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Abstract

Statistics indicate that women in management remain concentrated in junior levels while underrepresented in senior positions (Employment and Immigration Canada, 1992). Researchers have pointed to the effects of sex discrimination as responsible for women's slow progress into upper-management (Morrison & Von Glinow, 1990). Given this disadvantageous situation, the question remains: What activities do women managers initiate to improve their conditions in the organization? The purpose of the present study is to examine this issue while considering a significant situational factor: women's proportional representation. Moreover, the concept of relative deprivation was used to account for women's motivation to take an active role in the promotion of their personal and collective situation. Reactions from a total of 253 women managers were solicited. Univariate and multivariate analyses of variance uncovered four noteworthy findings: (1) greater personal deprivation was expressed among women managers who either perceived themselves as underrepresented or perceived the entrance of no new female recruits in their work group; (2) greater collective relative deprivation was reported among women who held high, rather than low personal relative deprivation scores; (3) the preferred group enhancement activity for women who expressed high, rather than low levels of collective deprivation was endorsement of employment equity programmes and (4) priority was given to the individual strategy, intention to leave, for women who expressed high, rather than low personal deprivation. Theoretical and practical implications of these results are discussed.
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CHAPTER 1: Theoretical Background

Introduction

The year 1975 marked the International Year of the Woman and a new beginning in a series of efforts to improve the disadvantaged situation of women in the workforce. These attempts focused on increasing the representation of women in all sectors of employment, and at all levels of the hierarchy. Now that almost 20 years have passed, it is worth asking whether these goals have been reached.

It has become increasingly clear that over the last two decades, women have come to represent an important segment of the labour market. The proportion of women has been growing at a steady rate (Blum & Smith, 1988; Burke, 1991; Davidson & Cooper, 1992; Gutek, 1993; Schwartz, 1989; Sutton & Moore, 1985), and has now reached 44.11% (Employment and Immigration Canada, 1992). If this trend continues, by the year 2000, women will form the largest group of new entrants into the workforce (Fagenson, 1993; Packer & Johnston, 1988).

Women's situation, however, has certainly not improved at an equal pace. For instance, according to the Annual Report on Employment Equity (1992), women now earn 72.7% of men's average annual earnings, an increase of only 2% in the last five years. Women's career progression has similarly stagnated, despite employment equity initiatives. According to statistics, women's promotion rate declined since 1990 by 2.34% (Employment and Immigration Canada, 1992). Statistics reveal that women remain
concentrated in traditional areas of employment while underrepresented in nontraditional employment (Employment and Immigration Canada, 1992; Statistics Canada, 1993).

The profile of women in management is not unlike that of women in the workforce. For instance, according to statistics, the percentage of women occupying management positions has risen from 3.4% in 1975 to 12.1% in 1992 (Statistics Canada, 1993). Despite this trend, research reveals that the situation of women in management remains difficult. A study of the career paths of men and women managers shows that significant gaps persist in terms of salary increases, despite common factors, such as education, workplace and family obligations (Stroh, Brett & Reilly, 1992) or comparable levels of education, performance, age, and experience (Cox & Harquail, 1991). In addition, women continue to be concentrated in entry-level positions while underrepresented in senior ranks (Adler, 1993; McKeen, 1991; Morrison & Von Glinow, 1990; Morrison, White & Van Velsor, 1987). For example, while women occupy 40.8% of middle and other management positions, they represent 8.38% of upper-level management (Employment and Immigration Canada, 1992). This seems a paradox given the increase over the years of women pursuing their studies in professional and managerial fields (McKeen, 1991; McKeen & Burke, 1991; Schwartz, 1989).

Many reasons have been given to explain why women are underrepresented in upper management. These explanations can be categorized into two broad themes, that is, person-centered and
situation-centered arguments (Gutek, 1993; Riger & Galligan, 1980). According to person-centered arguments, the scarcity of women in senior ranks is attributed to their unique personality and behavioural characteristics. An example of such traits is women's unwillingness to take the necessary risks for the sake of career advancement (Rosen & Jerdee, 1978). Yet, studies have shown that women and men do not differ in terms of commitment, dedication and willingness to assume the costs involved in career advancement (Chusmir, 1985a; Rynes & Rosen, 1983). In fact, according to results of a study conducted by Chusmir (1985b), women managers are significantly more motivated than men.

