



UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS  
JOURNALS + DIGITAL PUBLISHING

## Pacific Sociological Association

---

Work Values, Job Characteristics, and Gender

Author(s): Cecily C. Neil and William E. Snizek

Source: *Sociological Perspectives*, Vol. 30, No. 3 (Jul., 1987), pp. 245-265

Published by: [University of California Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1389112>

Accessed: 19/02/2014 09:24

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at  
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



University of California Press and Pacific Sociological Association are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Sociological Perspectives*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

## WORK VALUES, JOB CHARACTERISTICS, AND GENDER

CECILY C. NEIL

*Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization,  
Australia*

WILLIAM E. SNIZEK

*Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University*

This study uses ordinal regression analysis to examine the impact of gender on work values, after controlling for various organizational variables. The analysis is based on a complete enumeration of women in a large Australian organization, together with "representative" and "matched" samples of male employees. When organizational variables are controlled, women are shown to place greater importance on *working relations*, men on *salary, job status, and prestige in the community*. Type of work has a significant impact on work values, as does the interaction of gender and type of work, thus supporting the argument that the array of occupations studied may be an important factor in explaining conflicting prior findings concerning the influence of gender on work values. While gender differences in some work values remain after a variety of organizational variables are considered, a model based on work experiences may still be appropriate for explaining such observed differences.

**The present study analyzes** differences in the work values of men and women in an attempt to uncover those factors that have contributed to difficulties in generalizing from past research in this area (Brief and Aldag, 1975, p. 306). It contributes to the

---

AUTHORS' NOTE: *An earlier version of this article was presented at the annual meetings of the American Sociological Association, New York, August 1986. The authors are grateful for sampling advice given by Ken Brewer, and for statistical assistance from Tony Pettit. The authors also wish to thank Bernard Farber and three anonymous reviewers for their suggestions. Order of authorship is alphabetical and does not imply differential contribution to this essay.*

SOCIOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVES, Vol. 30 No. 3, July 1987 245-265  
© 1987 Pacific Sociological Assn.

existing literature on gender differences in work values in two ways. First, it uses a sample of men and women, carefully *matched* by job classification, to explore gender differences in work values when organizational position is controlled in the analyses. Second, using a *representative* sample of men and women, this study explores the work contexts in which apparent gender differences are likely to emerge or not emerge.

Respondents whose work values are analyzed all work for a large, geographically dispersed, Australian government agency, with a wide variety of jobs performed by its employees. Moreover, this organization has two quite distinct substructures with very different functions—one an administrative and clerical sector, the other a research sector. Thus it offers an ideal environment in which to test whether certain work contexts are more likely than others to reveal gender differences in values.

### RELEVANT RESEARCH

Empirical comparisons concerning the importance placed by men and women on different job characteristics have taken place at two levels. At a general level, some studies are concerned with the existence of sex differences in the *overall* value placed on intrinsic versus extrinsic job components. Here, for example, earlier research suggests that while women place a greater value on extrinsic factors such as working conditions and pay, men place more importance on intrinsic factors such as use of abilities and overall enjoyment (Herzberg et al., 1957). In a more recent study, Taveggia and Ziemba (1978) find a tendency for women employees to be more strongly attached to extrinsic work features than men, after controlling for job status; yet this study considered only jobs of white- versus blue-collar job status and perceived mobility opportunity as controls.

At the level of more specific job values, the results of past research are more consistent, but hardly conclusive. Centers and Bugental (1966, p. 196), for example, report that “men and women were not found to differ in the extent to which they valued

intrinsic or extrinsic job satisfactions in general . . . [but] sex differences were observed in the value placed on self-expression (opportunity to use skill or talent) and good co-workers." In a review of similar studies, Brief and Aldag (1975, pp. 305-306) report that women generally have been found to be more concerned with social aspects of their jobs and such things as working conditions, while men are more interested in pay and career-related values. In related studies, both Rosenbach et al. (1979) and Miller (1980) indicate significant differences between men and women in the relationship between certain job characteristics and effective job outcomes, including work values.

