may react differently to organizational contingencies than their male counterparts. In 1990, Eagly and Johnson published a meta-analysis of 162 studies
that examined male-female differences in leadership style. Most of the studies had to do with the dimensions of leadership that are most commonly measured: roughly speaking, these could be described as task orientation and relationship orientation. Despite the existence of gender stereotypes that suggest women leaders are likely to be more relationship-oriented than men, Eagly and Johnson found no substantial difference on these dimensions. What they did find, based on a subset of eighteen studies that looked at the autocratic-democratic dimension of leadership style, was that women were more democratic than men. (The terms autocratic/democratic and directive/participative are used interchangeably in Eagly & Johnson's study to describe the continuum identified by Tannenbaum & Schmidt, 1958, and discussed above.) The mean weighted effect size for the difference was .22 (i.e., about 1/5 of a standard deviation difference between women and men). Eagly and Johnson's a priori hypothesis was that women's tendency to be more democratic would be less pronounced in organizational settings than in laboratory studies, because a laboratory study is an artificial situation which provides few environmental cues to behaviour, and so stereotypes might be expected to become more powerful -- that is, women would be more likely to behave in the way their socialization would dictate. However, this expected difference between laboratory studies and field studies failed to emerge with the autocratic-democratic dichotomy. By implication, then, this is a "real" difference between male and female managers (Eagly & Johnson, 1990).

Eagly and Johnson suggest two theoretical explanations for the observed gender
difference in participativeness:

1. Women may be more interpersonally skillful than men, which may lead them to have greater confidence in a style of managing that requires effective use of communication and negotiation, or

2. Women may be reacting to the stereotypical expectations of others — in particular, the fact that women are perceived more negatively than men when they adopt an autocratic decision-making style (Jago & Vroom, 1982).

The findings of the meta-analysis do not enable the researchers to rule out either of these possibilities. Both factors may play a role in the observed difference, and there may be other explanations that cannot be either supported or ruled out given the limitations of the studies. For example, it is possible that differences in the specific managerial functions of men's and women's jobs may account for at least part of the observed difference (Jago & Vroom, 1982).

Lacking empirical certainty, we can still construct a hypothetical pattern that can explain Eagly and Johnson's findings, using a combination of theory and inference. It seems likely that a manager's behaviour patterns, including decision-making style, are learned within a particular organizational environment, and that the organization's culture may shape that learning. The next section discusses this theoretical perspective in some detail.

Organizational Culture

The term "organizational culture" came into vogue among researchers in the
early 1980s (Reichers & Schneider, 1990). Because the term "culture" was borrowed from anthropology, organizational theorists felt called upon to explain what it meant, although their explanations have been inconsistent and even contradictory (Smircich, 1983). Here, I am defining culture as "the shared values and norms that exist in an organization and that are taught to incoming employees" (Vecchio, 1991, p. 550). The teaching of culture need not be verbal or explicit; it may arise through observation or through taking part in organizational rituals (Rosen, 1991).

For many individuals, particularly those who have made a career within an organization, that organization's culture has a profound and pervasive effect on their behaviour. Kanter (1977) describes the effect of "Indsco"'s culture on its managerial workforce:

Indsco managers tended to put in many more hours than workers, and they spent more of their so-called leisure time in work-related activities. One manager even dreamed about the company. At 4:30, when the working day ended, people stuffed the elevators in the rush to get out. Some of the men stayed behind for an occasional dinner or training program or important meeting. Into the briefcase went those inevitable papers or a trade publication or even a book on work-related issues that certainly could not be read in the office. "No one would believe that an executive was working if he were found at his desk reading a book," one commented. (On the other hand, another manager said that visibly working very long hours could also be slightly suspect. People would begin to wonder about the competence of someone who seemed to have to work much longer than others at the same job.) (Kanter, 1977, p. 64)

According to Schein (1992), there are three levels on which organizational culture operates. Level I is the most visible and accessible to organizational members as well as researchers: it consists of artifacts (a company logo, for example) as well as
of behaviour patterns engaged in by the organization's members (examples might include a tradition of exchanging gifts with coworkers at Christmas; prolonged coffee breaks; or the sorts of managerial behaviour identified by Kanter, above). Level II consists of values and beliefs shared by organizational members, while Level III is basic underlying assumptions, which according to Schein are inaccessible to organizational members as well as researchers, because they are so taken for granted as to be unconscious (Schein, 1992). The contents of Level III influence Level II, and Level II gives rise to the visible manifestations of Level I.

The relationship between organizational culture and how gender is socially constructed in the workplace is connected with individuals' values and beliefs, and is probably more closely identified with Level II than with Level I. The relationship between gender and organizational culture will be specifically addressed in a later section of the paper; the next section will focus on theoretical approaches to organizational decision-making in order to demonstrate how organizational culture is potentially involved. In addition, empirical and normative studies of how organizational culture influences gender perceptions will be discussed in Chapter 3, in the discussion of how the model used in the present study was developed.

Organizational Culture and Decision-making

Early theorists concerned with organizational decision-making started from the assumption that it was essentially a rational process (Barnard, 1938; Simon, 1976). Despite some caveats, they tended to depict decisions as arising from perfect informa-
tion and a careful weighing of alternatives. Unfortunately, this clearcut description often bore little resemblance to reality. Simon (1976) pointed out some of the most glaring difficulties with the rational model of decision-making: incomplete knowledge of consequences, and the sheer inability to conceptualize all the imaginable alternatives (Simon, 1976, p. 81).

March (1994) suggested that decision-makers rely on heuristics: rules of thumb based on similarities between situations, so that what worked last time can reasonably be expected to work again. He surmised that many decisions are made according to a "logic of appropriateness" (March, 1994, p. 58) where what is appropriate is dictated by cultural rules and norms. One implication of this approach is that a solution which works in a given environment is likely to be the source of a future norm. From Schein's point of view, this is precisely how organizational culture comes about (Schein, 1992).

From a theoretical perspective, there are several mechanisms that could link organizational culture and decision-making:

1. Organizational culture defines the boundaries within which actions are doable, and perhaps even thinkable, within a given organization. Cognitively, organizational culture is useful in that it reduces a bewildering number of possible actions to a smaller, more manageable subset.

2. Organizational culture provides a ready-made set of examples -- traditions, stories, both positive and negative role models -- which can facilitate decisions whose
features are familiar. March (1994) talks about a perspective which regards decision-making as a process of following rules: from this perspective, organizational culture is one source of these rules.

3. Organizational culture may determine who makes or influences the decision, by formally or informally influencing policies and procedures.

4. There may be norms or values (part of the organization's culture) about what features of the inputs (information) and outcomes of the decision process should be paid attention to. Is return on investment the primary consideration? Customer satisfaction? Reputability and the standards of the larger society in which the organization operates? The organization's culture often provides cues as to what values should be taken into account, and may even enable the decision maker(s) to prioritize the values considered important.

The above discussion suggests that within the Vroom-Yetton model, organizational culture will influence both decision quality (a high-quality decision presumably would not violate taken-for-granted cultural assumptions at Level III of Schein's model) as well as decision acceptance (a decision which violates cultural norms is likely to meet with resistance from other organization members).

Organizational culture may also have an indirect influence on decision-making processes. In order to understand this possibility, we need to examine the relationship between cultures in organizations and gender perceptions of organizational members.
Organizational Culture and Gender

A useful way to begin thinking about how behavioural differences between men and women could be related to organizational culture is provided by Fagenson's (1990) typology. She distinguishes between gender-centred (or person-centred) approaches which locate the source of difference within the individual -- in effect, gender is the cause and the explanation for the difference -- and structural and interactive perspectives which take the environment into account as a causal factor. In the workplace, the organization's culture is an important part of the environment.

Many researchers have asserted that there is a link between organizational culture -- particularly norms associated with the managerial role -- and gender (Acker, 1991; West & Zimmerman, 1991). In the first place, most organizations in the twentieth century have been and are run by men, while women have tended to predominate in low-status positions that allow little autonomy (Lorber, 1994; Morrison, White & Van Velsor, 1992). In 1992, despite the fact that 42% of managers in the U.S. were women, the percentage of women in top management was still less than 5 (Powell & Butterfield, 1994). In Canada, 43% of managers and administrators were women as of 1994 (Almey, 1995), but this undoubtedly includes large numbers of supervisors and lower-level managers.

Thus, to the extent that organizations have or are cultures, these cultures have been shaped primarily by men. There is a common stereotypical association in the minds of many people between maleness and managerial ability (Heilman, Block,
Martell & Simon, 1989). The result within many organizations is that women promoted into managerial positions feel isolated and singled out for critical scrutiny (Marshall, 1995). A newly-promoted woman manager who attends an otherwise all-male meeting may find initially that her presence and contributions are simply ignored (Freeman, 1990). When this occurs, the organizational culture reinforces a message that women have received more generally from their overall socialization: a woman who occupies a high status job is by definition deviant (Marshall, 1995). If she emphasizes her deviance by what is perceived as an autocratic managerial style, her subordinates and colleagues are more likely to disapprove than would be the case for a man in the equivalent organizational role (Eagly, Makhijani & Klonsky, 1992).

There is another aspect to the question of how gender and organizational culture potentially interact, related to differences in male and female socialization and how these carry over into organizational life. According to social role theory (Eagly, 1987), men and women are conditioned to respond differently in social situations, and these responses conform to traditional stereotypes: men are seen as active, aggressive, self-promoting; women as manifesting a concern for others that may lead to more passive and altruistic reactions (Eagly, 1987, p. 16). Eagly terms the female and male stereotypes "communal" and "agentic", respectively, and asserts that they may result from the traditional division of labour that gives women primary responsibility for nurturant tasks (Eagly, 1987).

In themselves, the communal tendencies of women might not operate to their
disadvantage within organizational cultures. In practice, however, male-dominated organizations lead to perceptions that men are the appropriate spokespersons, trendsetters, and decision-makers. In part this results from the tendency to "homosexual reproduction" identified by Kanter: because the appraisal of success in managerial roles is not an easy task, there is a tendency to look for outward signs that someone is "the right sort" -- which, for an Anglo-Saxon male, tends to translate into another Anglo-Saxon male. Another, closely linked consideration is that communication and trust are easier with someone who shares a common set of assumptions about the world; gender and racial similarity provide some assurance that these assumptions will be present (Kanter, 1977, p. 48).

A U.S. consultant and researcher who has worked with a number of companies on women's issues believes that there is a spectrum of organizational performance in terms of how women managers are treated (Schwartz, 1992). On a scale of 0 to 5 (5 representing excellence) she asserts that most companies currently seen as "woman friendly" are 2s, or at best 3s. Although these companies have made some efforts to promote women into higher-level managerial positions, the efforts tend to be sporadic and reactive. Schwartz contends that the organizational culture of many of these workplaces is "corrosive" for women on their way up:

[The CEO] is not aware of all that happens to undermine women as they move up the corporate ladder -- how damaging are the preconceptions about what they can and cannot achieve, how exclusive the male networks through which deals are cemented and careers gradually built, how commonplace the sexual innuendos and casual sexist remarks. (Schwartz, 1992, p. 156)
Thus, an interlocking set of conditions tends to make organizational cultures, as they have evolved in industrial society, less than totally friendly to women in managerial roles. The world view of powerful decision-makers within the corporation is male; it sees the male agentic type as a natural candidate for managerial positions (Reskin, 1991); and it perpetuates itself and its view of men, women, and organizational norms over time.

**Gender Salience**

From a theoretical viewpoint, the question of congruence between female gender and the managerial role is related to the issue of gender salience: the degree to which gender ascription is seen as an important part of someone's identity in the workplace. Much of the work bearing on this issue has been done by sociologists interested in the effect of demographic characteristics such as race or sex on performance in groups. For example, Kanter (1977) hypothesized that the proportion of women within work groups would affect how they were perceived by men: minority status in the group led to undesirable effects including stereotyping. Kanter's approach was gender neutral: she claimed that men in minority status within a group would experience the same forms of tokenism. Her conclusions have since been challenged by a number of other researchers, who assert that status differences present in the larger society result in differing consequences for men and women who are token representatives within work groups (Konrad, Winter & Gutek, 1992; Martin, 1985; Zimmer, 1988). Because the normative expectations of the workplace are
generally set by men, women experience more difficulty than men when they try to assert leadership within a mixed male/female work group, even if women are not a minority within the group (Martin, 1985). Gender is salient under these conditions at least in part because of the expectation carried over from norms in the larger society that leaders are male (Heilman et al., 1989).

More recently, work on organizational demography has helped to demonstrate that where women are located in the organization, in terms of power and status, has a bearing on perceptions of gender in relation to career success. For example, Ely interviewed women who were associates (in effect, middle managers) in law firms, and discovered that women in firms which had higher proportions of female partners were less likely to see being female as a liability, and less likely overall to emphasize the role of gender in organizational life, than those from male-dominated firms (Ely, 1995). Burke and McKeen (1996) found that women working in firms that were either disproportionately male (more men than women at all levels) or male dominated (more men than women in senior management) were less satisfied with their jobs and had higher intentions to quit than women working in organizations where senior management was gender-balanced or where women predominated.

These studies demonstrate that, although the culture within organizations has been often alien, and in many cases downright unfriendly, to women, culture within a particular organization is likely to exhibit certain features that either emphasize or downplay the saliency of gender to the managerial role. To the extent that women
managers are few and therefore anomalies in organizational terms, they are likely to experience pressures that have less to do with their work roles than their gender roles (Ely, 1994, 1995; Gutek, 1985; Martin, 1985).

Part of the impact of women's presence or absence at higher managerial levels in the organization is the signal sent to women at lower levels. From the perspective of the present study, organizational demography can be seen as a visible manifestation of some aspects of the organization's culture. Research shows that ascribed characteristics such as gender become more salient when there are fewer members of a particular group -- such as top management -- who are members of the "out group" (the group that differs from the norm; since most managers are male, the out group in this case is women). Ely's findings (1994;1995) extend previous work in this area, such as Kanter's (1977) by demonstrating that even for women who are not members of the top management group, the salience of gender is heightened when there are few women at the top.

The demographic profile of the organization, particularly in terms of its leadership, will have an impact on the organizational culture, and the culture in turn will influence selection and promotion processes, leading to change or perpetuation of the demographic profile (Stewman, 1988). Both organizational culture and demography, in turn, will influence the understanding of organizational members about the meanings attached to gender: whether women are perceived as first-class citizens and valued contributors, or as individuals who deviate from the norms associated with the
managerial type (Acker, 1991) and who are thus naturally relegated to subordinate positions.

Summary

The purpose of this literature review has been to introduce and discuss variables within a conceptual framework that may help to explain the "gender gap" in management style described above. These variables are organizational culture and gender salience. The next section discusses how these variables and others fit together into a model designed to explain the choice of a more or less participative style of decision-making by an individual manager.
CHAPTER 3

DESIGN OF THE RESEARCH

The research described here was designed as a field study in which both quantitative and qualitative data would be collected. The research strategy involved using triangulation. Triangulation in research can take different forms (Janesick, 1994; Schmitt & Klimoski, 1991), but in this case I am following the usage provided by Rossman and Wilson (1985) who discuss the use of combined qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis in terms of three approaches: data from one type of research can be used to validate findings from the other type (a convergent validation strategy, which Rossman and Wilson term "corroboration"), or to enrich understanding of phenomena uncovered by the other type ("elaboration"), or to uncover inconsistencies in the data which may lead to new insights ("initiation"). While my intent when designing the research was primarily corroboration, I believe that all three processes helped to enrich and validate the findings of the present study. This point will be addressed in Chapter 5.

Goals of the Research

The research described here proposed a model to link organizational culture, gender salience and managerial decision-making along lines suggested by the literature reviewed in the previous section. In order to test such a model, the research attempted:
1. To determine whether there is a relationship between specific elements of organizational culture (e.g., respect for people, teamwork orientation) and the degree to which managers are participative in their approach to decision-making. The first two hypotheses (discussed below) deal with this question.

2. To determine whether gender-based differences (or non-differences) in decision-making styles can be linked to woman-friendliness as an aspect of the organization's culture (hypotheses 3-10).

3. To determine whether organizational culture is connected with perceptions of gender salience by organizational members (hypotheses 11 and 12).

These questions reflect a hypothetico-deductive approach to data analysis where relationships believed to exist are posited and tested. However, there is also a more exploratory dimension to the study. Little is known about how particular aspects of organizational culture (for example, values that stress a family-friendly approach, which might signal greater woman-friendliness) affect gender perceptions and gender salience as individuals experience them in the workplace.

Maxwell (1998) identifies five strengths of qualitative research: it enables investigators to understand meaning (i.e., to see events and processes through the eyes of study subjects, at least to some extent), to gain insight into the context of the research (very important when investigating organizational culture), to understand processes, to identify unanticipated influences and build grounded theory, and to develop causal explanations. In beginning my research, the first three of these
(understanding participants' point of view, the context, and what processes were involved) seemed to me very important. The original research design included both semi-structured interviews (to gain insight into what organizational members thought about the culture, their own and others' decision-making in the workplace, and how these might be related) and observation. Concerns about client confidentiality expressed by gatekeepers meant that observation (except incidentally, when I showed up to conduct the research onsite) was ruled out, but the interviews were part of the research design from the beginning.

Variables Included in the Model

The research was designed in part to test a model that focuses specifically on gender differences in decision-making. It is not designed as a comprehensive model of decision-making, nor does it pretend to take into account all the variables that are likely to affect an individual manager's preference for subordinate participation. However, the research design does attempt to control for individual and organizational characteristics that might create confusion. These will be discussed in the section on "variables not included in the model," just following this one.

This section describes the variables included in a model of decision-making, with an indication whether they are independent (I), dependent (D), or mediating (M). (See Appendix C for a summary list of these variables.) This section also discusses how the variables will be measured. The model which links the variables together will
be discussed in section D, below.

Organizational Culture (I)

For the purposes of the research, organizational culture is defined as "the shared values and norms that exist in an organization and that are taught to incoming employees" (Vecchio, 1991, p. 550). It corresponds to Schein's (1992) Level II of organizational culture (see p. 18, above) which is intermediate between Level III (unconscious shared assumptions of organizational members) and Level I (visible symbols and artifacts). As discussed above, I believe that Level II is the most appropriate level of the organization's culture to examine in relation to decision-making.