Proponents of the person-centered position will further claim that sex differences in career advancement are due to women's youth, lack of experience and seniority (Lewis, 1992), or repeated leaves from the workforce due to child rearing responsibilities (Herriot, Gibson, Pemberton & Pinder, 1993). However, researchers have found that upon controlling for factors such as the length of tenure, age, level of education (Stewart & Gudykunst, 1982), childhood socialization, formal education, productivity (Cannings, 1988), child rearing responsibilities (Tucker, 1985), career paths, performance, education (Cox & Harquail, 1991), years spent in the workforce and company tenure (Stroh, Brett & Reilly, 1992), women lag behind men in terms of career progression in management.

The situation-centered approach represents an alternative explanation of women's underrepresentation in upper management.
Implicit in situation-centered explanation is the belief that the source of women's slow climb up the corporate ladder is due to organizational and social structures rather than inherent female traits (Kanter, 1977, 1987). For instance, in an investigation of the limited career progression of women managers, Morrison, White and Van Velsor (1987) proposed the presence of a glass ceiling as the factor responsible for the scarcity of women in senior ranks. This glass ceiling is defined as a subtle, invisible but nevertheless, impenetrable systemic barrier which excludes women from gaining access to the "inner sanctum of senior management" (Morrison, White & Van Velsor, 1987, p.142).

Factors identified as responsible for the presence of this glass ceiling include gender bias and stereotyping (Morrison & Von Glinow, 1990; Morrison, White & Van Velsor, 1987). For instance, studies have demonstrated that the perception of women in management is gender biased, and incompatible to the attributes conferred to the image of managers (Brenner, Tomkiewicz & Schein, 1989; Heilman, Block, Martell & Simon, 1989). In addition, sex discrimination, although more subtle than in the past (Benokraitis & Feagin, 1986; Colwill, 1982; Simpson, McCarrey & Edwards, 1987), continues to negatively affect the evaluation of women's managerial skills and potential (Shore, 1992; Tougas, Brown, Beaton & Joly, in press).

The relevance of a situation-centered approach in accounting for the difficulties faced by women managers has been recognized in the Canadian context. For instance, the Employment Equity
Bill, implemented in 1986, required employers to design measures to counter sex discrimination in the workplace, and thus increase the representation of women. However, it is argued that these programmes may not be sufficient means in themselves to produce the necessary changes to the disadvantaged situation of women managers. For instance, women must be ready to assume the responsibility of their own career progression by taking the necessary steps to reach upper management. These steps may include participating in training courses to develop their skills, sitting on committees, demonstrating their enthusiasm and motivation to climb up the corporate ladder. Furthermore, women must be favourable to the different employment equity strategies introduced within the organization (Tougas & Beaton, 1993). Finally, women must be willing to take an active part in encouraging and promoting the disadvantaged situation of members of their ingroup.

In sum, two broad categories of explanations have been addressed to account for women's lack of representation in senior management. On the one hand, according to the person-centered approach, the source of women's underrepresentation is traced back to their unique attributes. On the other hand, and in contrast, the situation-centered mode of explanation points to obstacles inherent to the organizational system which impedes women's access to top ranks in management. The value of both approaches has been recognized by social policy makers in their attempt to redress the situation of women in management. For
example, employment equity has been designed not only to identify and eliminate systemic discrimination but also to include means which enable women to help themselves, such as introducing leadership training courses and workshops, career counselling, formal networking and orientation programmes. Thus the conclusion that despite employment equity initiatives, women managers must be understood as active agents in any process involving the promotion of their personal and group situation.

We cannot proceed to examine determinants to strategies adopted by women without addressing the effects of their level of representation. As statistics reveal, a disproportionate representation of women across different levels of management has remained a lingering problem, and thus part of their reality. The purpose of the present study is to examine, within the scope of this reality, factors that lead women managers to adopt the necessary means to counter the difficulties faced in an organization. Strategies addressed in the present study range from managing one’s own career, advocating for a women’s support system in the organization to endorsing employment equity initiatives. These strategies have been proposed as effective means in thwarting the detrimental effects of discriminatory practices (Morrison & Von Glinow, 1990; Tougas & Beaton, 1992).