Although, as outlined above, a number of studies have been concerned with gender differences in work values, it is only recently that an attempt has been made to ground the findings of these investigations in organizational theory. In her seminal work, Kanter (1977) theorizes that the gender differences that have been observed are in fact adaptations to the different structural conditions men and women tend to experience in the workplace. According to Kanter, regardless of gender, lower opportunity and influence in the workplace lead to lower interest in career advancement, and greater interest in security and social rewards. Since women are more likely than men to be in positions with relatively low opportunity and influence, their work values are more likely to reflect this trend. This explanation of observed gender differences in values is consistent with the fact that in a number of studies in which occupation and organizational level have been controlled (Brief and Aldag, 1975; Brief et al., 1977), no significant pattern of male-female differences in work values has been evident.

Yet in contrast to the writings of Kanter (1977) and the research of Brief and Aldag (1975) and Brief et al. (1977), Schuler (1975) and Bartol (1976) both present evidence of male-female differences in work values even when the organizational level of employees is controlled. Attempts by Markham et al. (1985) to verify empirically Kanter's theoretical propositions suggest that the emergence of gender differences in work values, after organizational level has been controlled, may be dependent on whether or not an

organization displays gender differences in opportunity and influence, at the same hierarchical level. In their study of a federal bureaucracy, Markham et al. (1985) find only very weak relationships between work values and gender. As they point out,

Women were concentrated in lower level-career ladders. However, such ladders provided about as much internal promotion opportunity as those dominated by men. There was also evidence that most women at the agency set their aspirations to conform to the actual promotion possibilities of their status. Within the limits of their aspirations, they rated promotion as just as important as men did, and their promotion chances were roughly equal [Markham et al., 1985, p. 147].

If Kanter's propositions are correct, generalizations about gender differences in work values cannot be made from single organization studies without taking into account the organizational structure confronting men and women in these particular settings.

#### **HYPOTHESES**

Since organizational structure is believed to mediate the relationship between gender and work values, this relationship should in turn be affected by employees' perceptions of their jobs. Accordingly, the first hypothesis to be tested in this article is:

- (1) When *objective* job characteristics (job classifications) are held constant, there will be a positive association between *perception* of job characteristics and work values.

While lack of support for this hypothesis would seem to discredit a structural explanation of the various findings that have emerged, positive findings are open to contradictory interpretations. Kalleberg (1977) suggests that perception of job conditions may only partly depend on actual job conditions. It is possible

that work values *interact* with *objective* job characteristics to influence employee *perceptions* of job rewards or characteristics. Thus actual responses to questions of perceived characteristics “are quite possibly the product of the ‘true’ scores on these questions, and the extent to which the respondent values the reward in question. Under these conditions, the (perceived) job reward measures *already* represent the interactions between true job characteristics scores and values” (Kalleberg, 1977, p. 135).

To test whether there are significant gender differences in work values, this study examines male-female differences in specific work values controlling for both work section (administration and clerical or research), and hierarchical level of employment (junior or senior career path). Perceptions of job are not incorporated in the analysis. If, in fact, the relationship between work values and perceived job conditions is reciprocal, even controlling for *perceptions* of job conditions could confound any tests of the relationship between gender and values.

The divergent findings concerning gender differences in values may be explained by the extent to which men and women in the same organizational position experience structural differences. If so, it should be possible to predict whether differences will emerge by prior examination of the organization. The organization examined here has an official policy of ignoring gender in assessing the merits of employees eligible for promotion. A report commissioned by the Consultative Council at CSIRO (1983), however, found that in the junior research stream, women generally have been assigned work that is repetitive and/or routine, offers little opportunity for promotion, and is less securely funded. Further, women are underpromoted in both senior research and clerk/administrative streams. Accordingly, it is hypothesized that:

- (2) Women will show some evidence of adaptation to the different organization structure by placing *more* importance on *security* and *personal relationships*, and *less* importance on *job status*, than do their male counterparts.