Organizational culture was measured in two ways: using the Organizational Culture Profile (OCP), a quantitative instrument that will be described in more detail in a later section, and by means of an interview question which asked respondents whether they felt their personal style was a good fit with the organization's culture (see Appendix F). Although the question did not ask respondents to describe or define the organization's culture, the answers in many cases provided rich data on relevant dimensions of that variable. These findings are discussed in detail in the Results section.

Gender Salience (M)

In conventional usage, the word "gender" tends to be regarded as a synonym for "sex" (Gove et al., 1966, p. 944). However, feminist theory sees gender as much
more equivocal and contingent on social norms. According to West and Zimmerman (1991), gender is "an emergent feature of social situations...an outcome of and a rationale for various social arrangements and ...a means of legitimating one of the most fundamental divisions of society" (West and Zimmerman, 1991, p. 14).

This approach to defining gender leads to an understanding of what is meant by gender salience: the degree to which gender ascription is seen as an important part of someone's identity in the workplace. In an organization where status cues are minimized, where jobs are not segregated by gender, and where competence can be clearly linked to performance (rather than having to be ascribed based on personal traits) gender salience is likely to be low. However, such organizations are rare in the North American context (Perry, Davis-Blake & Kulik, 1994; Zeytinoglu & Weber, 1999). As the discussion of organizational culture and gender above demonstrates, gender is often linked to assumptions about managerial competence and DMS.

In terms of the present study, gender salience is defined as a perceptual variable. Others who have used salience in this way include Chatman et al. (1998) and Ely (1989). Ely's work on organizational demography demonstrated that promotion of women to senior positions (partnerships) had an effect on the gender perceptions of women at lower levels in the organization (Ely, 1995). In the present study, this finding is extrapolated as I assume that indicators of woman-friendliness in the organization (including promotion of women) will have an effect on the salience of gender in the eyes of women employees.
Decision-making Style (D)

As discussed earlier, I am investigating decision-making style (DMS) along a particular dimension, from autocratic/directive to democratic/participative. A problem set of 30 cases based on the Vroom-Yetton model (described earlier) will be used to measure decision-making style. This measure will be discussed in more detail under Methodology, below.

Variables Not Included in the Model

Clearly, a number of factors that could be expected to affect managerial DMS are not included in the model. Some of these factors, such as the characteristic problem attributes delineated in the Vroom-Yetton model, are explicitly controlled for by the measures used (Vroom & Yetton, 1973; see Appendix A). Other factors influenced the sample selection process, which was expected to help control for job-related features such as organizational level and work role. This section discusses in some detail variables that could be expected to play a role in DMS, but that are not being measured in the research.

Individual Characteristics

Although the focus of the Vroom/Yetton model is on situational factors, research using the model has demonstrated that a more participative decision-making style is negatively correlated with the individual personality attributes of authoritarianism and a leadership style that stresses initiating structure (Vroom & Jago, 1988). The fact that managers respond differently to identical situations is amply demonstrated by
the variance in MLP scores (see the discussion earlier on this feature of the Vroom/Yetton model) and personality factors are a natural suspect in this kind of differential response (House, Shane & Herold, 1996).

On the other hand, unless personality factors are correlated with gender, or with some source of bias in the sample, they are unlikely to affect the findings of this research. Eagly and Johnson (1990) demonstrated that there was no significant correlation between gender and initiating structure. And although authoritarianism is linked to strongly traditional views of sex roles, empirical research has not established a correlation between gender per se and authoritarianism (Lippa, 1995; Rubinstein, 1995).

It would have been helpful to have administered instruments to measure differences in personality among the respondents. The reason I did not do so had to do with the perceived need (confirmed in almost every case in telephone conversations with gatekeepers and potential respondents) to minimize the time demands of the research on participants.

Information on what has influenced individual preferences for participation was gathered in the interviews (see the list of interview questions, Appendix F). Age differences were checked and controlled for via a question on a demographic survey given to all respondents (see Appendix G).

**Interpersonal Skills**

One criticism that has been leveled at the Vroom/Yetton model is that it does
not allow for differences in managers' interpersonal skills (Yukl & Van Fleet, 1990). Crouch and Yetton (1987) point out that one area in which the prescriptions of the Vroom/Yetton model seem to diverge most markedly from actual managerial practice is in relation to the "conflict rule": the model states that if subordinate acceptance of the decision is important, but subordinates are likely to disagree about the optimal course of action, then a more participative decision style (CII or GII -- consultation with the group or consensus decision making) is mandated (Vroom & Jago, 1988).

According to Crouch and Yetton (1987) a manager's willingness to follow a group problem-solving process in this situation is dependent on his/her interpersonal skills. A manager who feels confident that subordinate conflict can be surfaced and resolved in a group setting will find the prescription of the model leads to a better decision, because subordinates have a chance to bring out their doubts and argue them through. The result, if not consensus, is at least a feeling of having been heard. On the other hand, a manager who feels unskillful in the face of subordinate disagreement and who is afraid the conflict will go unresolved is more likely to use a less participative style. Crouch and Yetton (1987) argue that this behaviour is rational because the manager's fear of conflict sets up a self-fulfilling prophecy.

Where the conflict rule is concerned, then, individual differences may override the effect of organizational culture to create discrepancies in DMS between managers. This is potentially a confounding variable, given that research has demonstrated that women seem to be higher in social skills that may make them more confident when
facing subordinate conflict (Eagly & Johnson, 1990). Its effect can be controlled by using a subset of the Vroom-Yetton problems that does not include the problem attribute of subordinate conflict, and comparing the MLP score obtained for an individual with that obtained by using the full Vroom-Yetton set.

Subordinate Characteristics

A set of important variables that has not been explicitly discussed up to this point is the characteristics of subordinates: what knowledge and skills they possess relative to the manager, and how far they can be trusted to adopt organizational goals. These variables are both explicitly (in decision rules C and E-H) and implicitly (via the emphasis on decision acceptance by subordinates) included in the Vroom/Yetton model. Thus they are controlled for by the specification of the problem attributes.

Another form of control for subordinate characteristics has to do with the nature of the sample utilized in the study. Accounting firms benefit from the professional socialization of their members, which tends to ensure that the staff accountants who are managers' subordinates have a uniform level of knowledge and similar values (Davidson, 1994). Thus, it seems likely that subordinates will be fairly homogeneous (in terms of knowledge and commitment to the employer) across the sample, eliminating a potential source of variance in the managers' responses.

Individual/Organizational Characteristics

Evidence exists that job level (i.e., level of authority within the organization), job function, and task variables affect a manager's willingness to include subordinates
in decision-making. Pasewark and Strawser (1994) found that the participative tendencies of managers making audit budgeting decisions in accounting firms depended heavily on the decision styles employed by their superiors. Heller and Yukl (1969) and Jago and Vroom (1977) found that higher-level managers were more participative than lower-level ones, possibly reflecting a shift from a perspective that considers time to be of major importance to a more pronounced focus on developing subordinates (Vroom & Yetton, 1973; for another perspective on these findings, see Bass, 1990, p. 448-449.)

In terms of job function, Jago (1980) found that functional specialization resulted in important differences in MLP, with personnel managers displaying a significantly higher MLP than any other type. Jago and Scamell (1982) compared MIS managers to other types and found that they were close to the mean MLP for a sample of 1647 managers of different types. (The overall F-value for differences in MLP across the sample was 3.82, p < .01). These individual/organizational characteristics will be controlled for by the nature of the sample and the setting of the study, described under Methodology, below.

Organizational Characteristics

Demography

Although demography is a reasonable candidate as a variable to include in the model, there were several reasons why I eventually decided to omit it. Although demography is often treated as an independent variable (Ely, 1994, 1995; Kanter,
In the present research its status is more that of an indicator of organizational culture. In addition, because the research was on the relationship between organizational culture and decision-making, I felt that I could not include direct questions on matters such as the proportion of upper-level managers who were women -- an issue that was not only outside the domain of the research as described to participants, but was also likely to be sensitive for respondents, since the glass ceiling and turnover rates among women at middle management levels are items of concern to these firms. (Some indirect evidence on the paucity of women in upper management in sampled firms will be discussed later, in the Results chapter.)

Having discussed variables included in the model and those not included, the next task is to describe the model itself.

**A Model for Gender Differences in Decision-making**

Figure 1 depicts a model that links organizational culture, gender salience, and decision-making in order to help explain why women managers display more participative behaviour. One of the assumptions of the model is that this difference in behaviour has been observed in traditional organizations, which could be called "gender blind". This term is derived from the literature on affirmative action, where it describes an attitude that sees absence of discrimination, rather than positive attempts to remediate past discrimination, as the most appropriate response to social inequity (Skrentny, 1996).
culture, these differences include the gender-related attitudes and expectations about managers discussed above, in the section on gender and organizational culture. Paradoxically, the attempt to create equality between male and female employees by ignoring these differences actually highlights what, in a male-defined organizational culture, will appear as individual "disabilities" suffered or taken on by women (Tavris, 1992). Thus, I expect that gender will be more, not less, salient in these supposedly gender blind organizations (Kanter, 1977; Schwartz, 1992).

\footnote{The model is also depicted in Appendix B.}
1992). Thus, I expect that gender will be more, not less, salient in these supposedly
gender blind organizations (Kanter, 1977; Schwartz, 1992).

Why should gender salience lead to differences in decision-making styles
(DMSs) between men and women? Based on Eagly and Johnson’s (1990) findings, it
seems that women managers consistently choose a more participative DMS. Although
the study provides no evidence on whether the organizations involved were woman
friendly or otherwise, the fact that data were collected before 1988 gives rise to a
strong presumption that many, if not all, of the organizations which provided data for
the meta-analysis were gender blind (Schwartz, 1992). Studies by Eagly et al. (1992)
and Jago and Vroom (1982) show that women managers who adopt an autocratic DMS
are evaluated more negatively than autocratic male managers. In a gender blind
environment, where gender is more salient, the pressures for women to conform to
stereotypical expectations (including a more "communal", hence participative, DMS --
Eagly, 1987; Eagly et al., 1992) should be heightened. In the model, this leads to
predicting a higher MLP ("mean level of participation" -- see the discussion of the
Vroom-Yetton instrument, below, pp. 40-42) score for women managers than for their
male counterparts in the gender blind organization.

The model also depicts a hypothetical organization which is woman friendly.
Criteria for woman-friendliness used in one survey of Canadian organizations included
employee satisfaction, movement of women into senior management, and policies and
procedures designed to make the work-family balancing act easier (Frank, 1994). My
expectation is that a woman-friendly organizational culture will lessen the salience of gender for women employees (including managers). Support for this assumption is found in Ely (1995) and in work by Denton and Zeytinoglu (1993) and Ahmed, Denton, O'Connor, and Zeytinoglu (in press) who found that women's perceptions of their status and career advancement within a university were affected by low overall numbers as well as by low levels of integration into decision-making bodies of the institution. In other words, gender salience in many organizations tends to arise out of a feeling that one's own gender is devalued relative to the other (Deschamps, 1982; Wharton, 1992). Ahmed et al. (in press) argue that an increase in numbers and increased integration of women into decision-making bodies would create a more woman-friendly organizational culture, decreasing the salience of gender for organizational actors.

In the absence of pressures to behave in stereotypically female fashion, women managers are more likely to utilize a DMS that follows organizational norms. With gender removed from the situational dynamic, organizational culture should provide the same cues to men and women managers, leading to identical (or at least very similar) DMSs. The influence of organizational culture on DMS, independent of any gender effect, is shown by the arrows labelled (a) and (b). Theoretical and empirical support for this aspect of the model was discussed above in Chapter 2, "Organizational Culture and Decision-making".

Arrows (c) and (d) show that in both gender blind and woman-friendly
organizations, organizational culture is expected to influence the degree to which gender is salient for women managers. However, the effect is disparate. In the gender blind organization, the expectation is that cultural and demographic cues will heighten gender salience for women, affecting their DMSs in ways that do not occur for men.

Support for arrow (c) -- the relationship between traditional organizational culture and heightened gender salience for women managers -- has been discussed in the literature review. Support for arrow (d) comes from Ely's (1995) research, which showed that in "sex-integrated" law firms -- those with a larger proportion of women partners -- women at lower levels were less likely to use gender stereotypes in their discussions of male/female differences, and more likely to take individual differences into account. Although Ely's sample did not include men, it seems reasonable to infer that lowered gender salience for women would result in a sense that managerial norms were independent of gender considerations, leading to greater similarity in managerial behaviours of men and women.

Finally, arrows (e) and (f) show the links between the perceptual aspect of the model (gender salience) and behavioural outcomes -- in this case, decision-making. The expectation is that within traditional organizations, heightened gender salience will result in a gender gap between men's and women's participative behaviour. Empirical evidence for this expectation comes from Eagly and Johnson (1990) and from Jago and Vroom (1982), and has been discussed in the literature review.

Arrow (f) suggests that in woman-friendly organizations, organizational culture
will operate in a similar fashion on male and female managers, resulting in similar DMSs. According to Schwartz (1992), there are no truly woman-friendly corporations, so it is perhaps unsurprising that I was unable to find research that supports empirically this aspect of the model. However, some theoretical support is provided by Hood and Koberg (1994) who describe, in ideal terms, "An organization where women are assimilated rather than acculturated (where men and women accept individual differences and status equality)". Hood and Koberg stress the positive nature of an organizational culture where gender is not a status signal, but like Schwartz, they see such a culture as not fully existing at present. The assumptions represented by arrow (f) are part of what the present research is attempting to test; they represent terra incognita as opposed to simply confirming previous research results with a new sample.

A somewhat different approach, but one with interesting implications for the present research, was utilized by Chatman et al. (1998). They examined the relationship between organizational culture and gender (and other kinds of) salience, using individualist/collectivist dimensions of organizational culture. Their initial hypotheses were based on the assumption that a collectivist organizational culture, by making organizational membership more salient than would be the case in an individualist culture, would lessen the salience of ascribed characteristics such as gender. They found that "the salience of organizational and demographic categories were [sic] inversely related" (Chatman et al., 1998, p. 772). This suggests direct
support for arrows (a) and (b), and indirect support for arrows (d) and (f), within the present model. In other words, if the relationship between organizational and demographic categories is conceived of as one-way (a "stronger" organizational culture makes gender salience weaker) then arrows (a) and (b) are supported. However, the converse might also be true -- that is, an organization where gender salience is lower might result in the salience of organizational categories (e.g., "I am a manager") becoming more powerful. This would provide support for arrows (d) and (f).

Chatman et al. did not specifically test this relationship, however.

**Hypotheses Based on the Model**

Organizational Culture and DMS

The first two hypotheses posit a relationship between organizational culture and decision-making style (DMS) independent of the role of gender salience. This relationship is represented by the arrows labelled (a) and (b) in the model.

The hypotheses are based on a factor analysis of the Organizational Culture Profile (OCP -- see O'Reilly, Chatman & Caldwell, 1991). Data from 826 accountants in seven firms were used to factor analyze the profiles obtained, resulting in seven factors: two of these (*respect for people* and *team orientation*) are expected to correlate highly with an organization which encourages a participative DMS in its managers. The purpose of these two hypotheses is to show the effect of organizational culture on decision-making, independent of gender.
Respect for People

Many advocates of a participative approach to management base their argument on McGregor's (1960) Theory Y assumptions: that human beings are not naturally averse to work, that they are willing to put their best talents and energies to work to achieve organizational goals, but that these talents and energies are often (consciously or unconsciously) suppressed by workers because managers are intent on controlling their activities rather than encouraging their intelligence and creativity (McGregor, 1960). While it is possible to imagine a manager using a participative approach in a purely manipulative way, it would be hard to sustain the pretence of belief in Theory Y assumptions over a long period of time (Kanter, 1989, p. 154-155). The management literature of the past few decades is well stocked with both theoretical treatises (Ouchi, 1981; Walton, 1986) and case studies exemplifying the relationship between participative management and "respect for people" (Kanter, 1983; Peters & Waterman, 1982). Therefore,

H1: Organizational units with high scores on the "respect for people" factor of the OCP will have a higher average MLP score than other units in the study.

Teamwork Orientation

The widespread use of teams in North American workplaces began in the 1970s, but its theoretical origins were several decades earlier (Ketchum & Trist, 1992). Researchers in Britain, studying work organization in coal mines, realized that working as a team enabled the miners to enhance both productivity and job satisfaction.
Crucial to the effective functioning of teams, however, is the need to hand over large chunks of decision-making that have traditionally been considered within managers' area of responsibility (Ketchum & Trist, 1992; Whyte, 1991). While delegation as an activity goes beyond the prescriptions of the Vroom/Yetton group model, it clearly belongs at the participative end of the spectrum (Vroom & Jago, 1988). Thus it seems logical to assume that

H2: Organizational units with high scores on the "teamwork orientation" factor of the OCP will have a higher average MLP score.

Organizational Culture, Gender Salience, and DMS

As discussed earlier, the assumptions of the gender blind organization do not take into account differences in the context of men's and women's work lives. Among these differences is a greater need, on the part of many women, for flexibility in scheduling work in relation to other demands, particularly those of young children (Schwartz, 1992). Some items on the Organizational Culture Profile can be used to measure the degree to which an organization is able to respond to women's needs in this regard. For example, organizations that score low on "adaptability" and "flexibility" (the first two items in the OCP set) would presumably be less likely to adopt flexible work arrangements that are helpful to women (Frank, 1994). Similarly, an organization that values working long hours (item 45) is unlikely to have a policy in place stating that "a part-time work arrangement will not affect long-term career prospects, including consideration for partnership admission" (Price Waterhouse
Canada brochure, no date). These organizations are expected to illustrate the gender blind aspect of the model: men and women will differ in their DMSs, with women displaying a more participative DMS (i.e., a higher MLP score).

H3: In organizations with low scores on "flexibility", MLP scores will be higher for women than for men.

H4: In organizations with low scores on "adaptability", MLP scores will be higher for women than for men.

H5: In organizations with high scores on "working long hours", women's MLP scores will be higher than men's.