To examine these issues, the present thesis project will include four chapters. In the first chapter, the theoretical background will be presented. The first issue discussed deals with the effect of women’s level of representation. Specifically,
the focus will be placed on the token phenomenon, a consequence of women's underrepresentation in a nontraditional work setting (Kanter 1977, 1987). In a following section, the concept of relative deprivation will be introduced in an effort to demonstrate how it can be used to account on the one hand, for the experiences of discrimination among women in management and on the other hand, for social change activities. This section will be followed by an integration of hypotheses which will be tested using a sample of women managers. The second chapter will include descriptions of the sample under study, the measurements used to assess each concept, and the analyses conducted. Furthermore, the third chapter will include a discussion of the results obtained for each hypothesis. Finally, these results will be discussed in the fourth, and last chapter.
Tokenism

Research in the area of tokenism was first conducted in the 70's to investigate the particular circumstances of women introduced in nontraditional work settings. Upon examining the experiences of these women pioneers, researchers soon recognized that as tokens, women faced unique challenges in their attempt to integrate within a male dominated field of employment.

The first author to formally address the situation of these female tokens was Laws (1975). In her analysis of the work experiences of women in academia, Laws defines tokenism, as:

"Tokenism is likely to be found wherever a dominant group is under pressure to share privilege, power, or other desirable commodities with a group which is excluded. Tokenism is the means by which the dominant group advertises a promise of mobility between the dominant and excluded classes. By definition, however, tokenism involves mobility which is severely restricted in quantity, and the quality of mobility is severely restricted as well. (Laws, 1975, p.51)"

The work conducted by Kanter (1977) has served to elaborate further on the effects of tokenism. Two important contributions have been made by this author in the development of the area of tokenism. First, this author has argued that the tokenism phenomenon does not only apply to the group of women in male dominated fields of work, but rather to any group members who are found to occupy a minority status. Second, the work conducted by Kanter (1977) represents the first attempt to investigate the
type of experiences encountered by minority group members, in this case, women in management. In the following, an outline of her results are discussed.

In light of a study conducted in a large organization, named INDSCO, Kanter proposed three structural factors which affect the work experiences of women and men. One of these factors has been identified as the proportional representation of women relative to men. Specifically, through her interviews with employees, Kanter (1977) has recognized that the more women were underrepresented, the more they were susceptible to encounter gender-based barriers. In fact, this author contends, that the difficulties encountered by women are most critical when the minority group makes up approximately 15% or less of the work group.

A first set of difficulties encountered by tokens at INDSCO includes misperceptions. According to Kanter, minority group members are viewed in a stereotyped fashion. To add to this burden, these stereotypes often restrict the performance and activities of minority group members. For example, these individuals are expected to behave in a manner which conforms to stereotypic beliefs. A second set of difficulties identified involves what Kanter has named the tokenism eclipse. The tokenism eclipse refers to misdirected attention given to irrelevant or non-ability attributes rather than actual work performance. For instance, attention is directed towards physical attributes of women rather than achievements and
successes. As a result, minority group members have to work twice as hard as dominant group members to provide evidence of their capabilities and competence. As Kanter reports: "The women had to put in extra effort to make their technical skills known, and said they worked twice as hard to prove their competence" (p.216). A third set of difficulties encountered by tokens at INDSCO consists of exclusionary practices such as contrast. Contrast is a practice used by dominant group members to emphasize shared aspects of the ingroup and focus on differences with tokens. The purpose of contrast is to exclude tokens and create boundaries preventing their acceptance into the dominant group. Consequently, the contrast practice has led tokens at INDSCO to experience isolation, and alienation from important social networks and sponsors (Kanter, 1977).

To sum up, the results obtained by Kanter (1977) revealed that as women in INDSCO occupy a minority positions, they become vulnerable to discriminatory practices and sexist views. This finding has sparked much interest among researchers and attempts have been made to examine the validity and generalization of the negative effects of tokenism in a variety of situations ranging from controlled laboratory settings to organizational contexts. In the following, studies investigating the negative effects of tokenism among women are presented.

Laboratory studies have been conducted to demonstrate the negative effects of tokenism (Hurtig & Pichevin, 1990; Shomer & Centers, 1970). A classic example of this demonstration is the
study conducted by Taylor, Fiske, Etoff and Ruderman (1978). The purpose of this experiment was to investigate whether participants discriminate against women when evaluating male and female members of a discussion group. Results indicate that as the number of women in the discussion group decreased, women were perceived as significantly less warm, pleasant, organized, and increasingly more sex-typed. This design was also used in a study carried out by Craig and Sherif (1986), to verify the effects of gender group composition. Results supported the disadvantaged situation of female tokens in the discussion group. For instance, it was demonstrated that women are less influential when placed in a discussion group as a "solo woman" than in an equal gender group.