## METHODOLOGY

### SAMPLE

The subjects used in this study work in a large Australian government organization with over 7,100 employees. The primary concern of the organization is to conduct and oversee applied research. While employees in all divisions and at all levels of the organization were surveyed, data are reported herein for only four groups of respondents: senior- and junior-level researchers and senior- and junior-level administrative and clerical workers. The data base used in this study is composed of a complete enumeration of all female employees for those ranks indicated, along with two male samples, one a "matched" sample and the other "representative." Two male samples were drawn to cope with the considerable imbalance in the sex composition of different occupations. The matched male sample is stratified according to job classification, the number of male respondents from each classification being proportional to the number of females employed within specific job classifications. To make sure that there were sufficient numbers of males and females in each strata of the "matched" sample, classifications were grouped according to the type of work involved and the level of responsibility. If the total number of males plus females in a group was greater than 100, then matching was performed at the classification level; otherwise it took place at the group level. Job classifications that were exclusively male or female were excluded from the sample. The representative male sample was composed of 15% of the number of males employed within the various job classifications of the organization.<sup>1</sup> After omitting part-time and temporary employees, and those younger than 21, data were analyzed on 621 female, 233 "matched" male, and 768 "representative" male respondents. Using the two samples, it is possible to examine the gender effects with and without controls for hierarchical position within the organization.

## MEASUREMENT

The data for this study were gathered through the use of self-administered questionnaires, distributed as part of a broader survey of sex discrimination in the organization. In addition to collecting basic biographical data, respondents were asked to rate a list of seventeen job characteristics (modified from work by Slesinger, 1961), according to whether each characteristic was "very important," "fairly important," or "not at all important" in their work. Responses to these items are used to measure employees' work values. Next, respondents were asked to indicate whether they felt their current job provided each of these same characteristics "quite a bit," "in some ways," or "not at all." These replies were used to assess employees' perceived evaluations of their own jobs. Since four of the items relating to job status formed a reliable scale (standardized item alpha of 0.75 for males and 0.74 for females), these are treated throughout as a single job characteristic. A complete list of all job characteristics tested in this study is presented in Table 1.

## METHOD OF ANALYSIS

Four job characteristics were selected to test the influence of work values on employees' perceived evaluations of job characteristics. The characteristics selected are those for which job descriptions for particular job classifications leave little or no opportunity for variability as to the extent to which particular characteristics exist in those classifications across the organization. The characteristics considered are *salary*, *opportunity for originality*, and *opportunity to learn*. A similar analysis also is made of the extent to which respondents' perceptions of their *job security* are influenced by the importance they attach to security (controlling for gender), and whether or not the respondents have fixed or indefinite tenure in the organization.

Once the influence of work values on employees' evaluations of their job characteristics has been assessed, separate logistic regression models for ordinal data (McCullagh, 1980) are then

used to test the work value—job characteristic models, controlling for the effects of gender and job classification. Logistic regression models are fitted due to the measurement properties of the data. More specifically, the ordered categorical nature of the variables analyzed requires an ordinal approach. The PLUM statistical package (McCullagh, 1982) is used for this and subsequent analyses, since it enables quantitative conclusions to be drawn concerning the odds that particular values are rated “very important” to a greater extent by males, when compared to females (McCullagh, 1980, p. 113).

Analyses using the “matched” sample are employed to determine whether any gender differences in work values remain after organizational variables are taken into account. The influence of gender on work values is examined, controlling for type of work (research or administration) and hierarchical position of career path stream (junior or senior career stream).

Analysis of the “representative” male sample is carried out to determine the impact on work values of certain organizational variables that may covary with gender, thereby leading to conflicting results concerning gender differences in work values at the organizational level. Career path level and type of work are fitted separately and together to see whether introducing these organizational variables without gender provides a fit that is as good as, or better than, that obtained by fitting gender alone, or gender together with other variables.

## RESULTS

### IMPACT OF WORK VALUES ON JOB EVALUATIONS

An analysis of data found in Table 1 shows that, even after the objective existence of a particular job characteristic is taken into account, work values still appear to have a significant impact on the way jobs are evaluated by respondents with respect to three of the four characteristics considered. The importance attached to *salary* has *no* significant influence on how a job is evaluated in this

**TABLE 1**  
**Influence of Work Values on Evaluation of Job Characteristics:**  
**Controlling for Gender and Variation in Actual Conditions**