For reasons described above in the discussion of gender blind organizations, it seems likely that men and women in these organizations will have different perceptions of opportunities for professional growth (item 35) provided by their organizations. Hence,

H6: In organizations where men see the organization as placing a higher value on "opportunities for professional growth" than do women, women's MLP scores will be higher than men's.

Cultural Indicators of Woman-Friendliness

A parallel set of hypotheses to those discussed in 2, above, can be constructed for the woman-friendly organization.

H7: In organizations with high scores on "flexibility", MLP scores will not differ for men and women.
H8: In organizations with high scores on "adaptability", MLP scores will not differ for men and women.

H9: In organizations with low scores on "working long hours", MLP scores will not differ for men and women.

H10: In organizations where men and women see equal opportunities for professional growth, MLP scores will not differ for men and women.

Organizational Culture and Gender Salience

The next set of hypotheses addresses the relationship between organizational culture and gender salience represented by arrows (c) and (d) in the model. Since gender is expected to be less salient in woman-friendly than in gender blind firms, it seems reasonable that men and women in a woman-friendly organizational culture would see little or no difference in decision-making styles based on gender. In addition, the lessened salience of gender should result in women feeling a greater degree of comfort with their own DMSs, and less likelihood that they see their personal DMSs as discrepant with the organization’s values (Ely, 1994), than would be the case in gender blind organizations.

H11: Respondents from gender blind firms are more likely than those from woman-friendly firms to see gender differences in participation in the workplace.

H12: In woman-friendly firms, women are more likely to say that their personal style fits well with the culture of their organization than are women in gender blind firms.
It should be noted that the ability to test these last two hypotheses depends on being able to distinguish between gender blind and woman-friendly firms. Because no a priori assumptions were made about which firms might fit these profiles, I hoped that the independent variables used in hypotheses 3-10 would create a clear picture: one set of firms high on flexibility, adaptability, growth opportunities for women, and low on working long hours (woman-friendly firms) and another set with the opposite characteristics. The outcome was by no means so clearcut, as will be discussed in Chapter 4.

Methodology

Rationale for Sample Selection

The aim of sample selection in this case was to obtain a sample of organizations that would be internally homogeneous enough that a group of managers at the same hierarchical level could be expected to have very similar jobs, yet heterogeneous enough to provide meaningful variation on the OCP. In order to control for variables such as job level, job function, and task-related differences, I selected organizations (accounting firms) and individuals (middle managers within those firms) that seemed likely to be homogeneous in terms of organization structure, number of hierarchical levels, and tasks assigned to individuals at those levels (Maister, 1982; O'Dwyer, 1992). According to Maister (1982):

The archetypal structure of the professional service is an organization containing three professional levels which serve as a normal or expected career path...In a CPA [public accounting] firm, [the levels] might be referred to as
staff accountant, manager, and partner. (p. 15).

O'Dwyer (1992) and J. Buchhausen (personal communication, March 27, 1997) have confirmed that this pattern is typical of Canadian public accounting firms. In addition, questions on a demographic survey enabled control for differences in job title and function, as well as job and organizational tenure (see Appendix G).

One concern in selecting the sample was to utilize organizations for which at least a subset could be considered relatively woman-friendly. There is a body of scholarly and practitioner-oriented literature that makes this assertion for accounting firms (Connor, Hooks & McGuire, 1997; Flynn, Leeth & Levy, 1997; Hooks, 1996). However, this literature deals primarily with U.S. offices of the Big Six, and I made special attempts to gather information about the picture in Canada.

Frank (1994) attempted to survey 730 of the largest companies located in Canada about their policies related to women employees. Her criteria for woman-friendliness included "satisfied employees, numbers that showed women making good progress into senior management and non-traditional jobs, and policies and practices that help employees who are trying to combine work and busy personal lives" (Frank, 1994, p. 7). Based on these criteria, only one of the Big Six firms was included in her book. According to T. Frank (personal communication, July 3, 1997), all of the Big Six were initially contacted; the others either declined to answer the survey (her overall response rate was around 18%), or failed to meet one or more of the criteria.

In addition to Frank's findings, I contacted two researchers knowledgeable
about the culture of accounting firms in Canada (R. Burke, personal communication, July 1997; C. McKeen, personal communication, April 1996). Each named one Big Six firm (not the same firm) which he/she felt was in the vanguard of woman-friendly policies and practices. I therefore believed that it would be possible to find a reasonable amount of variation on woman-friendliness among the large public accounting firms.

Setting of the Study: the Organizational Structure and Culture of Public Accounting Firms

In order to put the findings of this study in perspective, it is helpful to have some understanding of the organizational structure and culture of public accounting firms as workplaces. In both the U.S. and Canada, they are usually partnership arrangements, meaning that those at the top are not employees, but owners. They are generally highly decentralized, with a group of partners in a given geographic location having a high degree of discretion over matters internal to that office. On the other hand, globalization and computerization (which tends to commoditize information) have favoured the strategy of amalgamation over the past few decades, resulting in the formation of the Big Six: the world's six largest accounting and management consulting firms, all based in the U.S. and with a substantial Canadian presence (Ministry of Industry, Science and Technology, 1991). Partnerships in the Big Six are overwhelmingly male: although all the firms have made what they consider strenuous efforts to bring more women into the higher echelons over recent years, in 1992 less
than 5% of senior partners in the U.S. Big Six offices were women (Hayes & Hollman, 1996). Comparable figures were not obtainable for Canada as a whole. However, in Ontario in 1993, 4% of all women CAs were in partnership positions, as opposed to around 19% of all male CAs (McKeen & Bujaki, 1994).

Career paths in public accounting, along with a pyramid structure where the number of employees decreases as one climbs the career ladder, virtually ensure that partners will be older than most of the firm's employees. A typical accounting graduate from a four-year university program will begin his/her career at around 22, and take several years to obtain the CA designation, which requires a combination of further coursework and on-the-job training. The hours are long and the workload, especially during the busy tax season, is often brutal -- characteristics that these firms share with other professional services environments (Burke, 1997).

Most accountants begin their work experience in the audit department, where they are assigned to teams that go out to client locations to perform the audits. After a few years, depending on performance and the firm's needs, the employee is likely to be promoted to senior accountant status, which means s/he will now be in charge of audits "in the field". Further promotions to manager and senior manager may follow in due course. It is unusual for an individual to "make partner" before the age of 30, and in times of economic downturn, when it is harder for firms to support growth at the partner level, the time spent at the managerial levels lengthens (Wescott & Seiler, 1986).
In the past, personnel policies in major accounting firms favoured an "up or out" approach, whereby someone who had been with the firm for a certain number of years as a senior manager was either invited into the partnership, or invited to leave. More recently, this policy has undergone some modification in response both to shortages of skilled personnel and to some employees' preference for a lower-profile role in exchange for more private time (Flynn, Leeth & Levy, 1997).

Accounting firms at present are facing the combined challenge of (1) shortages of qualified entry-level people, (2) a labour supply which is about 50% female and in its prime childbearing and childrearing years, and (3) a marketplace imperative which suggests that growth is key to survival and market dominance (Greenwood, Hinings, Cooper & Suddaby, 1997). The struggle on the part of individual employees to balance work and family responsibilities is reflected on the organizational side by firms' attempts to come to terms with the needs of dual-career employees without sacrificing a reputation for client service. This has resulted in the implementation of a number of family-friendly policies among the Big Six in the U.S., including flexible hours and part-time work arrangements (Hooks, 1996; Lawlor, 1995).

The next section describes the data sources and data collection methods.

Primary Data Sources

*Quantitative measures*

Organizational culture

Organizational culture was measured using the Organizational Culture Profile
(OCP). The OCP is an example of the Q-sort methodology (Block, 1978) originally
developed by Stephenson (1953) as a means of personality assessment. It consists of a
series of descriptors which are sorted into a fixed number of categories, with the
number of items to go into each category specified in advance. The instrument can be
used, among other purposes, to standardize observer evaluations (Block, 1978).

The OCP is a set of 54 value statements which organizational members sort, as
an individual exercise, into categories in the manner described above. The resulting
"profiles" can be compared, in the case of a single organization, to see whether there
is agreement on the organization's most characteristic values. Or a number of
organizations can be compared using aggregate profiles for each. For a complete list
of the value statements comprising the OCP, see Appendix E.

In a longitudinal study of U.S. public accounting firms, Chatman (1988) used
the OCP to generate a measure of person-organization fit for new employees, and the
measure was later examined for correlation with variables such as job satisfaction and
turnover (O'Reilly et al., 1991). The OCP showed high reliability (.88) and predictive
validity based on factor analysis (O'Reilly et al., 1991).

The factor analysis identified seven organizational dimensions: innovation,
stability, respect for people, outcome orientation, attention to detail, team orientation,
and aggressiveness. Despite the fact that all the organizations in the sample were
public accounting firms, which would presumably be fairly similar in their values,
between-firm correlations on the OCP measure "ranged from .29 to .85, suggesting
substantial variability in the extent to which any two firms had similar cultures" (O'Reilly et al., 1991, p. 496).

Gender-blindness and Woman-friendliness as Aspects of Organizational Culture

For reasons discussed above, certain items on the OCP (i.e., flexibility, adaptability, opportunities for professional growth, and working long hours) are considered indicators of to what degree the organizational culture is gender blind or woman-friendly. However, it should be stressed that these are by no means "objective" measures of organizational policies. Rather, they reflect the perceptions of organization members about how policies translate in the reality of their work lives.

There are reasons why I considered this approach to measuring woman-friendliness (and the converse, gender blindness) to be more legitimate than, for example, using an index of "family friendly" policies as some other researchers have done (Konrad & Mangel, 1998; Milliken, Martins & Morgan, 1998). Many researchers have discovered that formal policies related to alternative work arrangements, for example, are almost meaningless in the absence of supervisory support (Flack & Reskin, 1998; Powell & Mainiero, 1999). Hence, to ask respondents to provide their perceptions on organizational flexibility seemed likely to yield information that would be more relevant in relation to gender salience (since that is also a perceptual variable in the context of this research).
Decision-making style (DMS)

The Vroom-Yetton problem set was used to measure individuals' DMS. As discussed above in the literature review, the Vroom-Yetton model has given rise to a diagnostic instrument in the form of short cases that embody varying combinations of the problem attributes. A manager provided with a set of these cases (the "problem set") is asked to decide, with each case, which of the specified five decision modes s/he would adopt. Answers to a set of these cases (thirty cases were used to cover realistic combinations of problem attributes) yielded two scores for the individual manager: an "agreement with feasible set" score (i.e., what proportion of times the manager's answer fell within the feasible set specified by the model) and a "mean level of participation" (MLP) score, based on a scale that converts the choice of decision method to a number. (See Vroom & Yetton, 1973, p. 67 for a full explanation.)

In the present study, interest is focused on the MLP score, which has a potential range from 0 to 10, with 10 representing maximum preference for participation. In fact, however, the range of MLP scores which falls within the "feasible set" (answers which make sense given the scenarios laid out in the problem set) is between 4.17 and 9.2.

In previous research, the problem set has shown reasonable levels of reliability and validity. In particular, the MLP scores attained in a split-half reliability test of the problem set had a reliability coefficient of .81 (Vroom and Yetton, 1973; p. 130).
The instrument has also been extensively validated in both laboratory and field studies (for laboratory studies see Ettling & Jago, 1988; Field, 1982; Heilman, Hornstein, Cage & Hershchlag, 1984; for field studies, Margerison & Glube, 1979; Pate & Heiman, 1987; Paul & Ebadi, 1989). In addition, Vroom and Jago (1978) made use of a kind of laboratory/field hybrid experiment where they used recalled problems by real managers to test the model; this approach was also utilized by Field and House (1990). In general, studies that utilized Vroom and Yetton's approach without drastic modification validated the model.

The result of interest in the present research is the mean level of participation (MLP) score, which is obtained by converting responses to the cases in the problem set to numbers. (For a description of the mathematical basis of the conversion, see Vroom & Yetton, 1973, pp. 66-68). MLP scores have been averaged as appropriate to obtain a unit score for a particular firm, or by gender within each firm.

Demographic variables

A brief questionnaire provided information on the following demographic variables: gender, age, tenure with the organization, tenure on the job currently held, and job title (see Appendix G).

Qualitative measures

Gender salience

For the purposes of this study, gender salience is defined as the degree to which gender ascription is seen as an important part of an individual's identity in the
workplace. It is a perceptual variable, and as discussed in the review of relevant literature, there is reason to believe that the perceptions of women managers may differ from those of their male colleagues -- gender may be more salient to women because of their "out group" identification in the managerial role (Ely, 1994, 1995; Kanter, 1977).

As with organizational culture and decision-making, I initially hoped to find a pre-validated measure for gender salience. I searched reference literature (Beere, 1979, 1990; Miller, 1991; Robinson, Shaver & Wrightman, 1991) as well as databases and periodical indexes in an attempt to find such a measure, but without success. The closest approach in the literature to working with gender salience as a perceptual process variable seemed to be contained in Ely's (1989, 1995) work. Ely used semi-structured interviews to collect her data, and since I was planning to do the same, it seemed best to include interview questions that might capture gender salience within the organizational context.

Gender salience was measured using questions 3 and 4 from the interview data (see Appendix F). Question 3 asked respondents whether they believe that women in their organization are more participative than men. The a priori assumption was that a positive response to this question (aggregated across respondents for a particular organizational unit) would suggest relatively high gender salience.

Question 4 asked the respondent whether s/he felt that the organizational culture fit well with his/her personal style (not just DMS -- the question was phrased
as broadly as possible in order to maximize the chance of collecting relevant information). The assumption was that positive responses by women in an organizational unit suggest that role conflict (i.e., a sense that being a woman somehow contradicts aspects of the managerial role) is minimal. The inference is that if women feel that their personal styles are a good fit with the organization's culture, gender salience is probably relatively low within the unit (Ely, 1989).

Qualitative information on decision-making

The answers to question 3 supplemented (and in some cases seemed to contradict) information supplied by the MLP scores. The reason for this is that question 3 was asking for firm-specific experience about the difference, or absence of difference, between men's and women's DMS. The qualitative findings on DMS will be discussed in Chapter 4, below.

Qualitative information on organizational culture

The interviews began with a debriefing in which the interviewer summarized both the individual's Vroom-Yetton scores and (in general terms) the findings of the OCP for the interviewee's firm. This often led to further comments and discussion on the interviewee's perception of the organization's culture. In addition, question 4 on perceived fit between individual and organizational styles often elicited valuable comments that further fleshed out the findings of the OCP.
Data Collection

Linking Qualitative and Quantitative Data

There were several reasons for combining quantitative and qualitative methods of data collection. In terms of the initial purpose of the research -- to explain the observed phenomenon of the gender gap in participative behaviour -- it seemed to me that qualitative data would add fresh and helpful insights to the quantitative findings discussed earlier (Eagly & Johnson, 1990). On the other hand, a wholly qualitative research design ideally involves more than one researcher, and a more spacious time frame than I envisaged for myself (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Under the circumstances, I thought it was sensible to utilize quantitative measure of proven validity and usefulness for the variables when they existed (i.e., for organizational culture and decision-making).

In terms of how the data would be linked, my initial ideas had mainly to do with triangulation (Janesick, 1994), or what Rossman and Wilson (1985) term "corroboration". I hoped that the qualitative and quantitative findings would support each other in a way that provided a clearcut, and more richly detailed, picture of what was going on in the organizational context (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Thus, I collected both qualitative and quantitative information on organizational culture and decision-making style. Ultimately, the analysis of both types of data resulted in elaboration (a richer set of findings overall) and initiation (new and unexpected findings based on inconsistencies between what I observed and what I expected to
observe). The details of the data analysis are discussed in Chapter 5.

**The Population and the Sample**

The population for the study was accountants with some managerial responsibilities in public accounting firms located in south central Ontario. In fact, however, given the resource limitations of the researcher, it quickly became clear that it was feasible to include only a small number of accounting offices (six were hoped for; five eventually consented to take part). The initial pool of potential respondents from these five offices is shown in Table 1, which also makes it clear how the sample evolved via self-selection of respondents.

The sample for the purposes of quantitative data collection consisted of 54 individuals (twenty-eight men and twenty-six women) with some management responsibilities from offices of 5 accounting firms located in south central Ontario. Age in the sample ranged from 25 to 42, with a mean age in the low 30s for both men and women. Tenure in present job averaged 2.65 years; tenure in the firm averaged 6.25 years. While length of time as an accountant was not asked for, age could be used as a proxy variable: in general, respondents would take the Uniform Final Examination and fulfill the work requirements associated with becoming a CA in their mid-twenties.

Of the 54 individuals who completed the Vroom-Yetton instrument, 46 were interviewed. Three of the other 8 had left their firms by the time interviewing began, 2 were on leave, and the other 3 I was unable to schedule an interview with after
repeated attempts.

The sample size (in terms of number of individuals and number of firms) represented something of a tradeoff between the quantitative and qualitative elements of the study. On the one hand, 54 respondents across 5 firms is a relatively small sample for the purposes of quantitative research. However, increasing the sample size would have jeopardized my ability to collect in-depth qualitative information from respondents within the time constraints of the research. While I was not aiming at an ethnographic study, I hoped to be able to collect "rich data" (Maxwell, 1998) for each of the five firms studied, based on respondents' perceptions of the organizational culture. To some extent, then, breadth was sacrificed to depth in the research design.

Four of the five organizations in the sample were Big Six firms; the fifth was a large international firm which shares the characteristic organizational structure and culture discussed above.

The Data Collection Process

The research design called for the researcher to approach a gatekeeper (usually the partner in charge of human resource issues for the office being approached) to describe the study and ask whether the gatekeeper would be willing to allow employees to be informed about the research and requested to participate. Efforts were made to include both firms mentioned as woman-friendly by Canadian researchers, and also to include a smaller, non-Big Six firm: the intention was to add variation in terms of woman-friendliness. One of the woman-friendly firms consented
to join the sample; the other did not and the smaller firm likewise refused to participate.