Field studies lent further support to the difficulties faced by women as they occupied a minority status. Research revealed the presence of stereotyped perceptions of female tokens (Floge & Merrill, 1986; Johnson & Schulman, 1989; Ott, 1989; Yoder, Adams & Prince, 1983; Yoder, Adams, Grove & Priest, 1985). For instance, studies demonstrated that as minority group members, women were associated with characteristics such as gender stereotypes (Heilman, 1980), lack of power (Yoder, et al., 1985), physical weakness (Yoder, Adams & Prince, 1983), lacking leadership initiative (Floge & Merrill, 1986; Yoder, Adams, & Prince, 1983), or leadership capabilities (Ott, 1989). Furthermore, across a variety of nontraditional areas of employment, it was found that female tokens face the pressures of
heightened visibility (Floge & Merrill, 1986; Ott, 1989; Yoder, Adams & Prince, 1983). Performance pressures, due to increased visibility are also reported as particularly debilitating for token women. For instance, according to Spangler, Gordon and Pipkin, (1978), performance pressures experienced by token female law students were found to have negative repercussions on their academic achievement.

Research further corroborates the presence of the contrast effect encountered by tokens (Floge & Merrill, 1986; Ott, 1989; Yoder, Adams & Prince, 1983). Female tokens are more likely to feel less accepted by their peers, and excluded from social networks or events (Yoder, 1985). As one token senior female cadet reported: "There were a lot of rumors going around that we (women) should not have been cadets" (Yoder, Adams & Prince, 1983, p.329).

However, research has not consistently demonstrated that tokenism elicits discriminatory practices and sexism. Studies conducted among women in nontraditional employment have revealed that in some cases, tokens benefit from more positive experiences than other groups of women. For example, it was found that token women receive more social support from male coworkers and supervisors (South, Bonjean, Markham & Corder, 1982; South, Markham, Bonjean & Corder, 1987), face less negative attitudes (Deaux & Ullman, 1983), experience less performance pressures (Harlan & Weiss, 1981), and less sexual harassment (Gruber & Bjorn, 1982) than women who are more equitably represented.
Yoder (1991) offers an explanation to account for these mitigating results. This author claims that the effect of numerical imbalance is not a sufficient factor in triggering the negative experiences encountered by token women. Yoder contends that, in conjunction with numerical imbalance, Kanter has confounded three additional variables in her research on tokenism. The first variable identified by Yoder is gender status. According to this author, token women are more likely to face negative experiences than token men. This position is in strict contradiction with Kanter's view. Kanter (1977) has argued that the mere scarcity of members of any group be it women or men, is a sufficient and necessary factor contributing to the negative consequences of tokenism. This position has not been supported by research. Results rather demonstrated that token men encounter more positive experiences than token women (Johnson & Schulman, 1989; Ott, 1989). For example, in comparison to female tokens, male tokens are more likely to be identified as group leaders (Crocker & McGraw, 1984), viewed as influential (Craig & Sherif, 1986), and competent (Floge & Merrill, 1986). These results have led some authors to suspect that sexism against women is inherent to the tokenism process (Yoder, 1991; Zimmer, 1988).

Occupational inappropriateness has also been raised by Yoder (1991) as an additional element contributing to the tokenism effect. This author contends that when women occupy nontraditional occupations they become deviants of a norm
prescribing what is appropriate work for a woman. Violation of such a norm is believed to contribute to the denigration of token women. Yoder further argues that the importance of the occupational inappropriateness factor has been implicitly considered by researchers of the token phenomenon among women. For instance, South and his colleagues (1982) have made deliberate attempts to focus specifically on a sample of women who occupy nontraditional, and thus, inappropriate occupations.

The last factor identified by Yoder (1991) is termed intrusiveness and involves the impact of an increase of women. Yoder suggests that a sharp increase in the representation of women will threaten members of the dominant group, in this case, men. As a result, men will react to this threat by engaging in discriminatory behaviours in order to limit the gains made by women. These discriminatory practices, according to Yoder, will include sexual harassment, wage inequities, and few promotion opportunities (Yoder, 1991, p.184).

Yoder (1991) further contends that the effect of intrusiveness must be considered in conjunction with the numerical representation of women in a given work group. This author proposes that the negative impact of intrusiveness is heightened specifically when the size of the group of women is small. For example, an increase of two women among a group of five employees is believed to be more dramatic than an increase of two women within a group of ten employees.