JOB CHARACTERISTICS EVALUATED <sup>a</sup>	Residual Deviance after model including Job characteristic (Job Classification), gender and work value fitted (df = 18)	Change in Deviance when Work value fitted to model (df = 1)	Odds that those who regard characteristic as "very important" perceive it as existing to greater extent in job classification than those who do not rate it so.
Salary (Earning enough money for a good living) (n=196)	32.81	1.60	n.s.
Opportunity for originality <sup>c</sup> (n=534)	17.45	41.77 <sup>b</sup>	4.46
Opportunity to learn (n=534)	25.96	21.72 <sup>b</sup>	2.83
Security (n=1954)	47.99	16.46 <sup>b</sup>	1.73

NOTE: Based on all women within certain detailed job classifications and a representative sample of males in those classifications, excluding those with limited tenure and part-time.

a. Not at all = 1; in some ways = 2; quite a bit = 3.

b. F-ratio,  $p < 0.05$ .

c. Categories "in some ways" and "not at all" combined.

d. Based on all females, and a representative sample of all males, including those with fixed tenure.

respect. However, the importance attached to the *opportunity to learn*, *opportunity for originality*, and *job security* is shown to have a significant influence on respondents' evaluations of the characteristics of their jobs. The greater the importance attached to these characteristics, the greater the extent to which their jobs are perceived to provide these features. However, variation in detailed job classification, used as a surrogate for variation in actual work conditions, accounts for the largest proportion of the variance in work value responses. When work values and actual job conditions (job classification) are controlled, sex has only a significant influence on evaluations of job characteristics in the case of *salary*.

#### IMPACT OF GENDER ON WORK VALUES

Data presented in Table 2 indicate the proportional odds for regarding each work value as "very important," as opposed to "fairly important" and "not important." This is first shown for the "representative" sample of respondents in research and administrative staff sectors; next, for those in junior and senior paths; and, finally, for men and women. Also shown are the odds of women, as compared to men, regarding each value as "very important" when occupation and hierarchical position are controlled (i.e., using the "matched" sample and fitting gender to the model after fitting type of work and seniority of career path to allow for discrepancies in the sampling as a result of nonrespondents). The odds are presented only where the relevant factor produces a statistically significant difference in the importance attached to various work values. However, some care is still required in interpreting the data in this table, since not all factors for which odds are given have F-ratios significant at the .05 level (as indicated by the size of the overall residuals).

Type of work and career path both contribute significantly to the importance attached to a majority of work values by those in the "representative" sample of male respondents. For nine of the fourteen values—*good personal relations*, *competence*, *prestige in the community*, *job status*, *originality*, *full use of abilities*,

**TABLE 2**  
**Influence of Gender on Work Values: Proportional Odds Associated with Organizational Factors**

WORK VALUES*	GENDER		IMPORTANCE ATTACHED TO VALUE (Matched sample)		PROPORTIONAL ODDS FOR REPRESENTATIVE SAMPLE (Female n=621; Male n=768)		PROPORTIONAL ODDS FOR MATCHED SAMPLE (Female n=621; Male n=233)				
	Females	Males	Very Important	Fairly Important	Odds <sup>†</sup> that more important on value by: ----- Research Senior vs. Ad- ministrative Staff career paths vs. Males Junior	Residual Deviance (df in parenthesis)	Odds <sup>†</sup> for Females vs. males	Residual Deviance (df in parenthesis)			
Good personal relations (Being with people who are congenial - easy to work with) <sup>b</sup>	Females		79%	21%	0	n.s.	.61 (12.64)	1.75 (41.3)	15.99 (12)	1.65 (7.48)	0.73 (4)
	Males		70%	29%	0						
Competence (Knowing the job - competent to do the work) <sup>c</sup>	Females		91%	9%	0						
	Males		77%	22%	1%	.50 (8.93)	1.65 (7.68)	2.34 (23.87)	6.22 (4)	2.69 (20.69)	1.38 (4)
Prestige in community (Having a job seen by people outside the organization as being an important and meaningful job)	Females		8%	47%	45%	n.s.	n.s.	.58 (27.6)	11.11 (13)	.63 (9.81)	18.76 (11)
	Males		14%	51%	35%						
Importance attached to job status (influence, prestige in the organization, and getting ahead professionally in the organization)	Females		7%	52%	41%	.73 (5.73)	2.10 (40.46)	n.s.	14.82 (12)	.65 (6.18)	16.87 (11)
	Males		8%	63%	29%						