In cases where the gatekeeper consented to allow access, the researcher obtained a list of potentially eligible employees. For the most part, these included managers and senior managers, but for the smaller offices some senior accountants were also included in order to increase the sample size. Potential respondents were initially sent a letter explaining the research and asking for their participation; this was followed up by a phone call. Table 1 shows how the final sample was arrived at; Table 2 shows the distribution by gender across the job titles represented in the sample.

Data collection took place in two phases: administration of the two standardized instruments (the Vroom-Yetton problem set and the OCP) was completed first, then individual interviews were set up in order to (a) debrief the participants about the nature and their scores on the Vroom-Yetton instrument, and (b) collect qualitative data designed to give a fuller picture of the organization's culture and the individual's sense of how his/her decision-making style might be influenced (or not) by it. There was some attrition between the two phases (see Table 1 for details).

---

2 Because the information about the eligible population of employees was supplied by gatekeepers, there was some inconsistency across the sample. In some cases, I was given titles as well as names, but not in others. It is safe to say, however, given the composition of these firms, that most of the names supplied were those of managers or senior managers.
Table 1. Sample Selection Process*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm</th>
<th>Initial Pool</th>
<th>Consented to take part</th>
<th>Completed VY/OCP</th>
<th>Completed Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14/13**</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11/11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9/9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12/11***</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8/8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>54/52</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In order to ascertain whether sample selection bias was present, it would have been helpful to have had more data on respondents. However, I was not allowed access to personnel files. Because of the organizational structure and culture of these firms, discussed earlier in the chapter, I had good reason to believe that the demographic characteristics (age, race, education and previous training and job experience) would be homogeneous between respondents and non-respondents.

*One individual misunderstood my instructions about the OCP, and his completed instrument was unusable.

**I sent copies of the quantitative measures to an employee who was seconded to a European office of his firm, but who wished to take part. He completed and returned the Vroom-Yetton measure, but lost the OCP. I did not think it worthwhile to send him a second copy. (I did interview him by telephone, however.)
In most cases, the Vroom-Yetton problem set and the OCP were administered during on-site visits by the researcher. In one firm (firm 2), the instruments were dropped off in envelopes addressed to individuals, who mailed the completed instruments back to the researcher. (This approach was also taken with sample members who could not meet with the researcher at the time of on-site visits.) The mail-back method was more time-consuming, as I had to make a number of phone calls in order to retrieve completed instruments, but it does not appear to have affected the responses themselves in any discernible way.

Data Analysis

Quantitative data

Statistical procedures (analysis of variance and t-tests) were used to analyze the quantitative results (i.e., from the Vroom-Yetton and OCP data). These methods will be discussed in the next section in connection with the findings obtained.

Qualitative data

In order to analyze the interview results, I employed coding procedures similar to those described by Strauss and Corbin (1990). Interviews and interview notes were transcribed and I read through them, noting recurrent themes and topics. I particularly noted comments on aspects of the organization’s culture, attitudes toward decision-making and participation, and comments about gender in the organizational context. As common themes began to emerge within and across organizations, I generated memos designed to capture questions and tentative ideas about what was going on. I
Table 2. Breakdown of Respondents by Gender and Job Title

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Title</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. Associate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The job title "principal" denotes a level between senior manager and partner. It is a relatively unusual title compared to the others listed. To the best of my knowledge, only firm 3 had principals in the office that was sampled.

**The "other" category contained such job titles as staff accountant (duties similar to a senior associate, but not yet fully qualified as a CA) and accounting supervisor (not a CA). They were included for two reasons: with firm 1, I was given their names by the gatekeeper and I invited them to participate without being aware of their non-CA status; with firm 5, I was trying to increase both sample size and female gender representation.
also created matrix displays (Miles & Huberman, 1994) which were useful for cross-site comparisons, and which provided the data for several of the tables included here.

Responses to Question 3 from the interviews (the question on whether the respondent perceived differences in participative management by gender in the workplace) were coded using a form shown in Figure 2, which I created after reading through all the interviews and getting an idea of categories of responses (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). I did the initial coding; then a subset of 20 interviews, randomly selected, received a reading from a second coder whom I trained. The second coder and I were in 100% agreement as far as the basic response was concerned (i.e., whether the respondent agreed or disagreed that women were more participative). In the initial round of second coding, coder 2 did not mark any of the interviews as containing counter-examples, probably because the initial instruction had not stressed this aspect of the material. After discussion of some instances of what I meant by counter-examples, the second coder marked a second batch of ten interviews. This time, she found eight instances of counter-examples where I found four. I believe that the difference between my coding and hers was that I was looking for specific instances of a person being less participative (female) or more participative (male) and the second coder, not understanding this, marked passages that discussed the question in abstract terms. If we had proceeded to a third round of marking, I am confident that the percent of agreement would have gone up substantially.

Since the responses to the interview questions did not seem to provide clearcut
Figure 2. Coding Scheme for Question 3: Gender Differences in Participative Management

Question 3: As I mentioned earlier, the "mean level of participation" scores on this instrument tend to be higher for women than for men, suggesting that women prefer a more participative decision-making style. Do you think that this generalization holds true for managers at [your firm]?

Name of Respondent:

Gender:

Responses (check all that apply):

1. Answer is clearcut:

   Yes (I agree that women managers in my firm are more partic.) _____
   No (I don't agree)_____
   Not sure (i.e., not enough evidence)_____

2. Answer contains elements of both yes and no_______

   Example of yes: (quote or paraphrase)
   Example of no: (quote or paraphrase)

3. Respondent cites counter-example(s):

   a. Male manager(s) more partic._____
   b. Female manager(s) less partic._____

4. Other factors (besides gender) responsible for difference:

   age_____
   org. level_____
   org. function_____
   other_____
evidence on woman-friendliness or gender blindness at the organizational level, the data were examined from a different angle. Rather than trying to impose structure through the questions, this approach looked for common themes within the responses (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). The interview material was coded utilizing the previously mentioned criteria\(^3\) for woman-friendliness: mentions of alternative work arrangements, promotion or "fast-tracking" of women employees, or general comments that reflected employee satisfaction with the workplace were coded positively; comments that suggested these were absent or negative were coded negatively.

A subset of sixteen interviews (comprising around 35% of the qualitative data) was read by a second coder. There were 111 instances where at least one coder marked a chunk of text as containing data on woman-friendliness (positive or negative); we agreed on 90 of these instances, for an inter-rater reliability of 81%. Miles & Huberman, describing a coding process with many iterations, and where all coders are involved in data collection, suggest that inter-rater reliability should exceed 90% "eventually" (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 64). However, given the research procedure followed here (the second coder was brought in after data collection was complete, and read only a portion of the material), an agreement level of over 80% can be considered reasonable (Ely, 1995).

---

\(^3\)See Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 68 for a discussion of coding that uses pre-established concepts from the literature.
Limitations of the Research Design and Data Collection Process

There were several constraints that created less than optimal conditions in terms of the research design and data collection. One difficulty was that the description of the study given to gatekeepers and potential respondents did not mention gender as an issue in the study. This was a deliberate choice, based on the suspicion that mentioning gender as a factor would (a) possibly limit access to sites, and (b) distort respondents' answers, particularly in the interview. Given the sensitivity displayed by some sample members to the question about gender differences in MLP, I believe that this was a sensible approach. (In addition, Dr. Zeytinoglu, who was my advisor throughout the research process, concurred based on her own experience doing research on gender issues.) However, the decision prevented me from asking certain questions, particularly in relation to demography, that if honestly answered would have enlarged my ability to test the role of demography in relation to gender salience.

Another limitation was the nature of the sample. Because this was a field study and I needed the full cooperation of respondents, everyone in the sample was self-selected. In fact, the firms could also be said to have selected themselves into the study. A related issue is that the sample size, both overall and within some of the firms, was relatively small, diminishing the likelihood of statistically significant findings. As discussed above, however, the small sample size was also a deliberate design choice given the importance of qualitative data to the research scheme as a whole.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

Findings on Participation

Findings based on the MLP scores

Table 3 summarizes the mean MLP scores for men and women within each of the five firms in the sample. For the sample as a whole (N = 54) the mean MLP\(^1\) was 4.98. Within each firm, as well as for the sample as a whole, the mean female MLP score was higher than the mean for males. Firm 3 had the highest mean MLP score (5.73). Firm 4 had the lowest mean overall, and the difference between male and female scores in Firm 4 was significant at p < .05, with a 95% confidence interval that does not include zero. For the sample as a whole, the mean difference between men and women was .77 (p < .05). Thus these finding mirrored those of Eagly and Johnson (1990) in suggesting that women managers are more consistently participative than their male counterparts.

Since one of the basic assumptions of the model is that gender salience is likely to influence MLP in some firms (those that are traditional and hence gender

---

\(^1\)The meaning of the MLP score was discussed above, in the description of the Vroom-Yetton model of decision-making. It is a measure of the individual's preference for including subordinates in decisions, across a range of situations (represented by the 30 cases in the problem sets). Vroom and Jago (1988) found an overall mean of 4.97 in a sample of 2631 U.S. managers. See Vroom & Jago, 1988, p. 96.
Table 3. MLP Scores for the Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm</th>
<th>Sample Mean (S.D.)</th>
<th>Women Mean (S.D.)</th>
<th>Men Mean (S.D.)</th>
<th>Gender Difference in Mean MLP</th>
<th>t-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (9F, 5M)</td>
<td>4.80 (0.80)</td>
<td>4.91 (0.76)</td>
<td>4.59 (0.94)</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (5F, 6M)</td>
<td>4.99 (0.92)</td>
<td>5.32 (1.23)</td>
<td>4.71 (0.54)</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>-1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (4F, 5M)</td>
<td>5.73 (1.52)</td>
<td>6.55 (1.12)</td>
<td>5.07 (1.56)</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>-1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (5F, 7M)</td>
<td>4.66 (1.29)</td>
<td>5.55 (0.64)</td>
<td>4.02 (1.28)</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>-2.44*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (3F, 5M)</td>
<td>4.93 (0.96)</td>
<td>5.04 (0.63)</td>
<td>4.87 (1.18)</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals (26F, 28M)</td>
<td>4.98 (1.12)</td>
<td>5.38 (1.00)</td>
<td>4.61 (1.12)</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>-2.66*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

blind) and not in others, it was of interest to determine whether the firms could be differentiated in terms of how strongly gender was related to MLP score.

Accordingly, I performed an ANOVA with MLP as the dependent variable, and "firm" and "sex" as the independent variables. The results are shown in Table 4.

While gender clearly played a role in determining MLP, the firm-by-gender interaction
Table 4. Analysis of Variance in MLP accounted for by FIRM and SEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Signif. of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRM</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>8.42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>.007*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm x Sex</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>.436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>19.85</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>46.86</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66.71</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .01

was not significant.

One possible explanation for differences by gender in MLP score is that women may be more likely to include subordinates in the decision process even when there is a possibility of conflict among them. (This possibility was discussed above under "Variables not included in the model -- Individual Characteristics"). In order to test this potential explanation, MLP scores were calculated for Firm 4 respondents without including cases that involved the "conflict rule" (i.e., the rule in Vroom-Yetton's model that deals with conflict between subordinates). The new mean values for the MLP scores were 3.63 (versus 4.02 for the full set of cases) for men and 5.04 (versus 5.54) for women. While it was clear that the gender differences between
scores lessened slightly by eliminating conflict cases, that difference was still signifi-
cant at p < .05. It seems fair to conclude that the conflict rule accounts for a minimal
part of the difference in MLP scores for men and women.

Participation in Context: Findings Based on the Interviews

The Vroom-Yetton measure, which gives rise to the MLP scores, does not
provide insight into how individuals feel about subordinate participation. However,
some of the discussion that took place in the open-ended interviews shed light on this
question. One factor that clearly influenced some respondents was the sense that
decision-making in accounting firms is time-bound and often deadline-bound:

[T]he level of urgency does have an effect on the way you handle things. Sometimes you take the attitude (it's not necessarily the best thing to do): This has to be done tomorrow; well, I'll just do it myself, because it's going to get done quicker and it'll get done right.

One man commented on how the image of the decisive leader/manager
prevalent in his firm influenced his decision-making style:

I wouldn't say it's this office, but [the firm] as a whole, I'm sure has [influenced how he makes decisions]. I think the [MLP] scores are a little lower, below average in terms of involvement [of subordinates]. And I think that's partly due to this notion I have that people value independent workers and people who just get the job done, so you can, whatever's the most expedi-
tious way to get a job out the door, do it.

There was also an implied belief that trying to achieve consensus is inefficient:
"You can't do completely consensus decision-making; you won't get anywhere", as one respondent phrased it.
Another attitude that came through in some of the interviews was that directive (i.e., non-participative) decision-making is equated with decisiveness, which is seen as a positive value in managerial terms. One woman said, when asked whether she saw women managers as more participative (question 3):

I would say that I think it would depend upon your level. I think somebody who's a senior [accountant] or who is within their first few years as manager, I could believe that just because seeing the way they react in management meetings -- they do not make a decision while they're in the room. But I think if you aspire to be more than that within the firm, they know that they would be more like their male counterparts. Or, in fact, even worse, because you do have -- I've heard one person say, "The only type of female I would make a partner is a ball-breaker", and you get that type of comment. So just through that, I think you see sometimes people will react even to the other extreme.

Another respondent phrased the same feeling in more general terms:

We always had this sense for the take-charge kind of guy, I guess is probably looked upon more favourably by society than the consultative type of person. So I imagine that's had an influence. I mean, I don't think about it; I don't try to be the guy on TV. But I'm sure at the back of my mind subconsciously, it's there. That people want to see the job get done, and you want to be the guy in charge to get the job done.

There was also some evidence of confusion about what participation actually involves, or what Heller (1998) terms "inauthentic participation": managers who believe, or hope subordinates believe, that they are fostering participation when in fact the decision is reserved by themselves. One man, asked whether women in his firm were more participative, responded:

Oh, yeah....not necessarily just here....You have a request, where someone says: I need this now. And more likely than not, that's a guy saying that. Whereas I notice other girls in this office who will say, would it be
possible that I could get this now?...In a sense, they're asking the same ques-
tion....It lets the subordinate have the idea, impression that they're having some
sort of input into the decision.

This, of course, is not the meaning of participation as measured by the Vroom-
Yetton instrument. Another misconception of the term that emerged was that sharing
information was a form of participation. One man described a female manager in his
firm as follows:

She'd take the time to talk to people about what she was planning on doing, so
that you sort of knew, whereas some of the guys were less likely, they were
more likely to just do it.

While it is certainly the case that this sort of information sharing is a necessary
prerequisite for effective group decision-making, that does not seem to be the process
this respondent was describing. In Vroom-Yetton terms, this would probably be an
A2 manager: consulting with subordinates individually, but making the decision on her
own.

To summarize the findings on participation, the results in terms of MLP scores
are similar to those of previous research. The qualitative findings extend and qualify
these data, suggesting that organizational context does in fact influence how people
think about participation as well as how decision styles are enacted. These points will
be expanded on in the Discussion chapter.

**Findings related to the Organizational Culture Profile (OCP) as a Whole**

Comparison of Profile Similarity with Chatman's Findings

As discussed above, the OCP has been used before as a diagnostic tool for
measuring the organizational culture of accounting firms. Chatman (1988) discovered that while accounting firms are generally considered rather homogeneous in terms of structure and function, there was substantial variation, in some cases, on the cultural dimension as measured by the OCP. The two firms whose cultures were most dissimilar had an overall correlation on the OCP of .29, and the mean across the seven correlations was .66 (Chatman, 1988, p. 128). Chatman's findings were encouraging to me, since formal tests of the model proposed in this research depend on a certain amount of variation in the organization's culture, and in particular on the "woman friendliness" of the organizations studied.

For each firm in the sample, the OCP was calculated by finding the mean of the values provided by all respondents for each of the 54 items in turn. (This was the method used by Chatman.) In order to compare profiles across firms, a Pearson product-moment correlation was performed for each pair of firms, a procedure suggested by Block (1978). In other words, I was determining the overall correlation of two firms on the 54 items. This was done for each pair of firms in turn. Compared to Chatman's, the correlations were all high (see Table 5). In fact, the weakest correlation (between firms 2 and 5) was .692, considerably higher than the .29 found by Chatman, and above the mean of her correlations as a whole.
Table 5. Correlations between Profiles for the Firms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This finding is not surprising given the history of accounting firms over the past ten years. For one thing, when Chatman conducted her research, there were eight "heavyweight" international firms (the Big Eight), but due to consolidation among these eight, there were only six while this research was being conducted\(^2\). Other things being equal, it seems reasonable that consolidation into a smaller number of firms would be accompanied by lower variation in organizational culture across the firms.