Although the role of intrusiveness in eliciting the negative
experiences among tokens has not been tested, this factor may account for mitigated results obtained in research on the effects of tokenism. For example, a study conducted by South and his colleagues (1982) was designed to investigate the extent of encouragement and support, professional and managerial women receive from male colleagues and supervisors. Results obtained did not replicate Kanter's findings, but rather indicated that as women's level of representation increased, women were less likely to receive social support from male peers and supervisors. Yoder claims that these findings "...clearly support intrusiveness theory" (p.186). Although Yoder's statement is premature, it is noteworthy to add that the sample under study consisted of women who occupied upper level positions. It could thus be argued that a surge of women within the higher rungs of the organizational ladder, could have led men to respond with less supportive behaviours. It is also possible that mitigating results found in previous research on the effects of tokenism among women do not necessarily contradict Kanter's position, but rather demonstrate the need to isolate confounding factors, particularly, the role of intrusiveness from the proportional representation of women.

In sum, previous studies designed to evaluate the effects of the numerical representation of women on their work experiences are inconclusive. To shed light on the nature of size effects, Yoder has proposed to isolate confounding factors. As of yet the hypotheses presented by this author have not been tested. The goal of the present study is to examine the impact of the
numerical representation among women managers in light of arguments raised by Yoder (1991). It is believed that women managers represent an appropriate sample with which to test Yoder's proposals for the following two reasons. First, given that the present study is conducted among women in a nontraditional field, two factors presented by Yoder (1991), that is, gender status and occupational appropriateness are considered. Second, the intrusiveness factor is of particular relevance among women managers. Over the past few years, the increase of women in management ranks has been steady. However, as authors point out, this trend has not been felt at an equal rate across all levels of the hierarchy (Blum & Smith, 1988; Burke, 1991; Employment and Immigration Canada, 1992; Davidson & Cooper, 1992; Schwartz, 1989; Sutton & Moore, 1985).

Based on arguments raised by Yoder (1991), the present study will seek to verify the impact of both women's level of representation, and intrusiveness on the extent of personal discrimination experienced in the organization. It is proposed that women will perceive greater discrimination as their level of representation decreases and the amount of new female recruits increases. This hypothesis is based on the belief that the difficulties encountered by token women will be exacerbated by reactions of male colleagues to a surge of women entering a male dominated area of employment.

The perceptions of discrimination experienced by women managers will be assessed via the concept of relative
deprivation. In the next section, this concept will be defined and relevant research conducted in this area will be presented.
Relative deprivation

The concept of relative deprivation has been used to account for feelings expressed by individuals following a disadvantageous social comparison (Crosby, 1976). Relative deprivation is not a recent issue, and can be traced back to the work conducted by Karl Marx in the late 19th Century (e.g. Marx & Engels, 1897). Over the years, however, research has broadened our understanding of the nature of relative deprivation. In the following, these contributions will be presented and briefly discussed.

The concept of relative deprivation was first formally introduced by Stouffer and his colleagues to interpret unexpected results obtained among American military personnel in their perception of promotion opportunities (Stouffer, Suchman, Devinney, Star & Williams, 1949). The purpose of their study was to examine whether members of the military police, and air corps officers were satisfied with the amount of promotions allocated. It was found that although air corps officers were twice as likely to receive promotions, they were significantly more dissatisfied than members of the military police.

To account for this paradox, these researchers refer to the nature of the social comparison process. Once individuals recognize that, in comparison to other ingroup members, they have not obtained what is believed to be legitimate gains, they will experience relative deprivation. However, as individuals perceive their own situation as favourable to that of their colleagues, they will feel relative satisfaction. In this
manner, air corps officers who have not been promoted will compare their situation with that of the majority of air corps colleagues who have benefitted from a promotion. As a result, they will come to feel relatively deprived of what is believed to be a legitimate right. In contrast, within the group of military police officers, a promoted individual who compares his lot with that of his peers will feel relatively satisfied. Although Stouffer and his colleagues have not offered a formal definition, these interpretations shed light on some fundamental principles of relative deprivation. It is argued that the sense of relative deprivation is triggered once an individual who lacks something (X) 1) wants X; 2) believes that he/she deserves X; and 3) recognizes that similar others possess X.

Following this initial study, a number of researchers proceeded to investigate antecedents and consequences of relative deprivation. Among these, Runciman (1966) is credited as being a major force in the development of this concept. This author proposed an additional principle to the definition of relative deprivation, that is, the belief that attaining a desired outcome is feasible. This precondition is the element which distinguishes feelings of relative deprivation from wishful thinking (Taylor & Moghaddam, 1987).