(continued)

TABLE 2 Continued

Salary (Earning enough money for a good living)	Females	47%	48%	5%	.64 (11.96)	.62 (25.03)	n.s.	24.36 (12)	.70 (5.5)	20.55* (11)
	Males	54%	42%	4%						
Originality (Working with new ideas - being original - using initiative)	Females	43%	48%	9%	1.92 (19.16)	2.08 (35.14)	.56 (99.71)	40.89 (11)	.71 (5.01)	23.83* (11)
	Males	51%	46%	2%						
Opportunity to learn (Acquiring new skills and knowledge)	Females	61%	37%	2%	n.s.	1.72 (23.35)	n.s.	45.28 (13)	n.s.	35.01* (11)
	Males	66%	30%	4%						
Full use of abilities (Having enough freedom, responsibility, and authority to do a job the way it should be done)	Females	66%	32%	2%	n.s.	2.10 (37.86)	n.s.	32.01 (13)	n.s.	14.48 (11)
	Males	69%	30%	1%						
Availability of support (Working with people who will stand behind you - who can help out in a tough spot when needed)	Females	52%	43%	5%	.73 (5.1)	n.s.	1.38 (15.88)	22.25 (12)	n.s.	14.21 (11)
	Males	45%	49%	6%						
Importance of task (Having a job that means something - that is necessary and valuable and essential)	Females	59%	38%	3%	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	19.08 (14)	n.s.	14.17 (11)
	Males	57%	40%	3%						

Respect for co-workers (Working with people who are competent and respected by others for their abilities)	Females	60%	37%	3%	n.s.	n.s.	13.03 (14)	n.s.	17.92 (11)
	Males	49%	48%	3%	n.s.	n.s.			
Work enjoyment (Enjoying the work itself)	Females	81%	19%	0	1.41 (3.85)	1.54 (7.8)	2.18 (12.34)	13.07 (11)	20.66** (11)
	Males	78%	21%	1%					
Security (Being reason- ably sure that the job is fairly permanent) <sup>d</sup>	Females	66%	30%	4%	.65 (9.36)	.48 (48.46)	n.s.	23.81 (12)	17.04 (11)
	Males	67%	29%	4%					
Nature of organization (Working in an agency with particular goals - a special kind of mission or purpose)	Females	33%	53%	14%	1.31 (4.65)	n.s.	n.s.	14.19 (13)	16.57 (11)
	Males	38%	51%	11%					

NOTE: Change in deviance when factor fitted, df in parenthesis.

a. Not important = 1; fairly important = 2; very important = 3.

b. Because of the very small numbers answering "not important" for this value, those responding in this manner were combined with those answering "fairly important" for the "matched" sample.

c. "Not important" and "fairly important" combined for "matched" and "representative" sample.

d. Except for this particular work value, only full-time respondents with permanent tenure were included in the analysis.

\*Likelihood chi-squared ratio indicates a poor fit.

+Odds are given only for those factors that produce a significant change in deviance.

n.s. = Not significant.

*availability of support, work enjoyment, and job security*—when gender alone is fitted, a significant drop in deviance results. However, as the figures in Table 2 show, gender is not a factor in the best fitting models for job status, use of abilities, or security when type of work and career path level are also fitted to control for their effects.

The introduction of a more rigorous control for both type of work and career path, through the use of the “matched” sample, improves the model’s fit in several cases, but has relatively little effect on the role of gender in explaining observed differences in the importance attached to particular work values. In the “matched” sample, gender contributes significantly to observed differences in the importance respondents attach to six of the fourteen work values considered. For three work values, both the changes in deviance and the F-ratio for gender are significant at the 0.05 level, namely:

- (1) Good personal relations—the odds for women rating this value as “very important” being 1.65 times greater than for men;
- (2) Being fully competent to do the job—the odds for women rating this as “very important” being 2.69 times greater than for men; and
- (3) Prestige in the community—the odds for women, compared to men, rating this as “fairly important,” rather than “not important,” being 0.63.

In each of these cases the likelihood ratio chi-square statistic indicates that the overall model provides a good fit to the data.