Another way to account for the convergence of cultural values in these firms between 1988 and 1997 is provided by the concept of interorganizational macrocultures (Abrahamson & Fombrun, 1994). A macroculture consists of a set of

\(^2\)Since completion of the research, a merger of Price Waterhouse and Coopers & Lybrand has reduced the Big Six to the Big Five.
organizations whose managers share crucial assumptions about the nature of their markets, strategic choices available to them, and how organizations of their type are ranked (Abrahamson & Fombrun, 1994). As a result of the shared world-view of upper level management, these organizations tend to pursue similar strategies and respond to similar perceived threats and opportunities. The increasing similarity of organizational culture among the Big Six could result from a dynamic where shared macrocultural values result in organizations pursuing very similar strategies, which in turn would reinforce the homogeneity of cultures across firms. Evidence that the Big Six imitate each other's strategic initiatives was abundant during the fall and winter of 1997-98, where a proposed merger between Price Waterhouse and Coopers & Lybrand sparked a set of initiatives designed to lead to a merger of KPMG and Ernst & Young. At the time, analysts declared that growth was imperative if the members of the Big Six were to keep their position of relative advantage (Heinzl, 1997). One commentator outlined the logic of the domino effect: "When [the Coopers/Price] merger was announced a month ago, industry insiders predicted that more deals would follow in a business in which the leading chief executive officers are friends who face many of the same pressures and who share similar approaches to the business" (Milner, 1997).
Values of Firms in the Sample

Figures 2 and 3 list the top and bottom scoring items from the OCP for each of the five firms in the present sample. (Note: the item is spelled out in detail for Firm 1; some items are abbreviated for the other firms since there is substantial correspondence of these items across the firms. For example, "having a good reputation" is abbreviated "good reputation". See Appendix E for the full list of OCP items.) Given the similarity in terms of items selected, it seems possible to create a profile of accounting firm organizational culture that would be reasonably accurate for all the firms in the sample. This point will be taken up and fleshed out in the Discussion chapter. It remains to be seen how much variation exists on particular items within the OCP that are expected to provide indications about woman-friendliness. The next sections deal with tests for hypotheses based on these items.
Figure 2. Comparison of Firms on Top 5 OCP Items

**Firm 1**

1. Having high expectations for performance
2. Having a good reputation
3. Being results oriented
4. Being team oriented
5. Being competitive

**Firm 2**

1. Being results oriented
2. High exp. for perf.
3. Paying attention to detail
4. An emphasis on quality
5. Working long hours

**Firm 3**

1. Results oriented
2. Good reputation
3. High exp. for perf.
4. Emphasis on quality
5. Achievement orient.

**Firm 4**

1. Long hours
2. High exp. for perf.
3. Opp. for prof. growth
4. Results oriented
5. Good reputation

**Firm 5**

1. Long hours
2. Being demanding
3. Results oriented
4. Analytical
5. Emphasis on quality
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm 1</th>
<th>Firm 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Having a clear guiding philosophy</td>
<td>1. Informality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Single culture organization-wide</td>
<td>2. Not constrained by many rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Not constrained by many rules</td>
<td>3. Being distinctive - different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Offers praise for good performance</td>
<td>from others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. High pay for good performance</td>
<td>4. Being reflective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Confronting conflict directly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm 3</th>
<th>Firm 4</th>
<th>Firm 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Reflective</td>
<td>2. Quick to take advantage of opp.</td>
<td>2. Low level of conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conflict directly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The items are listed starting with the fifth from the bottom; i.e., the fifth item listed is the least characteristic of the firm according to respondents.*
Findings Related to the Hypotheses

H1: Organizational units with high scores on the "respect for people" factor of the OCP will have a higher mean MLP score than other units.

As discussed above (p. 40), Chatman performed factor analysis on her OCP data, and one of the factors that emerged was termed "respect for people" (RFP -- O'Reilly et al., 1991). The three items from the OCP that loaded most heavily on "respect for people were "fairness", "respect for individual's right", and "tolerance". To create the composite variable in this study, I summed the scores on these items for each individual respondent, then averaged the responses for each firm. A reliability analysis (Schmitt & Klimoski, 1991) for this composite showed an alpha value of .597. Although this is somewhat below conventionally desirable values, it does show a degree of internal consistency.

Table 6 shows the means on RFP by firm. They range from a low of 13.38 (Firm 5) to a high of 15.18 (Firm 4). Given that RFP is a composite variable, and that the three items composing it could each have a value from 1 to 9, it is clear that all the means are close together in the middle of the possible range.
Table 6. Mean values for firms on "Respect for People" (RFP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm</th>
<th>Mean (S.D.)</th>
<th>Firm</th>
<th>Mean (S.D.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sample</td>
<td>14.32 (3.02)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.00 (2.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.00 (2.89)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.18 (3.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.64 (2.80)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.38 (3.81)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to test for significant differences between the firms on RFP scores, an ANOVA was performed (see Table 7). The probability value was .575 (non-significant).

Table 7. One-way ANOVA for "Respect for People"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27.39</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>440.06</td>
<td>9.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>467.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Since the within-firm numbers were small, I also performed a t-test with 4 of
the 5 firms, grouping together the two whose scores were lowest (firms 2 and 5) and
those whose scores were highest (1 and 4) and omitting Firm 3, which was closest to
the mean. Results of the t-test appear in Table 8; they were non-significant. As
result, the first hypothesis could not be tested given the lack of significant variation on
RFP in the firms within the sample.

Table 8. t-test for Differences in MLP with "Respect for People" (RFP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number of cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>2-tailed significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RFP (low)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13.53</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(high)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15.08</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H2: Organizational units with high scores on the "teamwork orientation" factor
of the OCP will have a higher mean MLP score.

The teamwork orientation factor in Chatman's research loaded most heavily on
the OCP items "being team oriented", "being people oriented", and "working in
collaboration with others". As with the composite RFP, I formed the teamwork
orientation variable (abbreviated TM) by adding responses on these items for each
individual, then finding the mean response by firm.

Table 9. Mean values for firms on "Teamwork Orientation" (TM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm</th>
<th>Mean (S.D.)</th>
<th>Firm</th>
<th>Mean (S.D.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>18.04 (3.59)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.00 (4.95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.00 (4.08)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.64 (2.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>17.18 (2.48)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.88 (3.31)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The firms that scored highest on variable TM were the same as for RFP: Firms 1 (mean = 19) and 4 (mean = 18.64), while Firms 2 and 5 scored lowest on this factor (see Table 9). As with the previous hypothesis, an ANOVA and t-test were performed in order to determine whether there was enough variation on this independent variable to test the hypotheses. The ANOVA was non-significant (see Table 10).
Table 10. One-way ANOVA for "Teamwork Orientation"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34.87</td>
<td>8.72</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>621.06</td>
<td>13.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>655.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The division of firms for the t-test was the same as for RFP: Firms 1 and 4 were the "High score" group; 2 and 5 the "Low score" (see Table 11). The p-value for the t-test was .079. Given the small numbers in the sample, this could be considered a marginally significant result. However, it did not seem strong enough to justify attempting to test the second hypothesis. To sum up, the relationships represented by arrows (a) and (b) in the model could not be tested due to the lack of significant variation in the independent variables (RFP and TM).

Table 11. t-test for differences in MLP with "Teamwork Orientation" (TM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>No. of cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>2-tailed significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TM (low)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17.05</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(high)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18.83</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The next set of hypotheses deals with the relationship between organizational culture and decision-making style within the two types of organization posited in the model — gender blind and woman-friendly. H3 through H6 describe what is expected to be the relationship between a gender blind organizational culture and decision-making (gender is salient and hence there is a gender gap in MLP), while H7 through H10 are related to a woman-friendly organization (gender is less salient and men's and women's MLPs are expected to be similar). However, in the discussion that follows, the hypotheses will be discussed in relation to the organizational culture variable being examined. They are thus paired as follows: H3 and H7 (organizational culture variable: flexibility), H4 and H8 (adaptability), H5 and H9 (working long hours), H6 and H10 (opportunities for professional growth).

**H3:** In organizations with low scores on "flexibility", MLP scores will be higher for women than for men.

**H7:** In organizations with high scores on "flexibility", MLP scores will not differ for men and women.

Table 12 shows the mean scores on flexibility for the firms in the sample. As a single item in the Organizational Culture Profile, flexibility could potentially have a score range between 1 and 9. Clearly the results here are clustered around the mean.

---

3The same is true for the items discussed in the next three sets of hypotheses: H4 and H8, H5 and H9, and H6 and H10.
Table 12. Mean values for firms on "Flexibility"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm</th>
<th>Mean (S.D.)</th>
<th>Firm</th>
<th>Mean (S.D.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>5.35 (1.90)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.33 (1.66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.62 (1.66)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.55 (1.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.55 (2.07)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.75 (2.38)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As with the previous hypotheses, the first concern was to establish that enough variability existed on the independent variable (flexibility) to allow for meaningful hypothesis testing. Therefore, I performed a one-way ANOVA with the independent variable (see Table 13). The differences in means on flexibility by firm were not significant.

Table 13. One-way ANOVA for "Flexibility"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.74</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>174.03</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>183.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although the ANOVA was not encouraging, given the small sample sizes within the firms it seemed worthwhile to group firms on the independent variable and perform a t-test. Two firms (Firms 2 and 3) were below the mean value on flexibility, but Firm 3 was almost at the mean. However, in order to obtain two groups not too different in size for a t-test, the firms below the mean were grouped as "Low score" ($N = 20$) and the rest as "High score" ($N = 32$). The t-test, however, was not significant (see Table 14). As a result of these preliminary tests, it was evident that hypotheses 3 and 7 were not testable with the present sample.

Table 14. t-test for Differences in MLP with "Flexibility"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number of cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>2-tailed significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility (low)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(high)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H4: In organizations with low scores on "adaptability", MLP scores will be higher for women than for men.

H8: In organizations with high scores on "adaptability", MLP scores will not differ for men and women.

Means for adaptability are shown in Table 15. Only Firm 5 was above the mean on this item.
Table 15. Mean values for firms on "Adaptability"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm</th>
<th>Mean (S.D.)</th>
<th>Firm</th>
<th>Mean (S.D.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>5.19 (1.37)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.11 (0.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.15 (1.57)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.09 (1.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.18 (1.17)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.50 (1.51)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, a one-way ANOVA was performed with the mean firm values on adaptability; results were not significant (see Table 16).

Table 16. One-way ANOVA for "Adaptability"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>95.13</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>96.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because the distribution of the means was somewhat peculiar (only Firm 5 could be considered a high scorer; i.e., above the overall mean), there was some question about how to appropriately divide the firms for a t-test. Ultimately two t-
tests were performed. The first used only Firm 5 as the "High score" group, and 
 omitted Firm 2, which was closest to the mean (see Table 17). The p-value for the 
t-test was .535 (non-significant).

Table 17. t-test for Differences in MLP with "Adaptability" (firm 2 omitted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number of cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>2-tailed signif.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adapt. (low)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(high)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second t-test using "adaptability" included all 5 firms, with firms 1, 3 and 
4 as the "low score" group and firms 2 and 5 as the "high score" group (see Table 
18). The p-value was .618 (non-significant). Given the lack of variability in 
adaptability, it was not possible to test hypotheses 4 and 8.

Table 18. t-test for Differences in MLP with "Adaptability" (all firms included)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number of cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>2-tailed signif.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adapt. (low)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(high)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**H5:** In organizations with high scores on "working long hours", women's MLP scores will be higher than men's.

**H9:** In organizations with low scores on "working long hours", MLP scores will not differ for men and women.

Mean scores on this item are provided in Table 19. Means here are obviously higher than for flexibility and adaptability, suggesting that all the firms place an emphasis on long hours as a value.

Table 19. Mean values for Firms on "Working Long Hours" (WLH)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm</th>
<th>Mean (S.D.)</th>
<th>Firm</th>
<th>Mean (S.D.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>6.90 (1.52)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.22 (1.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.69 (1.75)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.64 (1.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.73 (1.27)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.25 (1.67)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Firms 4 and 5 had the two highest scores on working long hours, and were the two firms for which that item on the OCP ranked first among the firm's values. A t-test grouping firms above and below the mean showed significance at the .05 level (see Table 21).
Table 21. t-test for Differences in MLP with WLH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number of cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>2-tailed signif.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WLH (low)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.038*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(high)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.47</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

The t-test result suggested that it was in fact reasonable to assume that the two groups of firms were different on the dimension of working long hours. The next question was whether this difference could be related to a difference, along gender lines, in MLP scores. In order to try and ascertain whether there was an interaction of firm (grouped by WLH) and gender, a further ANOVA was performed with MLP as the dependent variable. Table 22 shows the result. The firm-by-sex interaction was of interest here, rather than either variable by itself, and the interaction was non-significant. It appears that the aspect of firm culture captured by the WLH variable does not interact with sex to affect MLP.
### Table 22. ANOVA for Difference in MLP Scores with Firms Grouped by WLH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Signif. of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main effects FIRM</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm x Sex</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>9.16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>57.56</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66.71</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

**H6:** In organizations where men see the organization as placing a higher value on "opportunities for professional growth" than do women, women's MLP scores will be higher than men's.

**H10:** In organizations where men and women see equal opportunities for professional growth, MLP scores will not differ for men and women.

Table 23 shows the results, by gender within firms, for this item. In firms 1, 2 and 5, men saw higher opportunities for professional growth than did women. There were no firms where men and women saw equal opportunities, but in two firms (firms 3 and 4), women saw higher opportunities for professional growth than did men. This
finding was unexpected, and suggested the possibility of an even stronger test for H10: a firm in which women saw higher opportunities for professional growth than their male counterparts would presumably be a good candidate for woman-friendliness as an organizational attribute.

Table 23. Mean values for firms, by gender, on "Opportunities for Professional Growth" (OPG)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample (26F, 26M)</td>
<td>6.42 (1.94)</td>
<td>6.65 (1.35)</td>
<td>3 (4F, 5M)</td>
<td>6.75 (1.50)</td>
<td>6.40 (1.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (9F, 4M)</td>
<td>5.89 (1.83)</td>
<td>7.00 (2.15)</td>
<td>4 (5F, 6M)</td>
<td>7.40 (1.34)</td>
<td>6.83 (1.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (5F, 6M)</td>
<td>6.40 (2.19)</td>
<td>6.50 (1.52)</td>
<td>5 (3F, 5M)</td>
<td>6.00 (3.61)</td>
<td>6.60 (0.89)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This set of hypotheses required somewhat different testing procedures than the preceding ones, because what was of interest was the difference by gender in values of the independent variable ("opportunities for professional growth"). A one-way ANOVA would not be able to capture the relationships of interest here among firm, gender, and the independent variable "opportunities for professional growth" (OPG). Therefore, the firms were partitioned into two groups: the "high opportunities for professional growth/female" group (abbreviated "HiOPG/F") was firms 3 and 4, and
the other firms were combined into a "high opportunities for professional
growth/male" group ("HiOPG/M"). Then an ANOVA with MLP as the dependent
variable and "sex" and "firm" as the factors was performed. The firm-by-sex interaction
was significant at p < .05 and explained 6.85% of the variance in MLP scores
(see Table 24).

Table 24. ANOVA for Differences in MLP Scores with Firms Grouped by OPG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Signif. of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRM</td>
<td>11.79</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>.247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.02</td>
<td>10.38</td>
<td>.002**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm x Sex</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>13.64</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>53.07</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66.71</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05        **p < .01

Given the ANOVA results, a 2x2 table was constructed showing the MLP
mean scores partitioned by firms (grouped as described above) and sex.
Table 25. 2x2 Table Showing MLP Scores by Gender in HiOPG/F and HiOPG/M Firms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firms</th>
<th>Mean MLP Score Males</th>
<th>Mean MLP Score Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HiOPG/M</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>5.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HiOPG/F</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>5.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When t-tests were performed, it appeared that the mean MLP score for women in the HiOPG/F group of firms was significantly higher than both the male score for this group and the female score for the "low opportunities" group. (See Table 26).

Table 26. t-test for Differences in MLP Scores by Gender in HiOPG/F Firms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number of cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>2-tailed signif.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex (Male)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.009**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Female)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01

However, male and female scores in the HiOPG/M group of firms were not significantly different (see Table 27).
Table 27. t-test for Differences in MLP Scores by Gender in HiOPG/M Firms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number of cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>2-tailed signif.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex (Male)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Female)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This finding contradicts the prediction made by the model: that more woman-friendly firms (those where women would perceive higher opportunities for professional growth) would be lower in gender salience, and hence male and female MLP scores would be more alike than in the more traditional firms. This anomaly will be addressed in the discussion section.

**H11: Respondents from gender blind firms are more likely than those from woman-friendly firms to see gender differences in participation in the workplace.**

As discussed in Chapter 3, the test for this hypothesis depended on a clear picture emerging from the independent organizational culture variables already discussed (flexibility, adaptability, working long hours, and opportunities for professional growth). In fact, however, the picture that emerged from the data was far from clear, as the preceding discussion has shown. Therefore, hypotheses 11 and 12 were not tested; but the responses to the interview questions that were designed to measure gender salience were examined to see whether they had in fact functioned as
they were intended to do.

Question 3 was one of the two questions in the interview designed to measure gender salience. On examination of the responses (see Table 28), no clear pattern emerged. In every case except with Firm 5, where the numbers were equal, more respondents disagreed than agreed with the generalization that women in their firm were more participative, and there were no obvious differences based on gender. Many individuals cited counter-examples (either a male who was more participative than the norm, or a female manager who was less so) in support of their denial of gender-based difference. While the numbers are small, it seems worth noting that Firm 4 had the highest percentage of respondents who believed that women in their firm were more participative (36%; proportions of "yes" responses for the other firms ranged between 16% and 28%).

H12: In woman-friendly firms, women are more likely to say that their personal style fits well with the culture of their organization than women in gender blind firms.

Like the preceding hypothesis, H12 could not be formally tested given the contradictory results of the data on the independent organizational culture variables.
Table 28. Opinions on Gender Difference in MLP

Question 3: As I mentioned earlier, the "mean level of participation" scores on this instrument tend to be higher for women than for men, suggesting that women prefer a more participative decision-making style. Do you think that this generalization holds true for managers at [your firm]?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers:</th>
<th>Firm 1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Answer is clearcut:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Not sure</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Answer contains elements of both yes and no</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Respondent cites counter-example</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other factors (besides gender) responsible for difference:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. age</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. org. level</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. org. function</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However, the data were examined to determine whether they provided insights related to gender salience. Most of the responses seemed to have little or nothing to do with perceptions of gender in the workplace. The one exception was a woman in Firm 4 who linked her sense of lack of fit to the presence of an "old boys' network" and gave as an example the fact that she had been bumped from a leadership role on an audit because the client had requested a man in that role, and the firm had complied.

However, although the "fit" question did not generally yield data on gender salience, it did provide a good deal of evidence on the woman-friendliness or otherwise of the firm. In a number of cases, responses to this question had to do with the time demands of work, and the dilemmas involved in balancing work with time for family concerns. These responses have been discussed in detail elsewhere (Romaine and Zeytinoglu, 1998; in press) and will be drawn upon when appropriate in the next section of this chapter.

**Summary: Results of Hypothesis Testing**

The results of the hypothesis testing could be summarized as inconclusive. Even when firms were combined, the numbers for t-tests remained small. Lack of variation in many of the independent variables (respect for people, teamwork, flexibility, and adaptability) precluded testing the hypotheses based on these items.

The variable "working long hours" seemed to differentiate two groups of firms, but the grouping did not show statistical significance in relation to MLP scores. "Opportunities for professional growth" was the only variable for which results
suggested that firm and gender, taken together, could help to predict differences in MLP score, but the direction of the effect was the opposite of what had been hypothesized.