The work on relative deprivation conducted by Runciman (1966) will be discussed throughout this section. In the following, we will begin by pointing out two of his noteworthy contributions. In the first instance, Runciman (1966) has
proposed that relative deprivation contains two dimensions, that is, a cognitive and an affective component. On the one hand, the cognitive component refers to the perception of disparities between both the object compared and the referent other. On the other hand, the affective component of relative deprivation accounts for the intensity of the feelings triggered by this perceived discrepancy (Gaskell & Smith, 1984; Guimond & Dubé-Simard, 1983; Isaac, Mutran & Stryker, 1980; Martin & Murray, 1983; Walker & Pettigrew, 1984). Walker and Pettigrew (1984) illustrate the relationship between the cognitive and affective components of relative deprivation as such:

"Suppose that B receives a better salary than A even though they have the same experience and job. If A compares herself with B, A will arrive at the belief that she is deprived relative to B on the dimension of salary (the cognitive component). If neither equality nor money is highly valued by A, she may attach scant affect to the belief. But if A places central importance on either equality or money, she may well attach intense affect to the belief. As throughout social psychology, the behavioural effects of the cognitive component of RD should be mediated by the concomitant affective component" (p.308).

Runciman’s second noteworthy contribution lies in his proposal of a taxonomy of relative deprivation. This author identified four different types of relative deprivations on the basis of the object compared, and the referent other. Among
these, two are of particular interest in the present study. The first, named egoistical relative deprivation, which is also called personal relative deprivation, refers to the feeling of dissatisfaction due to a disadvantageous comparison between one's self and other ingroup members. For example, a woman manager could report discontent following an unfavourable comparison with other female colleagues, in terms of access to training opportunities. More recently, Walker and Pettigrew (1984) have identified two distinct types of personal relative deprivation. According to these authors, a distinction should be made between personal relative deprivation involving a social comparison between oneself and ingroup members, and a comparison between oneself and members of an outgroup. While the former has been the most widely used by researchers (Crosby, 1976; Runciman, 1966), Walker and Pettigrew (1984) contend that the latter form of personal relative deprivation has received little attention:

"Comparisons denoted by cell (d) (self vs. outgroup) are rarely studied; but since it directly involves self, any such comparison leading to a negative evaluation of self constitutes a form of egoistic RD" (p.306).

In the present study, the focus is placed on personal relative deprivation involving a comparison between the self and outgroup members. The selection of this form of personal relative deprivation is based on the belief that upon measuring the perception of sex discrimination as experienced by women managers, a social comparison with male colleagues, that is,
members of the outgroup, is most pertinent.

The second type of deprivation presented by Runciman (1966) is termed fraternal relative deprivation, that we prefer to call, collective relative deprivation, is defined as the feeling of dissatisfaction produced by perceived inequities between one's ingroup and an advantaged outgroup. In light of the previous example, women managers may come to feel discontent following the recognition of inequitable access to training opportunities which disadvantages women relative to men in an organization.

**Personal and collective relative deprivation**

Research in the area of relative deprivation has also focused on the link between personal and collective relative deprivation. In fact, two theoretical approaches have been proposed to account for the relationship between personal and collective relative deprivation. The first was developed by Runciman (1966) and is termed the generalization hypothesis. According to Runciman (1966), collective relative deprivation is the product of a generalization of experiences of personal relative deprivation. In other words, individuals are believed to translate, at the group level, their personal disadvantageous experiences.

However, the generalization hypothesis has been contested by Dibble (1981). According to this author, the generalization hypothesis cannot account for the complex relationship between both forms of deprivation. For instance, Dibble (1981) argues:

"[Runciman] assumes that a worker who feels grossly
underpaid, and who also has no ambitions to rise above his fellows, will more or less automatically generalize his experience to that of most workers and will experience deprivation as a member of the working class. Such a generalization cannot be taken for granted. For one thing, in order to generalize from one's own experience to a category, one must perceive oneself as belonging to that category" (p.150).

The importance of group membership in mediating the link between a sense of personal and collective relative deprivation has been addressed by other researchers (Dion, 1986; Petta & Walker, 1992; Usseem, 1980; Vanneman & Pettigrew, 1972). This alternative explanation raises a new issue, that is, the salience of one's group membership which will be discussed in light of the social identity theory.