In two of the remaining three cases in which gender contributes to the best fitting model, the likelihood ratio chi-square indicates a poor fit, and for all three the F-ratio for gender is significant at only the 0.10 level. These variables are:

- (1) Status of job—including opportunity to get ahead, the odds for women, compared to men, regarding this as “very important” being 0.65;
- (2) Salary—the odds for women, compared to men, rating this as “very important” in a job being 0.70; and

- (3) Originality—the odds for women, compared to men, rating this as “very important” being 0.71.

Thus the addition of the more rigorous controls for both type of work and career path leads to gender becoming statistically significant at the 0.10 level for *job status* and *salary*. Gender ceases to be significant with respect to *work enjoyment* and *availability of support*, although in these two cases, the best model fitted is nonetheless a poor fit.

For all work values, with the exception of *good personal relations*, the effect of gender is stronger among employees in the research staff sector. Only the importance attached to *good personal relations* shows no significant gender x staff interaction. This apparent interaction effect may be a function of differences in a sample size. However, examination of the raw data shows that in most cases the differences between research and administrative men and women, when analyzed separately, is in the same direction. It further suggests that these interaction effects likely arose because of greater discrepancies between the responses of men in research and those in administration, rather than as a result of discrepancy between the responses of women in the two staff sectors. The exceptions to this were *prestige in the community* and *job status*. Neither of these two work values indicates a clear-cut directional pattern.

While gender contributes to the best fitting model in only six cases, for two of the remaining values, *opportunity to learn* and *work enjoyment*, the likelihood ratio chi-square again suggests the models are a poor fit, making unambiguous interpretation difficult.

## DISCUSSION

This study has focused on two hypotheses derived from the theory that the emergence of gender differences in work values is a function of organizational structure. The first hypothesis is that there is some association between employees' job perceptions and

their work values, to some extent independent of actual job characteristics. Although limited in the characteristics considered, data reported in this study supported this first hypothesis.

The second hypothesis tested in this study—that significant gender differences would emerge in work values associated with security, social aspects of the job, and job status—was partially supported by the data. No gender differences emerged with respect to the rating of *security*, perhaps because the long-standing security of tenure associated with the organization had attracted both men and women for whom security was particularly important. However, the importance attached by male employees to *job status* and by females to *good personal relationships* on the job, did show the predicted associations with gender. Gender differences also emerged with respect to *prestige in the community* and *originality*—regarded as more important by men; and *competence to do the job*—regarded as more important by women. Although not initially predicted, gender differences in these last two values are not incompatible with an explanation of gender differences in work values resulting from the differential treatment of men and women in the organization. As noted earlier, the organization studied has shown a tendency for women to be assigned work that is repetitive and/or routine more often than men who occupy the same organizational position. Hence the greater importance attached to *competence* by women and *originality* by men can perhaps be understood as an aspect of adaptation to gender differences in work experience.

By contrast, it is more difficult to explain gender differences in the importance attached to *prestige in the community* in terms of organizational structure. One possible explanation is that such a gender-related difference in work values may be a function of the tendency for women outside the work context to be attributed with their husbands', rather than their own, job status. Consistent with this explanation, the same gender differences did not emerge among single men and women, although the very small number of single men in the sample ( $n = 48$ ), indicates that care should be taken in interpreting these findings. Obviously, further research is

needed before gender differences can be associated reliably with this work value.

The limited number of administrative personnel in the sample indicates that not too much emphasis should be placed on the effect that the interaction between gender and type of work apparently has on work values. Nonetheless, this apparent effect is also consistent with a structural explanation of gender differences in work values. Different methods of promotion in the administrative and research streams indicate that promotional opportunities are more limited in administration than in research. Since men in administration are liable to experience more restricted opportunities than men in research, they may therefore be expected to show some of the same adaptive behavior as women. This explanation is consistent with the fact that the interaction effects appear to reflect a greater discrepancy between the work values of male research and administrative workers, compared to female research and administrative workers.<sup>2</sup>

## CONCLUSION

In a broader sense, the findings of this study are consistent with those of earlier studies (Bartol, 1976; Schuler, 1975) that have found some male-female differences in work values, despite controls for hierarchical level. Thus the greater importance males are shown here to attach to *salary, job status, and prestige*, is consistent with the greater importance males are reported to assign pay and career-related values elsewhere. The importance women attach to *good personal relationships* is also consistent with other findings. However, there is a noticeable contrast with the findings of past studies in that virtually no gender differences were found with respect to the importance employees attached to both *usefulness of functions* and *social aspects* of the job.