Although the quantitative data, taken singly, do not seem to provide conclusive evidence for the hypothesized relationships, they can be linked in certain respects with the findings from the interview data to provide greater insight. Before discussing the linkages, however, it is necessary to describe in greater detail how the qualitative data were analyzed. This is the topic of the next section.

**Identifying Woman-friendliness: the Interview Data**

As discussed above in the Data Analysis section, responses to the interview questions were coded using three criteria for woman-friendliness: employee satisfaction (ES), alternative work arrangements (AWA), and promotion of women into upper level management positions (PROM). Negative mentions of these organizational attributes (i.e., employee dissatisfaction, problems with or non-availability of AWAs, and low levels of promotion for women) were also coded as "neg ES", "neg AWA", and "neg PROM". The question of interest here is whether differences by firm emerged from this set of codes. Table 29 provides an overview of the responses, totalled by firm. There is also a weighted total, arrived at by dividing the total number of mentions by the number of respondents for the firm in question.

**Employee Satisfaction (ES)**

"Employee satisfaction" is the item that received the greatest number of
mentions (both positive and negative). Looking at the ratio of positive to negative mentions for individual firms, it seems that employees in Firm 2 were the most satisfied while those in Firm 5 were least satisfied. However, it was clear from the nature of the comments that employee satisfaction was not necessarily closely related to woman friendliness. For example, in Firm 5 sources of dissatisfaction included the long hours (8 mentions), but also communication problems (10 mentions), conflict among the partners (4 mentions), and inadequate attention to policies and procedures (11 mentions). While long hours are considered a negative indication of woman friendliness, they were the source of only 25% of the complaints in Firm 5. The other sources of dissatisfaction did not appear to be linked to gender.

Similarly, in Firm 2 the mentions of employee satisfaction had to do with factors such as the leadership style of partners and relationships with coworkers. Partners were mentioned as approachable (6 comments) and as allowing substantial autonomy to subordinates in decision making (4 comments) while the social aspect of the firm and getting along with coworkers received 7 mentions. Communication was also a positive factor in this firm (3 mentions). There were also a number of comments, not so specifically classifiable, that had to do with a feeling of comfort with the work and the firm atmosphere. In short, the firm-specific sources of employee satisfaction were in some ways a mirror image of what caused substantial employee dissatisfaction at firm 5. They were also evenly distributed by gender: of 33 comments on employee satisfaction, 17 came from women.
Table 29. Qualitative data on woman-friendliness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Firm 1</th>
<th>Firm 2</th>
<th>Firm 3</th>
<th>Firm 4</th>
<th>Firm 5</th>
<th>N for Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AWA total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wtd. totl.</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wtd. total</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROM total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wtd. total</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NegAWA total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wtd. total</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NegES total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wtd. total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NegPROM total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wtd. total</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Promotion (PROM) and Alternative Work Arrangements (AWA)

The other two items ("alternative work arrangements" -- rather broadly interpreted to include policies and practices that contributed to employees' ability to flexibly schedule their time commitments) and "promotion" (specifically, promotion of women to high-level positions) seemed more likely than "employee satisfaction" to yield information on whether woman friendliness within the firm was high or low.
Promotion

Only Firms 1 and 4 had positive mentions of "promotion". One manager in Firm 1 and three in Firm 4 mentioned either relatively large numbers of women or women with part-time status who had been promoted. The Firm 1 manager said:

We had a partner in [a different office of Firm 1] who went full-time when she made partner, but was part-time before that....I think it was considered a little bit unusual at the time. But I'm not sure she was a superstar, either. She probably was surrounded by progressive thinkers that wanted her to get there.

Firm 3 had the highest number of negative mentions of promotion. For example, one woman said:

They had some statistics as a result of ...employer effectiveness surveys....The results hadn't improved as much as [the partners] thought they would have, with respect to the number of female partners.

And only in Firm 4 were there no negative mentions (i.e., comments on an absence or scarcity of women at the top levels of the organization).

Alternative work arrangements

Alternative work arrangements can include working part-time, flexible scheduling, and other arrangements (such as jobsharing) that are designed to allow more leeway for employees attempting to balance work and family life (Parasuraman & Greenhaus, 1997). For the purposes of the research described here, I have assumed that the presence of such arrangements in the firm is not by itself enough to send a signal of woman-friendliness; employees must feel that it is possible to take advantage of these arrangements without career detriment (Flack & Reskin, 1998). To tie this
assumption into the model: comments by employees from a given firm suggesting that alternative work arrangements are in place and being used without difficulty would suggest an organizational culture that (in this instance, at least) is signalling a higher level of woman-friendliness. In turn, the expectation is that gender salience would be lower for women in this organization.

In every firm, there were mentions of flexible scheduling, including doing work at home, taking time when needed for childcare responsibilities, and so on. And in every firm there were mentions of policies or practices, such as partners coming in and "taking attendance" on Saturdays, that seemed to militate against one's ability to work at home or to experience autonomy in scheduling work. If we look only at the ratio per firm of positive to negative mentions of "AWAs", it appears that Firm 3 is the most flexible and Firm 4 the least.

Firm 4 respondents made the greatest number of mentions of alternative work arrangements (21 in total) but what is especially striking is the large number of negative mentions of AWAs (9 versus 4 or 2 for all the other firms). Given that Firm 4 had the most explicit formal policy in place governing part-time arrangements, this seems at first like an odd result. However, the comments themselves yield some clues to what is going on. For one thing, those involved in part-time work were acutely aware that the time commitment was still, often, excessive. A woman who was herself on a three-fifths time arrangement commented:

It's hard to go 60%. I think Jane tried to go sixty; before she was
pregnant, she was sick....At that time, I think even though she was 60%, she was still working around 90%....But at least she wasn't working at 150%.

Another woman (full-time) made two negative observations concerning the part-time work arrangement of one of the partners: first, that she was only nominally part-time because of her accessibility at home to FAX, email, and phone communications from the office; and second, that it was nonetheless inconvenient for subordinates that the partner was not physically present when decisions needed to be made.

Summary

The preceding chapter described the findings of the study in terms of specific variables within the model: participation, organizational culture, and woman-friendliness. In terms of the quantitative results, the only significant findings (on the variables "working long hours" and "opportunities for professional growth") seem to directly contradict the model, suggesting that gender salience either has no effect or actually is heightened in connection with woman-friendly firm characteristics. The qualitative data paint a more complex picture, suggesting that organizational culture may not be uni-dimensional, and that firms which are woman-friendly on some measures are traditional (gender blind) on others.

The next chapter discusses these findings and integrates them into a modified version of the model, incorporating the same variables but explaining their relationship in a way that is more congruent with the results outlined above.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

The Meaning of Participation in Organizational Context

One of the more intriguing findings of the study was the discrepancy between the MLP scores, which consistently showed women as more participative, and the interview responses that suggested most respondents saw no overall difference between male and female decision-making (see Table 28). Some possible reasons for these discrepant findings are:

1. Women in the sample (i.e., at mid-management levels) were more participative than their male counterparts, but more senior women and men (e.g., partners) would not have showed the same "gender gap" in MLP if they had been sampled.

2. There may be an element of social desirability in the responses to the Vroom-Yetton instrument. For example, women may feel constrained to answer in a way that suggests they are more participative than they are. Conversely, men may feel that they should portray themselves as decisive, leading to artificially low MLP scores.

3. Because of gender stereotyping, directive behaviour by women managers may stand out more than when men exhibit that style.

The first possibility is supported to some extent by interview comments such as the one by the woman who said that in order to become a partner, a woman had to
exhibit male-stereotyped decisiveness (see p. 57). A man from the same firm commented:

[The gender difference in decision style] appears with junior staff....In my opinion, the males are more apt to come to conclusions on their own and the women actually will seek advice quicker than a male would.

In all, however, only four respondents named the "organization level" as a possible factor in the gender gap (see Table 28).

Evidence for a social desirability factor in the Vroom-Yetton scores is minimal in this study, although it is worth noting that Vroom and Jago found discrepancies between what managers said they did (as measured by the Vroom-Yetton problem set) and what subordinates said they did: subordinates saw the managers as more directive than managers' own MLP scores indicated (Vroom & Jago, 1988, p. 93-94). In terms of the present study, however, the implication is that there would be a gender difference in the social desirability factor. The stereotype of a manager as a decisive person has already been discussed in the Results chapter. This stereotype was mentioned by five male and two female respondents (across three firms), but it may have had more power over the men because of the societal pressures in the same direction. It may be worth repeating the quotation from one male manager:

We always had this sense for the take-charge kind of guy, I guess is probably looked upon more favourably by society than the consultative type of person. So I imagine that's had an influence. I mean, I don't think about it; I don't try to be the guy on TV. But I'm sure at the back of my mind subconsciously, it's there. That people want to see the job get done, and you want to be the guy in charge to get the job done.
Lastly, how strong is the possibility that women at all levels are in fact more participative, but that when they act decisively, that counter-stereotypical behaviour stands out disproportionately? Indirect evidence on this point comes from the counter-examples cited by respondents when asked if they saw women as more participative. There were six mentions of men who were more participative than women; nine mentions of women who were more directive than men. Often the respondent seemed to have one particular woman manager in mind:

[I]n my department there's two other managers, one male, one female. Specifically I think of those two, and she is definitely more of a[n] individual decision, and he tends to be a "let's talk about it" type person.

Other respondents agreed there was a gender difference, but cited directive females as exceptions to the rule:

I think women are probably more, they empathize a lot more....[T]hen again, you see a couple of odd examples that are totally out of character. It's hard to say, but I would say in general I would expect...women [to] have a higher [MLP] score. That doesn't surprise me.

To sum up, then, there seems to be some evidence in favour of each of the possible explanations given above. What does not seem to be supported in most of the interview answers is the view that there is an innate, gender-based difference in decision styles: most respondents seemed to believe that personality was both independent of gender, and that it played a stronger role than gender in determining DMS.
Organizational culture

As discussed above in the Results chapter, the profiles for the five firms in the sample were similar in many respects. For example, all five included "having high expectations for performance", "having a good reputation", "being results oriented", and "opportunities for professional growth" among the top ten values as rated by the respondents. "Working long hours" and "working in collaboration with others" were among the top ten for four of the five. Least valued were "confronting conflict directly" (mentioned by all five), "risk taking", "having a clear guiding philosophy", and "single culture organization-wide" (mentioned by four of the five). The composite portrait for these organizations is that they are elite, demanding, somewhat impersonal (only one firm mentioned "developing friends at work" as one of the top values), decentralized in terms of power arrangements (deduced from the lack of a clear guiding philosophy and absence of a unitary culture throughout the organization), valuing collaboration but otherwise not much concerned with the soft, people-oriented side of things. While these values may not directly contradict a woman-friendly orientation, the overall feeling of the accounting firm environment is undoubtedly agentic rather than communal. As some of the preceding quotes from respondents have indicated, the primary concern is with getting things done, rather than with paying attention to the feelings of those doing the work -- a concern that embodies stereotypically masculine values (Harlow & Hearn, 1995). One respondent, discussing the differences between non-profit organizations that he was concerned with and his
work environment, said:

[W]e're in a business where time is money, and I can cut to the heart of the matter and see where the thing's going and make the decision and move on, and get out of the meeting. Whereas people [in an environment of participative decision-making] have to banter it around for five hours or ten meetings and they come to a similar conclusion at the end. That frustrates me.

The question of how employees see woman-friendly initiatives in such an environment is clearly important, and is discussed in the next section.

**Woman-friendliness**

The model proposed earlier in this study outlines the expected relationships among organizational culture, gender salience, and the gender gap in MLP scores. To review briefly, the expectation was that a woman-friendly organization would lead to lessened gender salience for female managers, and the gender gap in MLP scores would decrease as a result.

Based on the interviews, it would be difficult to state unequivocally that any firm in the sample met the criteria for woman-friendliness to a much greater extent than the others. However, in terms of formal policies, Firm 4 seemed to be the least gender blind: one woman partner in the office sampled was part-time, and the firm had gone so far as to advertise for part-time CAs, a step that none of the others had taken at the time of data collection. As mentioned in the Results chapter, however, Firm 4 respondents made the greatest number of negative as well as positive comments on AWAs.

There are at least two plausible explanations for the attitude of respondents in
Firm 4 to AWAs. One is that having more experience with them day to day, they were in a better position to observe the disadvantages: the fact that part-time work often turned into a full-time commitment, and that communication was made more difficult for those officially full-time by the part-time status of their managers. Another possibility is that the family-friendly initiatives in this firm had caused a "revolution of rising expectations" (Davies, 1962).

The theoretical basis for this assumption comes from historical evidence suggesting that revolutions occur "when a prolonged period of objective economic and social development is followed by a short period of sharp reversal" (Davies, 1962, p. 6). The argument is that individuals in this situation have begun to expect that certain needs will be met, and then a threat arises to the satisfaction of those needs. From a psychological perspective, this is in some ways more disconcerting than a continued state of deprivation (Berkowitz, 1969). One mother, employed full-time by Firm 4, had this to say about the firm's woman-friendly policies:

I don't know whether we mentioned to you that we have, we had an initiative, I think it started two years ago, balancing your workload. Because they feel that a lot of female managers, they will leave, they will quit at a certain level. And because, it's the commitment; it's the family -- so now they want to recognize that yes, you have a life, too. So maybe between 1990 and 1997, or 1997 and 2000 whatever, your family life is more important, and you want to contribute less. So they allow you this flexibility. Although, I mean not everybody buys into it, but at least it's the firm's initiative. And I think quite a few people took advantage of it, saying, I want to make it work, and let me prove it to you that it's going to work.

This set of remarks was echoed by three other women at Firm 4, two of whom
were themselves part-time. It captures some of the ambiguity that Firm 4 employees seemed to feel about the changes that were occurring. On the one hand, "they want to recognize" employee needs to balance work and family responsibilities, "although not everybody buys into it". This woman also pointed out that the male office managing partner was something of a workaholic, and might well be serving as a role model for ambitious young managers.

Despite these caveats, Firm 4 did seem to be farther along on the road to woman-friendliness than the others in the sample. While a Firm 1 employee was aware of a woman who had been part-time before becoming a partner, in Firm 4 there was a woman partner in part-time status. (As far as I could discover, she was the only partner in any of the firms in my sample who were currently taking advantage of an alternative work arrangement.)

However, if Firm 4 is the most woman-friendly firm in fact as well as in terms of its espoused philosophy, then the fact that the gender gap in MLP scores was highest for that firm remains to be explained. The next section addresses this point.

**Recasting the model: Gender salience and Woman-friendliness**

The model proposed earlier as a basis for this study suggested that in traditional, gender blind organizations, gender salience is relatively high. The model predicted that woman-friendliness as an organizational attribute would lead to lower gender salience, and hence to greater similarity in the MLP scores of male and female managers.
However, both the quantitative and qualitative findings suggest the need for some modification of the model. Firm 4, where women perceived higher opportunities for professional growth than did their male counterparts, was also the only firm where the gender difference in MLP was significant. On the qualitative side, Firm 4 employees, and women in particular, seemed to be both hopeful ("at least it's the firm's initiative" to help balance work/family concerns) and fearful ("not everybody buys into it") when it came to the changes that were occurring. Given these findings, it seems reasonable to propose that in the short run, newly instituted policies and procedures designed to signal woman-friendliness may actually heighten the salience of gender.

Social identity theory suggests a possible mechanism for this dynamic. A change in policies and procedures which is designed to benefit a particular subgroup of employees (e.g., dual career parents, or more especially mothers) may be perceived as a threat by others who are not members of that subgroup (Ashforth & Mael, 1989), which in turn reinforces the strength and saliency of group characteristics. This would explain why women in the most woman-friendly of the firms were also the most distinct from men in their decision-making style, in a direction that conforms to gender stereotypes.

The crucial question here is whether the initiatives under discussion here are perceived as family-friendly (in which case both male and female dual-career parents would benefit) or specifically woman-friendly, meaning that mothers are more likely
to benefit than fathers — hence making gender a more prominent part of employees' social identification (Ashforth & Mael, 1989).

Evidence that family-friendly policies are often interpreted as benefiting women more than men is not lacking in the literature (Burke & Black, 1997). Powell (1997) states that women in the U.S. are more likely to take advantage of parental leave policies, and that even when men make use of flexible scheduling, they seem reluctant to admit that it is for family reasons. Within the present study, the most compelling support is provided by the father who had to work extra hard to convince his superiors that a part-time arrangement would be workable precisely because he was male:

I've been through, in the last two years I've taken two months parental leave. I'm now working four days a week, so part-time, which -- my thinking is very family-oriented. Family more equal to business... and that's taken some time with the powers that be, having that accepted. I think there was some real reluctance to let me do that. Basically it took me six months to show that yeah, I can work...

Q. So you had to prove it. Are you the first person [in the office to go part-time]?

Respondent: The first male.

The inference is that if a woman had requested a similar arrangement, it would not have been seen as an aberration in terms of the firm's cultural messages. However, a request for part-time status by a man represented an unprecedented extension of whatever family-friendly initiatives this firm (Firm 2) had previously allowed. Within many corporate cultures, an application for part-time status is seen as a signal
that one is not serious about career (Duxbury & Higgins, 1991), but societal norms and pressures make this signal more acceptable when it comes from a woman.

If we adopt the assumption that gender salience is at least temporarily heightened by woman-friendly policies, we need to re-examine the quantitative and qualitative findings with this in mind. At this point, the finding that respondents from Firm 4 showed the highest gender difference in MLP score makes sense. Because gender salience has been heightened due to the adoption of explicit policies designed to make life easier for dual-career parents, awareness of gender feeds into other areas, including decision-making.