Social identity theory, proposed by Tajfel (1978, 1982; Tajfel & Turner, 1979) represents a major step in social psychological theory of intergroup relations and group processes. Implicit in its title, this theory places central importance to the genesis of one's social identity. According to Tajfel (1978), social identity is defined as: "that part of an individual's self-concept which derives from his knowledge of his membership of a social group (groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership" (p. 63). In light of this definition, two additional points must be made. In the first case, one implication to Tajfel's definition is that social
identity contains three dimensions, that is, cognition, evaluation, and affect (Brown, Condor, Mathews, Wade & Williams, 1986; Brown & Williams, 1984; Hinkle, Taylor, Fox-Cardamone & Crook, 1989; Karasawa, 1991; Oaker & Brown, 1986; Petta & Walker, 1992). Secondly, Tajfel argues that individuals are motivated to acquire a positively valued social identity. In other words, it is not sufficient for individuals to merely recognize that they are members of a certain group. This membership must further be evaluated as advantageous, and trigger positive affect such as pride among its members. Once these conditions are fulfilled, individuals, according to Tajfel, are said to possess a positive social identity. However, to discover the value of one's group membership, certain steps must be taken. In the following, an overview of this sequence will be presented. The first step involved in the genesis of a positive social identity is the categorization of social stimuli (Hogg & Mcgarthy, 1990; Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Wilkes, 1963). Social categorization is a process whereby an individual will seek to organize his/her social environment in a meaningful fashion. Specifically, based on values and norms, emphasis is placed on differences between categories of people, and similarities within each category.

The result of social categorization are twofold. In the first instance, an individual achieves an understanding of his/her social environment. This provides direction and guidance to one's behaviour. Secondly, and more importantly, social categorization provides the opportunity, for an individual, to
include him/herself within a particular group. It is said that once this is achieved, social identity becomes salient.

However, to determine whether membership within a particular group contributes to a truly positive social identity, a second step must be achieved, that is, social comparison. The status of the ingroup is determined through a comparison between the ingroup, and a salient outgroup on the basis of valued dimensions. The result of a favourable comparison with a salient outgroup will convince an individual that membership within the ingroup enhances his/her social identity. However, an unfavourable social comparison with a given outgroup will lead the individual to believe that his/her membership does not contribute to a positive social identity. According to Tajfel, a social comparison of this nature, that is leading to a negatively valued social identity may also be responsible for the genesis of collective relative deprivation.

In fact, Tajfel (1978) argued that the dynamics involved in the development of one's social identity are also responsible for the functioning of collective relative deprivation. For instance, given that an unfavourable intergroup social comparison has led to a negative evaluation of the ingroup, collective relative deprivation will arise if an individual perceives the low status attributed to the ingroup as based on illegitimate grounds. Put differently, Tougas and Veilleux (1988) argue that: "Collective relative deprivation implies dissatisfaction with the social status of one's group, this being possible only once
membership in a group has been established (p.17)". For example, women managers who acknowledge their membership in a negatively viewed group in comparison to men, could come to feel discontent due to a perceived inequitable and illegitimate intergroup status relationship based on gender-biases.

The first study to test the link between social identity and collective relative deprivation, was conducted by Tougas and Veilleux (1988) among French Canadian women professionals, housewives and office workers. Respondents were asked to complete a questionnaire which assessed, among other variables, their level of identification to the group of women and collective relative deprivation. Contrary to hypotheses, results of a structural equation modeling technique revealed that the link between identification and collective relative deprivation was not significant. In fact, it was found that both identification with the ingroup and collective relative deprivation predicted attitudes towards strategies designed to improve the situation of women in the workforce.

The absence of any link between social identity and collective relative deprivation in this study has been attributed to limitations in the social identity scale devised (Fetta & Walker, 1992; Tougas, Beaton & Joly, 1990). This measure contained only two items which represented only the cognitive dimension of social identity, as defined by Tajfel (1978). Consequently, due to measurement problems, the role of social identity as a predictor of collective relative deprivation among
women requires further attention.

In sum, research concerning social identity and relative deprivation has focused mainly on the association between social identity and collective relative deprivation. It has been argued that the psychological processes implicit in the development of social identity are further responsible for the emergence of collective relative deprivation among disadvantaged group members. However, due to problems encountered in the measurement of social identity, the proposal whereby a strong attachment to a disadvantaged group will trigger discontent due to a perceived illegitimate status has not been confirmed among women in the workforce.

The work discussed to date has only been concerned with the relationship between social identity, and collective relative deprivation. This represents only one side of the coin. The next issue which must be addressed involves the hypothesized link between personal relative deprivation and social identity.