The question arises as to why the findings of Bartol (1976), Schuler (1975), and of this study, differ from those of Brief and Aldag (1975) and Brief et al. (1977) who found no significant

pattern of gender differences in work values when occupation and organizational level are controlled. The findings reported here suggest several possible explanations that may account for such divergence. First, in contrast to the findings of Markham et al. (1985), our results suggest that gender differences in work values may be dependent, at least in part, on the extent to which men and women who occupy the same hierarchical position are differentially treated within any given organization. In the organization studied by Markham et al. (1985, p. 147), "Women were concentrated in lower-level career ladders. However, such ladders provided about as much internal promotion opportunity as those dominated by men." In the organization studied here, however, personnel data suggest that promotional opportunities vary by gender across the same positions. Perhaps more important, results of a personnel survey (Sub-Committee Report, 1983, p. 96) show a greater degree of optimism among males, when compared to females, regarding the likelihood or expectation of future promotion.

Second, the importance of taking demographic variables into account, as noted by Markham et al. (1985), indicates that a further possible reason for the generally conflicting findings concerning sex differences in work values is that organizations may differ in the demographic structure of their male and female work forces. Particular organizations, for example, may recruit or promote either family men or women without children, thus leading to apparent male-female differences in those work values influenced by whether or not respondents have children. These and other selective recruitment/promotion practices need also to be taken into consideration by future researchers wishing to unravel the complicated relationship between work values, job attributes, and gender.

Third, while longitudinal research by Mortimer and Lorence (1979) shows that perceived job characteristics influence work values, Kalleberg (1977) suggests the possibility of a reciprocal relationship between these two variables. Hence one's work values may influence the way the job is seen, as well as being influenced by job perceptions. This presents a serious conceptual

problem for exploring gender differences in work values. On the one hand, controlling for job perceptions may lead to an understatement of the relationship between work values and gender. On the other hand, failure to control for job perceptions may result in an overestimate of the impact of gender on work values. This failure to take employees' perceptions of job characteristics properly into account may explain the varied findings when testing for gender differences in work values. Consistent with this explanation, in two instances in this study where objective measures were introduced in order to control for possible differences in job characteristics experienced by men and women in the same position (i.e., getting ahead in the organization and security), actual job characteristics contributed significantly to differences in work values.

Lastly, results of the analysis concerning interaction effects between gender and type of work (research versus administration), as well as the direct effect of type of work on variations in the importance attached to numerous work values, give credence to the argument that the array of occupations considered may be crucial in determining whether or not male-female differences in work values emerge (Brief et al., 1977, p. 645).

In conclusion, while many of the findings presented in this study are consistent with the thesis that gender differences in work values are the outcome of adaptations to gender differences in organizational structure, certainly not all observed differences can or should be explained in this way. Feldberg and Glenn (1982) define two models that have been used to analyze men and women's relationships to employment: a job model, which "treats the work people do as the primary independent variable" (1982, p. 66), and a gender model, in which "women's relationship to employment is treated as derivative of personal characteristics and relationships to family situations" (1982, p. 67). Given that both organizational and sociodemographic variables have a significant impact on work values, "an integrated model which takes into account the *interaction* between job and gender factors" (Feldberg and Glenn, 1982, p. 68), appears to be a model well worth pursuing.

## NOTES

1. The study was carried out primarily to examine sex discrimination and its correlates in the organization. To enable attitudinal analysis of those in power, a higher proportion of males over 35 in the most senior positions in the organization was drawn in the sample. Thus the representative samples of males is somewhat biased in favor of this group. Although this bias could exacerbate gender differences between women and representative males, this effect should be minimized by the controls introduced for seniority.