The finding that Firm 4 was high on "working long hours" is still anomalous if Firm 4 is in fact more woman-friendly than the other firms sampled. It could be due to particular conditions of the local economy (i.e., an economic boom which simultaneously increased demand on the firm's resources and made it more difficult to recruit the needed personnel). One factor which may have made this situation more acute for Firm 4 was its geographic location: alone of the firms sampled, it was in the Greater Toronto Area. All the other firms sampled were in a smaller city, and respondents often commented that this made for a more laid-back organizational culture than could be expected in Toronto and environs. While location might be considered as a separate and confounding variable, I believe that in this research it contributes to the difference in organizational culture, and can be considered as an aspect of that part of the model, rather than an extraneous factor that needs to be considered on its own.
At this point, then, the quantitative data seem to provide a coherent picture confirming that Firm 4 is the best example of woman-friendliness within the sample: high scores on "respect for people" and "opportunities for professional growth" combined with a large difference in MLP score, arguing that gender salience is heightened for respondents as a result of the woman-friendly initiatives.

On the qualitative side, Firm 4 was one of only two firms for which "promotion" received positive mention, and the only firm for which there was no negative "promotion" comment.

The relatively poor showing of Firm 4 on "employee satisfaction" is certainly linked in part to "working long hours". In addition, the factors discussed above in relation to AWAs (i.e., the heightened expectations generated by family-friendly policies, counteracted to some extent by actual experience with those policies) may play a role in the findings on employee satisfaction. There were other sources of dissatisfaction, as well: two employees mentioned compensation as a source of personal discontent, and there were hints that the managing partner was sometimes guilty of favouritism, which had a negative effect on morale.

In addition, while the introduction and adherence to policies of flexibility was well-publicized within Firm 4, there were some indications that the firm, as represented in the sample workplace, was not as consistently "human resources-friendly" as its proponents liked to claim. In the first place, the need to work long hours undercut some of the flexibility that was theoretically available.
Another indicator of some inconsistency or lack where "human resources-friendliness" is concerned was the degree to which the culture in Firm 4 as a whole was directive rather than participative. The mean MLP score for respondents in this firm was 4.66, the lowest mean for any firm in the sample. One woman senior manager made a revealing comment:

I definitely agree ...[t]hat there is a gender difference as far as women being more... consultive style. As far as here, in the firm, my department... if I looked at my style versus my colleagues' style, my male colleagues' style, I'd say yeah, definitely, there's no doubt about it....[In my department]...all the senior folks are men and all the junior folks are women. So when I came in the door, you know, I had a number of the women who...are the more junior folks, ...they have come to me and said, you know, we're so glad to see you here, we're so glad to see your style, thank you for talking to me, thank you for listening to me.... I almost have to sit back and say - well, don't people talk to you and don't people listen to you? - because usually you don't have someone thank you so much for those kind of things.

From a conventional point of view, the culture in Firm 4 seems internally contradictory: on the one hand, individuals perceive high respect for people and (women at least) opportunities for professional growth, and yet the decision-making seems directive and hierarchical. These inconsistencies may result in confusion for individuals who feel that things are changing in a more woman-friendly direction, but that there are still features of the organizational culture that do not fit well with those initiatives. The awareness that (as the Firm 4 manager quoted earlier said) "not everybody buys into it" and that those who want to take advantage of flexible arrangements have to "prove" that it will work was echoed in comments by other respondents from Firm 4. There were similar comments by respondents from other
firms as well, but what is striking here is the discrepancy between the policy
commitment to flexibility and the feelings of those who were involved in making
choices to balance work and family.

The New Model

Taking the various pieces of evidence provided as a whole, a change to the
model as originally laid out seems to be indicated. The new version of the model is
shown on the next page, in Figure 5.

The new model has a temporal dimension, unlike its predecessor. Rather than
posing two "states" -- woman-friendly versus gender blind -- at a given point in time,
the new model suggests what is likely to occur as an organization undergoes a
transition from traditional to more woman-friendly (at least on the level of formal
policies).

At Time 1, the organization is a traditional one: male dominated, with norms
that favour rationality and a strong separation of work from private life. Respondents'
comments suggest that until about five years ago, this was an accurate description of
the culture of their organizations, where (for example) taking time during the workday
to deal with a sick child would be considered unprofessional. The result of this
culture is a fairly high level of gender salience, but on the positive side, employees
feel that organizational norms are clearcut, without a lot of mixed messages in terms
of how career success is pursued. While it is arguable that all the firms in my sample
were moving away from this traditional culture, one respondent in Firm 1 said:
Figure 5. New Model: The Effect of Woman-friendly Initiatives on
Gender Salience and Decision-Making Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
<th>Time 3</th>
<th>Time 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational state:</td>
<td>Change is introduced:</td>
<td>Organization is &quot;hybrid&quot;: new policies contradict previous norms</td>
<td>Organization is woman-friendly; flexible policies are aligned with organizational norms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender blind</td>
<td>woman-friendly policies initiated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Salience:</td>
<td>Gender Salience is heightened</td>
<td>Gender Salience remains high</td>
<td>Gender Salience is minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees understand organizational norms</td>
<td>Employees are confused about organizational norms</td>
<td>Behavioural consequences of heightened gender salience include gender-stereotyped decision-making styles</td>
<td>Women's and men's decision-making styles are influenced in a similar way by the organization's culture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I think it's still going to stay the way, though -- like even though they're going to accept people who don't want to work as much...you're still going to be able to go further and a lot faster if you have that ambition to work all the time and you're willing to do everything they ask and never say no.

Within each firm, a respondent made a similar comment: two were fathers, two were mothers, and the fifth was a single woman.

At Time 2, the organization introduces woman-friendly (or family-friendly) initiatives, on a formal or informal basis. It seems probable that some managers' and partners' reactions are based on the perception that these changes are likely to disproportionately benefit one group of employees (women whose spouses are working and who have young children). As a result, gender salience is heightened at Time 2. Such managers and/or partners are likely to be the ones taking attendance on Saturdays, or commenting when someone leaves at the end of the day:

[It's said as a joke, but often if you leave on time, someone will say to you, "Oh, are you working half-days now?" So it's a bit of an ego thing: can I be the last person out of the office? So to admit I want to go home and see my kids is almost being seen as a wimp.]

Another result of the changes at Time 2 is that employees no longer feel sure of their ground in terms of the actions that will help them to fit in. The organization seems to be trying to signal that career success is possible without sacrificing family life, yet many of the partners (role models for other employees) work very long hours and seem to expect that others will, too (if only by keeping staff levels at a minimum).

---

1This remark was coded "neg AWA", because clearly it would be difficult for an employee to feel comfortable pursuing a flexible schedule in the face of comments such as this. To check for representativeness, see Table 29 in Chapter 4.
These mixed messages may also contribute to heightened gender salience, since those partners who are responsible for them are probably male, and are more likely to have grown children and spouses who have not worked outside the home than are their younger subordinates. This contributes to a feeling that it may be difficult for them to empathize with the dual career wife or husband:

Yeah, dinner's on the table, they put their feet up and read the paper, and the laundry's done. They don't have to worry about any of those things, in the old school. But I say to them all the time, 'I'm that wife, so I have to go, because (laughs) I still have to do laundry,' or whatever. Because homes aren't the same as they were then either — you know, husbands do laundry and cook and clean and everything else...But still, both partners are stretched.

There were five comments (two from men, three from women, across all five firms) that indicated employees believed there was a difference in outlook between partners with nonworking spouses and younger employees in dual-career marriages.

At Time 3, the heightened gender salience leads to behavioural consequences: differences between men and women that are based on gender stereotypes are accentuated, leading to a larger difference than would previously have been observed in the MLP scores of male and female managers.

Evidence in support of this sequence of events can be seen in the results for both Firm 3 and Firm 4. These were the two firms with the highest difference in MLP scores between men and women; they were also the two firms whose female managers saw higher opportunities for professional growth than did their male counterparts.
However, the model also posits a Time 4 beyond the time frame of the present research. In Time 4, the predictions of the original model come into play (see Appendix B for the original model). At this point in time, the organization's culture has become actually, rather than nominally, woman-friendly. The policies and procedures designed to create a more flexible workplace are now taken for granted; employees no longer fear adverse career consequences when they request flexible arrangements. At this point, the new model predicts lower gender salience than at Time 1, and hence (as in the original model) similar decision-making styles for men and women managers.

**Linking Quantitative and Qualitative Analysis**

The process of moving from the original model to the new one provides an example of how quantitative and qualitative data analysis can be linked to enrich and strengthen understanding of the findings. Rossman & Wilson (1985) suggest three ways in which this can be accomplished: corroboration (using the two types of data in conjunction and checking for convergent findings), elaboration (adding richness and detail to quantitative results), and initiation (uncovering paradoxes and contradictions in the data as a step towards new understanding). All of these processes occurred in the present study.

In terms of corroboration, the quantitative data showed that Firm 4 had the highest difference in MLP scores by gender. This finding was confirmed by the interview data, since Firm 4 also had the highest proportion of respondents who
believed women in their firm were more participative than men.

Elaboration can be illustrated using the OCP data. These data were quantitatively interpreted to show that accounting firms -- at least those in the sample -- were much more similar in cultural terms than at the time of Chatman's (1988) study. The same data were later interpreted qualitatively to show how the values espoused by these firms create difficulties in moving towards a more woman-friendly work environment.

However, the most substantial contribution of the linking process to understanding the results of the study occurred in terms of initiation: "the analytic function that turns ideas around" (Rossman & Wilson, 1985). During the data analysis process, the quantitative findings were examined in some detail in order to work with the hypotheses generated from the initial model. Certain anomalies emerged from this analysis. Probably the most striking discrepancy, in terms of expectations created by the initial model, was the fact that Firm 4 had the highest gender difference in MLP scores (suggesting a traditional orientation with high gender salience) and significantly higher perceptions by female employees of opportunities for professional growth.

In order to try to understand what this discrepancy might mean in terms of employees' personal experience, I turned to the interviews. Here the picture again seemed initially contradictory. Within my sample, Firm 4 seemed to have the most woman-friendly policies in terms of AWAs; yet the number of negative mentions of AWAs was higher than for any other firm.
It seemed clear that these apparent contradictions in the data could not be resolved by clinging to the original model. I began an iterative process of working back and forth between the data and my own ideas about what might be happening. Ideas were tested against the findings, both quantitative and qualitative, as well as against hints in the empirical and theoretical literature that seemed to suggest greater complexity in the process of moving toward a woman-friendly organizational culture than the initial model was prepared to account for. In the absence of a research team, I also tested my ideas with the thesis committee. They were cautiously enthusiastic about what looked like an emergent unifying perspective on the findings. Nonetheless, it was up to me to formulate and present the new model that seemed to be adumbrated in the data.

Summary

This chapter has used the findings from the study in order to move from the original model (which was not supported by the data) to a new version which seems to fit the picture that emerges when quantitative and qualitative results are analyzed in conjunction with each other.

The concluding chapter of the thesis offers some suggestions for how this new version of the model could be researched, and discusses the implications of the present research for organizations attempting to change their internal cultures in a more woman-friendly direction.
CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

When I began the research for the dissertation, my purpose was to examine the processes behind an empirically established phenomenon: the gender gap in participative decision-making. It seemed to me that two organization-level factors (i.e., organizational culture and demography) might be implicated in the difference, and the challenge was to design a piece of research that might begin to show how these pieces were linked. The original model suggested a central role for perceptions of gender salience in moderating women managers' decision-making styles.

As it turned out, the organizational demography variable was not one that could be properly examined within the constraints of the research design. I believe that it is important, but its role in the present study is theoretical only.

The study involved collecting both quantitative and qualitative data. When these were examined in conjunction with each other, it became evident that there were some discrepancies that could not be resolved with the original model. A modification of that model was therefore proposed: the new model is described on pp. 112-116.

Limitations of the present study

The present study has a number of limitations. One problem which was not foreseen was the lack of variation within the sample in terms of woman-friendliness. Although some differences were found, in general the five firms in the sample were
much closer together than anticipated on this dimension of their culture. This, in addition to the small sample sizes, almost certainly contributed to the relatively weak results in terms of the quantitative measures.

Another limitation is in terms of external validity. The findings described here were obtained in one type of organization: local offices of large multinational accounting firms. Whether these findings would generalize to other organizational environments is an open question. My own suspicion is that they would generalize well to other professional firms (e.g., law firms) but perhaps not so well to organizational environments which lack a "professional' culture (Schwartz, 1992).

It should also be stressed that the aim of the present research was to account for gender differences within male-dominated work cultures. There is some evidence that gender is salient in female-dominated work environments as well (Chatman et al., 1998). However, the number of female-dominated businesses is still relatively small, and the issue of decision-making styles in such environments remains to be investigated. It is beyond the scope of the present research.

In some ways, these limitations are a natural result of the initial decision to conduct a field study. A one-person field study, where time is limited, is almost inevitably going to involve a relatively small sample which is also non-random (Schmitt & Klimoski, 1991). While this creates concerns in terms of external validity, it helps to ensure fidelity to the particular context(s) of the research (Schofield, 1993).
Contributions to present knowledge

The present research has added to our understanding of how gender salience functions in organizational contexts. In particular, the findings embodied in the new model present challenges both to practitioners and to researchers. What the new model suggests is that managers engaged in organizational change should be prepared for some negative consequences, even though the changes are expected to benefit employees. How long the turmoil associated with times 2 and 3 is likely to last is an empirical question, but it seems likely that employers who expect these conditions will be better prepared to deal with them.

I believe that the present research generates substantive theory (Strauss & Corbin, 1990): that is, it describes a relationship between certain variables that could be expected to hold under a given set of conditions. While the initial theory (represented by the first model, described in Chapter 3) was drawn from a combination of personal experience and relevant literature, the theory modelled and presented in Chapter 5 emerged from and was grounded in the data produced by the study (see Miles & Huberman, 1994, pp. 14-15 for a discussion of how this process can work).

In terms of organizational culture, the present research adopted what Martin (1992) calls an "integrative" perspective: assuming that the culture represents an overriding world view which all the employees buy into to some extent. However, the findings on Firm 4 in particular suggest that this view may be too simplistic. It may be that a "fragmentation perspective" (Martin, 1992) better captures the dynamic in
firms undergoing cultural change.

In an unpublished paper (Romaine, 1999) I make the following point:

The fragmentation perspective seems most useful in describing a situation where organizational norms are in a process of change or flux. Employees are no longer sure of the cause and effect relationship between behavior and rewards. The implementation of flexible work arrangements in these firms [i.e., those in the present sample] was not accompanied by an increase in personnel to share the workload, and this led to ambiguity and frustration for employees who were trying to figure out what a leave or part-time arrangement might mean in career terms. (Romaine, 1999, p. 15)

See the discussion on pp. 105-106, above, which shows how this ambiguity emerged in the interviews.

Another finding, specific to the set of organizations studied, has been referred to several times: it is the cultural convergence of the large accounting firms over the past decade. This finding was both unexpected and unwelcome, since it contributed to the inability to test the original model. However, future researchers can presumably benefit from knowing in advance that these organizations are more alike than they were in the 1970s and 1980s (Chatman, 1988; Stevens, 1981).

The discrepancies between the quantitative and qualitative findings on participation are also provocative. One criticism often levelled at the Vroom-Yetton instrument is that (in common with many psychometric measures) it utilizes self-report data (Field, 1979). Within the present sample, women respondents scored higher in participation on this instrument, but they and their male colleagues for the most part denied that women in general were more participative than men. At the very least,
this suggests that self-report data should be used in conjunction with other measures when behaviour that may trigger gender stereotypes is being researched.

Another issue, which came to light at the very end of the research process, was the possibility of gender bias in the Vroom-Yetton instrument itself\(^1\). While the scenarios are scrupulously gender neutral (the decision-maker is always referred to in the second person singular; gender of subordinates and superiors is not mentioned except in one instance -- a female vice-president of finance), the fact remains that a number of job titles in our society remain gender stereotyped. Such designations as plant manager, or supervisor of industrial engineers, used in the scenarios, may have inadvertently triggered a stereotyping process for female respondents, and contributed to the gender gap in Vroom-Yetton scores. This is clearly a threat to the validity of the quantitative results, but it is not one which can be resolved in terms of the present research.

Finally, one interesting set of findings has to do with the men in the sample. Although I did not set out to research questions of work/family balance in a direct way, those issues came up repeatedly in the interviews, with both men and women. Despite abundant research that suggests women still bear a disproportionate share of responsibility for housework and childcare, the responses within my sample suggested a more egalitarian division of domestic duties. What appeared to create stress for my sample members was less a gender gap than a generation gap: spouses in dual career

\(^1\)I am indebted to Dr. Sue Inglis for this insight.
marriages attempting to communicate the difficulties of their family roles to older partners accustomed to relying on stay-at-home spouses. These findings are elaborated on in Romaine and Zeytinoglu, 1998; in press.

**Implications for future research**

One question that could be resolved by future research is whether organizational level (e.g., being a partner vs. being a manager) contributes to the gender gap in MLP. This would involve using the Vroom-Yetton problem set with a sample that included men and women in upper-level management as well as those at mid-level, to see whether the higher MLP scores for women persist across organizational levels.

Although unforeseen difficulties (discussed in detail above) made it impossible to test properly the model as initially presented, the refinement of that model described in the preceding chapter is supported by data from the present study. However, the new model should be tested systematically. One way to do this would be to use a longitudinal research design that will take the time dimension of the model into account, working with organizations that retain many traditional features but that seem to be experiencing the sort of demographic imperatives that the organizations described here were subject to (i.e., a need to recruit and retain skilled women as managers and/or professionals).

Another possibility would be to construct a sample of organizations that appear to be at different stages in the move towards creating a woman-friendly environment. That was the attempt in this research, but for the reasons discussed above, the firms in
the sample turned out to be much more similar to each other than expected on the relevant dimensions of organizational culture.

**Implications for organizational practice**

In introducing the study, I noted that the findings might provide some information useful to practitioners wishing to change their organizations in positive directions. While the organizations in the sample were not especially concerned with participation, they were concerned with creating a more family-friendly image in order to attract and retain younger employees. However, the study suggests that they fell into one of the pitfalls common when organizations attempt to change the culture (Wilkins & Patterson, 1985). Overt policy changes that contradicted the hidden, shared assumptions of the culture (such as the need and desirability of working long hours) could at best be only partly successful, and at worst were perceived by employees as hypocritical. In addition, the message that "not everybody buys into it" may have made employees reluctant to take advantage of the proffered flexibility (Bailyn, Fletcher & Kolb, 1997).