2. There are other possible explanations of why there is a greater difference in male research and administrative work values than in equivalent female values. For example, as a result of stereotyping "female work," there may be a tendency for women, compared to men, to have more universal work experiences regardless of occupation or employment sector. Such work experiences, in turn, may lead to more universal values across different work contexts. Alternatively, the difference may be unrelated to adaptation to structurally imposed differences in work experiences, and simply reflect greater flexibility by men to select, in accordance with their work values, in the nature or function of the work context in which they will be employed.

## REFERENCES

- Bartol, K. M. 1976. "Relationship of Sex and Professional Training Area to Job Orientation." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 61:368-370.
- Brief, A. P. and R. J. Aldag. 1975. "Male-Female Differences in Occupational Attitudes Within Minority Groups." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 6:305-314.
- Brief, A. P., G. L. Rose, and R. J. Aldag. 1977. "Sex Differences in Preferences for Job Attributes Revisited." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 62:645-646.
- Centers, R. and D. E. Bugental. 1966. "Intrinsic and Extrinsic Job Motivations Among Different Segments of the Working Population." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 50:193-197.
- Feldberg, R. and E. Glenn. 1982. "Male and Female: Job Versus Gender Models in the Sociology of Work." Pp. 65-80 in *Women and Work: Problems and Perspectives*, edited by R. Kahn-Hut, A. Daniels, and R. Colvard. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Herzberg, F. B. Mausner, R. O. Peterson, and D. F. Capwell. 1957. *Job Attitudes: Review of Research and Opinion*. Pittsburgh: Psychological Service of Pittsburgh.
- Kalleberg, A. L. 1977. "Work Values and Job Rewards: A Theory of Job Satisfaction." *American Sociological Review* 42:124-143.
- Kanter, R. M. 1976. "The Impact of Hierarchical Structures on the Work Behavior of Women and Men." *Social Problems* 23:415-430.
- . 1977. *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Markham, W. T., S. J. South, C. M. Bonjean, and J. Corder. 1985. "Gender and Opportunity in the Federal Bureaucracy." *American Journal of Sociology* 91:129-150.
- McCullagh, P. 1980. "Regression Models for Ordinal Data." *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society* 42:109-142.

- 1982. *PLUM: An Interactive Computer Package for Analyzing Ordinal Data* (revised by Vinh Dao). Melbourne, Australia: Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology.
- Miller, J. 1980. "Individual and Occupational Determinants of Job Satisfaction: A Focus on Gender Differences." *Sociology of Work and Occupations* 7:337-366.
- S. Labovitz, and L. Fry. 1975. "Inequities in the Organizational Experiences of Women and Men." *Social Forces* 54:365-381.
- Mortimer, J. T. and J. Lorence. 1979. "Work Experience and Occupational Value Socialization: A Longitudinal Study." *American Journal of Sociology* 84:1361-1385.
- Rosenbach, W. E., R. C. Dailey, and C. P. Morgan. 1979. "Perceptions of Job Characteristics and Affective Work Outcomes for Women and Men." *Sex Roles* 5:267-277.
- Schuler, R. S. 1975. "Sex, Organizational Level and Outcome Importance: Where the Differences Are." *Personnel Psychology* 28:365-375.
- Slesinger, J. A. 1961. *Personnel Adaptations in the Federal Junior Management Assistant Program*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
- Sub-Committee Report. 1983. *Consultative Council on the Status of Women in CSIRO*. Melbourne, Australia: Author.
- Tavaglia, T. C. and T. Ziemba. 1978. "Linkages to Work: A Study of the 'Central Life Interests' and 'Work Attachments' of Male and Female Workers." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 12:305-320.

*Cecily C. Neil is Principal Research Scientist, Division of Building Research, Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization, Melbourne, Australia. Her areas of interest include the sociology of work and occupations, gender roles, and organizational analysis. She has published numerous articles and research monographs on such topics as job satisfaction, work values, and job discrimination and is currently working on a book dealing with alternative explanations to gender-related job discrimination.*

*William E. Snizek is Professor of Sociology at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. His areas of interest include the sociology of work and occupations, organizational behavior, and the sociology of science. He has published over 50 articles in these areas and recently received a grant from the National Science Foundation to study Scientific Productivity and Communication Networks Among University Scientists.*