Some organizations seem to have found ways to address these issues. For example, early in the 1990s Deloitte & Touche (U.S.) began a set of initiatives designed to reduce turnover among women managers. Spearheaded very publicly by

---

2 Of the firms in the sample, all except Firm 5 had instituted more or less formal policies on part-time work arrangements. In Firm 5, managers talked about increased flexibility to schedule their own work, which made juggling the workload and parental responsibilities easier than in the past.
the CEO, these initiatives included a set of workshops in which at least 98% of management personnel (managers, senior managers and partners) have now taken part. The workshops are designed to bring out assumptions that may hinder the creation of a gender equitable workplace. Thus, formal policies are supplemented by an attention to the psychological and social underpinnings of organizational culture. It is not surprising that "many D&T employees view the workshops as the most compelling piece of the initiative" (Catalyst, 1998, p. 28). The present study provides further evidence confirming the importance of paying attention to attitudes and assumptions when attempting to change an organization's culture.

**Summary**

The purpose of the dissertation research was to investigate certain relationships among factors that seemed likely to influence gender perceptions, and hence a certain type of managerial behaviour where a gender difference had been observed (participative decision-making). The relationships that were outlined in the original model (based on previous research and theory) did not fit the data well, and the contradictions that emerged led to formulation of a somewhat different model.

It might be argued that this study raises more questions than it answers. The expected relationships among organizational culture, gender salience, and decision-making style did not emerge in the direction anticipated. However, the unexpected results could prove serendipitous (McCall & Bobko, 1990) in suggesting new insights into how organizational cultures, particularly in times of transition, affect the
perceptions and behaviour of individual employees. These questions are of high importance for organizations that wish to combine flexibility and productivity. All the evidence at hand suggests that organizations which are able to create woman-friendly cultures are likely to be winners in the competition for high-quality human resources, regardless of gender.
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Leadership and the Vroom-Yetton Model
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Figure A1

Continuum of leadership behavior.

Use of authority by the manager

Manager makes decision and announces it
Manager "sells" decision
Manager presents ideas and invites questions
Manager presents tentative decision subject to change
Manager presents problem, gets suggestions, makes decision
Manager defines limits; asks group to make decision
Manager permits subordinates to function within limits defined by superior

Area of freedom for subordinates

Subordinate-centered leadership

Boss-centered leadership

Appendix A

Figure A2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
<th>DEFINITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>You solve the problem or make the decision yourself using the information available to you at the present time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>You obtain any necessary information from subordinates, then decide on a solution to the problem yourself. You may or may not tell subordinates the purpose of your questions or give information about the problem or decision on which you are working. The input provided by them is clearly in response to your request for specific information. They do not play a role in the definition of the problem or in generating or evaluating alternative solutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>You share the problem with the relevant subordinates individually, getting their ideas and suggestions without bringing them together as a group. Then you make the decision. This decision may or may not reflect your subordinates' influence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>You share the problem with your subordinates in a group meeting. In this meeting you obtain their ideas and suggestions. Then you make the decision, which may or may not reflect your subordinates' influence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>You share the problem with your subordinates as a group. Together you generate and evaluate alternatives and attempt to reach agreement (consensus) on a solution. Your role is much like that of chairperson, coordinating the discussion, keeping it focused on the problem, and making sure that the critical issues are discussed. You can provide the group with information or ideas that you have, but you do not try to &quot;press&quot; them to adopt &quot;your&quot; solution, and you are willing to accept and implement any solution that has the support of the entire group.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reprinted from V. Vroom & P. Yetton (1973), Leadership and Decision-making (p. 13).
TABLE 2.3. Problem Attributes

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>If decision were accepted, would it make a difference which course of action were adopted?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Do I have sufficient information to make a high quality decision?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Do subordinates have sufficient additional information to result in a high quality decision?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Do I know exactly what information is needed, who possesses it, and how to collect it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Is acceptance of decision by subordinates critical to effective implementation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>If I were to make the decision by myself, is it certain that it would be accepted by my subordinates?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Can subordinates be trusted to base solutions on organizational considerations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Is conflict among subordinates likely in preferred solutions?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix B

A Model for Gender Differences in Decision-making

Traditional (Gender blind) Org. Culture → High Gender Salience → Women managers more participative than men

Woman-friendly Org. Culture → Low Gender Salience → Men and women managers equally participative
## Appendix C

### Variables Measured and Controlled For

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Measured or Controlled for?</th>
<th>Measure/Control used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Culture (independent)</td>
<td>Measured</td>
<td>Organizational Culture Profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Measured</td>
<td>Qualitative Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salience (mediating)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making style (DMS: dependent)</td>
<td>Measured</td>
<td>Vroom-Yetton; qualitative data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Characteristics (independent)</td>
<td>Measured via Controlled for via</td>
<td>Demog. survey Sample selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Skills (e.g., conflict management) (independent)</td>
<td>Controlled for</td>
<td>Subset of Vroom-Yetton problem set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate Characteristics (independent)</td>
<td>Measured via Controlled for via</td>
<td>Demog. survey Sample selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual/Organizational Characteristics (independent)</td>
<td>Measured via Controlled for via</td>
<td>Demog. survey Sample selection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Acronyms Used in the Study

AWA: Alternative work arrangements (see p. 65 for initial discussion)

DMS: Decision-making style (plural: DMSs); see literature review, passim; especially part E

ES: Employee satisfaction (see p. 65 for initial discussion)

HiOPG/F: Firms where women perceived higher opportunities for professional growth than did men

HiOPG/M: Firms where men perceived higher opportunities for professional growth than did women

MLP: Mean level of participation (see literature review, B)

OCP: Organizational Culture Profile (see Chapter 3)

PROM: Promotion of women into top management (see p. 65 for initial discussion)

RFP: Respect for people (see Chapter 4)

TM: Teamwork orientation (see Chapter 4)
Appendix E

Organizational Culture Profile Item Set

1. Flexibility
2. Adaptability
3. Stability
4. Predictability
5. Being innovative
6. Being quick to take advantage of opportunities
7. Willingness to experiment
8. Risk taking
9. Being careful
10. Autonomy
11. Being rule oriented
12. Being analytical
13. Paying attention to detail
14. Being precise
15. Being team oriented
16. Sharing information freely
17. Emphasizing a single culture throughout the organization
18. Being people oriented
19. Fairness
20. Respect for the individual's right
21. Tolerance
22. Informality
23. Being easy going
24. Being calm
25. Being supportive
26. Being aggressive
27. Decisiveness
28. Action orientation
29. Taking initiative
30. Being reflective
31. Achievement orientation
32. Being demanding
33. Taking individual responsibility
34. Having high expectations for performance
35. Opportunities for professional growth
36. High pay for good performance
37. Security of employment
38. Offers praise for good performance
39. Low level of conflict
40. Confronting conflict directly
41. Developing friends at work
42. Fitting in
43. Working in collaboration with others
44. Enthusiasm for the job
45. Working long hours
46. Not being constrained by many rules
47. An emphasis on quality
48. Being distinctive -- different from others
49. Having a good reputation
50. Being socially responsible
51. Being results oriented
52. Having a clear guiding philosophy
53. Being competitive
54. Being highly organized
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Interview Questions: Qualitative Data

(The interviews were preceded by my giving the respondent information about his/her score on the Vroom-Yetton instrument and what that means relative to personal decision-making style.)

1. Do you think the organizational culture of [your firm] has influenced your personal decision-making style?

If the response is yes:

Probe: In what way?
           Can you give me an (or another) example?

2. What other things have influenced how you make work-related decisions?

If the response to question 1 is no:

2. What do you feel have been the major things in your life that have influenced how you make work-related decisions?

(Same probes as above)

3. As I mentioned earlier, the "mean level of participation" scores on this instrument tend to be higher for women than for men, suggesting that women prefer a more participative decision-making style. Do you think that this generalization hold true for people in [your firm]?

(If answer is yes, same probes as above)

(If answer is no, prompt: So you feel that men and women in your organization tend to have the same approach to being participative?)

(Probe: ask for examples)

4. In terms of the organizational culture at [your firm], do you feel that your personal style (not just decision-making, but style in general) is a good fit?
(Probe: ask for examples)

4a. If you could change one thing about your firm, what would it be?

5. Do you think that your work affects your overall well-being?
Appendix G

Demographic Questionnaire

Demographic Information

Note: the following demographic information is requested for purposes of data analysis. It will be kept completely confidential (see the consent form for details).

Name: ______________________

Sex: Male____ Female____

Age: ______

Number of years with [present employer]: _____

Job title: ______________________

Number of years in present job: ______
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Communications to Sample Members and Gatekeepers
Appendix H-1

Sample Cover Memo to Gatekeeper

October 1, 1997

TO: Ms. --

FROM: Janet Romaine

RE: Proposed research at [your firm]

I received a phone call from -- last night to say that I should give you some details about the research that I am hoping to do at [your location of a public accounting firm]. I am happy to supply this information.

First, some background information: I am a doctoral student at McMaster University, and my dissertation research is on the relationship between organizational culture and managerial decision-making. My sample includes mostly managers and senior managers (with some senior associates) from accounting firms.

The time required for each individual is between 2 and 3 hours. I administer two standardized instruments, one on decision-making and the other on organizational culture. Time to complete both is around 90 minutes. Once the instruments have been scored, I schedule an individual interview with each participant, to give feedback on the decision-making score and to ask a few questions related to my study. Most of the interviews have taken under an hour.

Because the individuals who are potentially part of the sample are often very busy during the winter and spring months, I am hoping to complete the research by mid-November. This is feasible, but it means I need to get in touch with people fairly quickly. What I have done so far is to first write a letter to those who are eligible to participate, followed in about a week by a phone call. With the help of an internal contact person, the rest of the research can proceed quite expeditiously.

I believe that the research can offer some benefits to [your firm]. The instrument that I am using to measure organizational culture (the Organizational Culture Profile) was developed in the U.S. in the mid-1980s and used with a sample of Big 8 offices in the San Francisco area. It provides information about what organization members see as the most strongly held values of the firm, which can then be compared to those of other firms within the industry.
I hope that this brief summary has given you a better picture of what I'm interested in doing. I would be happy to supply further information, if you wish. You are also welcome to contact my advisor, Dr. Isik Zeytinoglu, who is a Professor in the business school at McMaster. She can be reached at the FAX number listed above, or at 905-525-9140 x23957. I can be reached at the same number, x27019, or at my home number: 905-628-9696.

Thank you very much for your attention to this request.
Appendix H-2

Letter to Prospective Sample Member

Date: September 30, 1997

To: 1-

From: Janet Romaine
       Doctoral student, McMaster University

Re: Leadership feedback opportunity

I'm a doctoral student in Human Resources at McMaster; my dissertation research is on the effect of organizational culture on middle managers' decision-making and leadership styles. I have been in contact with [the Human Resources partner in your office], and he has given me permission to approach employees with managerial responsibilities in the [location] office of [your firm], to see who would be interested in participating in the research. Below is a brief description of what is entailed, what you would get out of participating, and the time frame involved.

What's entailed: between 2 and 3 hours of your time.

-45 minutes to 1 hour to read and respond to a series of brief leadership cases
-45 minutes to 1 hour to fill out an Organizational Culture Profile
-40 minutes for a semi-structured interview with me, to discuss the findings and explore related issues

What you get: The leadership cases that you will be responding to are based on a well-validated instrument designed to measure managers' leadership styles. Your answers, which are completely confidential, will be used to arrive at 2 scores, which together represent your leadership profile. Your scores, together with explanatory material, will be provided to you alone. You may find that they provide useful insights into your own way of making decisions, working with subordinates, and how your leadership style compares with others who have similar responsibilities.

Timing: I hope to complete the research by the end of October, or mid-November at the latest.

How to proceed: I will be contacting you by telephone in a week or so to see if you are interested. In the meantime, if you would like more information, please contact me.
directly, by phone or email. If you wish, you may also contact my supervisor:

Dr. Isik Zeytinoglu, Professor
Michael G. DeGroote School of Business
McMaster University
525-9140 ext. 23957

If you are NOT interested in taking part, please call me or send me an e-mail message, and I will remove you from the list.

Telephone: 905-628-9696 (home -- messages can be left)
            905-525-9140 x27019 (office -- "   " )

e-mail: romainrj@mcmaster.ca

Thank you for your time and attention to this message.
Appendix H-3: Consent Form for Participants

INFORMED CONSENT AND WILLINGNESS TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH ON DECISION-MAKING AND ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

The purpose of this form is to obtain your informed consent to participate in research on leadership style and organizational culture. If you consent, your involvement with the research will consist of (1) completing 2 brief questionnaires (one to measure your decision-making style, the other to measure organizational culture) and (2) a follow-up interview with the researcher to provide feedback on your decision-making style and to supplement the information provided by the tests.

The information gathered from the questionnaires and interviews will be transcribed and aggregated in a way that preserves confidentiality for all participants. While identifying information will be retained in order to provide feedback to participants, this information will be kept in a locked file cabinet separate from the research data, and will be available to no one but the researcher. You have the right to withdraw from the research at any time and also to refrain from answering any questions in the interview that you prefer to omit.

If you have any questions, please call:

Janet Romaine, Ph.D. Candidate
Michael G. DeGroote School of Business
McMaster University
905-525-9140 ext. 27019

The supervisor for the research is Dr. Isik Zeytinoglu, who is also available to answer any questions or concerns about the research:

Dr. Isik Zeytinoglu
Professor of Industrial Relations
McMaster University
905-525-9140 ext. 23957

I am willing to participate in the research described above.

_________________________________________  ______________________________
(Name)                                        (Date)
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Instructions for the Vroom-Yetton Problem Set

MANAGING INVOLVEMENT:

AN INSTRUMENT MEASURING INDIVIDUAL DECISION-MAKING STYLE

Introduction

This instrument consists of 30 brief cases designed to reflect realistic decision scenarios. Your responses to these cases will provide a measure of your personal decision-making style.

Instructions:

1. Read the descriptions of "leader behaviors" on the next page.

2. Complete the 30 cases, writing your answers in the circle on each page. Put yourself in the position of the leader in each of these situations. Respond according to how you would act in each situation, as opposed to how you think you should act. Time in the followup interview will be devoted to providing you with an analysis of your decision-making style based on your answers: for this feedback to be meaningful to you, it is critical that you indicate the behaviour that you would actually use. Make whatever assumptions you need to in order to answer the cases, but don't try to "second guess" what the authors of the cases are looking for. In many of the cases, there is not just one "right answer"!
Appendix H-5

Instructions for the Org. Culture Profile

Instructions for completing the Organizational Culture Profile

The Organizational Culture Profile (OCP) contains 54 statements that describe organizational values. You are asked to sort these statements, which are on numbered cards, into 9 "boxes", from items that you consider "most characteristic" of your organization (box 9) to items that you see as "least characteristic" (box 1).

NOW COMES THE HARD PART: this is a "forced choice" sorting procedure, meaning that only a certain number of statements are allowed per box. This rule is in place for statistical reasons to allow for easier comparability between respondents. The number of items allowed per box is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box Number</th>
<th>Number of statements allowed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 (most characteristic)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (least characteristic)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The boxes are graduated: items placed in box 8 should be more characteristic of your organization than items in box 7, but less so than items in box 9.

The Sorting Procedure

It is recommended that you begin the sorting procedure by making 3 piles of cards: items that you see as characteristic of your organization, items that you see as uncharacteristic, and all other statements. Don't worry initially about how many cards land on each pile. Begin working with one pile at a time and start at one end of the spectrum (either most characteristic or least characteristic), working toward the middle. When you get to box 5, go to the other end and again work back toward the middle. Finally, make any adjustments that you need to to ensure that the right numbers are in each box. There will undoubtedly be "borderline" cases: just do the best you can and
don't worry. Remember that your response will be aggregated with others to form a composite; one decision is unlikely to skew the results in a noticeable way.

PLEASE DO NOT WRITE ON THE CARDS. They are to be re-used. If you wish to make notes as you go along, scrap paper can be provided.

The final step, once the cards are sorted, is to fill in the "score sheet". This sheet lists the item numbers of the statements (given on the cards) with a blank below for the number of the box to which you have assigned the statement. Once the score sheet is filled out, all materials can be returned to the person administering the OCP.

Thank you very much for your assistance with the Organizational Culture Profile.
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Feedback on Decision-Making Style

Name:________________________ Firm:________________________

Background: The decision-making instrument that you filled out ("Managing Involvement") is based on a model of how managers make effective decisions in particular circumstances. The model was devised by Victor Vroom and Philip Yetton in the early 1970s; it has been used quite a bit in organizations for diagnostic and training purposes.

The instrument yields 2 scores. The "Agreement with Feasible Set" score (AFS) has to do with what Vroom and Yetton considered to be the "feasible set" of best responses to the situation outlined in each case. It is important to realize that your AFS score, given that you are not trained in or knowledgeable about the Vroom-Yetton model of decision-making, is not terribly important. While Vroom and Yetton believed that decisions included in the feasible set were more effective, not everyone has agreed with them.

The second score, "Mean Level of Participation" (MLP) is related to how consistently you included your "subordinates" in the decision process. Each of the responses included in the exercise has a numerical score attached to it: A1 is 0, A2 is 1, C1 is 5, C2 is 8, and G2 is 10. Thus it is possible to add answers for the 30 cases and arrive at a number used to calculate the MLP.

Your scores: Your AFS score was arrived at by comparing the answer you gave to Vroom & Yetton's feasible set. An answer that was in the feasible set was scored one; other answers scored 0. Thus, the possible range of scores was from 0 to 30. The score was converted into a percentage for purposes of comparison with the other average scores.

The MLP score had a possible range of 0 to 10. I added the 30 individual answers and divided them by 30 to get a mean score.

For comparison purposes, I have included 2 sets of mean scores: the first is from a sample of 201 U.S. managers and the second is an average score for all respondents in my sample so far (N = 52).

Your AFS score:_____ Your MLP score:_____
U.S. Average AFS score: 70% U.S. Average MLP score: 4.68
Avg. AFS, my sample: 72.2% Avg. MLP, my sample: 4.96
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