In explaining the link between personal and social identity, we begin by addressing the following question: How does a woman manager account for her disadvantaged situation in comparison to her male colleagues? A list of possible attributions could include personal inadequacies, budgetary constraints, unreasonable demands on behalf of self, etc. However, it is believed that in an organizational context where it is recognized that resources and power are distributed inequitably among women and men, a woman manager may come to believe that her personal
disadvantaged situation is intimately linked to her gender status. This argument has been made elsewhere. For instance, Taylor and Moghaddam (1987) describe how disadvantaged group members explain their failures:

"Thus, they will look to external factors to explain their failure to move into the advantaged group. More specifically, they will see the actions of the advantaged group as having unjustly prevented their upward social mobility. Furthermore, they will switch from seeing their own personal characteristics as being the cause of their disadvantaged position to seeing the actions of the dominant group as being causally responsible. Thus, they will gradually see events in intergroup rather than in individualistic terms" (p.160).

In this sense, it is argued that the strength of personal relative deprivation will heighten the salience of one’s social identity among members of a low status group.

In a survey conducted among lesbians, Crosby, Pufall, Snyder, O’Connell and Whalen (1989) attempted to examine the link between identity, personal and collective relative deprivation. Correlational analyses indicated that all three concepts were significantly linked. Yet, no analyses were conducted to demonstrate their sequential role.

A study conducted by Petta and Walker (1992) pushed further Crosby’s study by testing the role of personal relative deprivation in predicting ethnic social identity. Much like the
results obtained by Crosby and her colleagues (1989), a correlational analysis indicated that social identity was significantly linked to personal relative deprivation. Yet, despite this link, regression analyses revealed that personal relative deprivation was not a significant predictor of ethnic social identity. However, it is believed that the measurement used in assessing personal relative deprivation was not appropriate given the type of referent other used in the social comparison. Petta and Walker (1992), in this instance, asked respondents to compare their own personal situations (e.g., job opportunities, income, standard of living, social services, education) with that of members of the ingroup. In our opinion, it is unlikely that any perceived inequity between an individual and members of one's own group will increase the saliency of one's group membership. In fact, it is argued that any discrepancy between one's situation, and that of other ingroup members may only heighten perceived intragroup differences, and alienate the individual from other ingroup members.

In summary, to account for the relationship between personal and collective relative deprivation, two competing hypotheses have been presented. The first, named the generalization hypothesis, proposed by Runciman (1966), predicts a direct link between personal and collective relative deprivation. In other words, a sense of personal deprivation is believed to spontaneously generalize to deprivation on behalf of one's group. This proposal, however is problematic given that Runciman (1966)
has conceived this link in light of a form of personal relative deprivation which discounts any comparisons with a salient outgroup.

Dibble (1981) has opposed the generalization hypothesis on the basis of its inability to account for the complexity involved in the nature of the relationship between personal and collective relative deprivation. According to Dibble (1981), and Dion (1986) the salience of group membership is believed to act as a mediating factor between personal and collective relative deprivation. Studies conducted in this area have demonstrated that the three variables are indeed linked (Crosby et al., 1989). However, due to measurement problems of social identity (Tougas & Veilleux, 1988), and to the nature of the personal relative deprivation addressed (Petta & Walker, 1992), the predictive role of each variable has not been clearly established. The question as to the mediating role of ingroup identification between personal and collective relative deprivation remains at best, obscure.

In the present study the opportunity will be taken to examine the validity of these two competing hypotheses concerning the link between personal and collective relative deprivation among women managers. The generalization hypothesis, as proposed by Runciman (1966) will be investigated in light of a form of personal relative deprivation involving a social comparison between the self and members of the outgroup. It is argued that this type of deprivation will provide a more valid assessment of
the generalization hypothesis. In this sense, discontent due to a perceived unfavourable situation between the self and male colleagues will lead women managers to recognize perceived intolerable inequalities based on one's sex group. In addition, the opportunity will be taken to evaluate an alternative hypothesis (Dibble, 1981; Dion, 1986). It has been argued that the link between personal and collective relative deprivation is mediated through one's social identity. Specifically, it is predicted that among members of a disadvantaged group, such as women managers, a sense of personal relative deprivation due to disadvantageous comparisons between the self, and fortunate male colleagues will trigger the salience of one's group membership. A salient group membership, in turn, will lead to discontent due to a perceived inequitable status relationship between women, and men in the organization.

Feelings of personal and collective deprivation may instigate the type of social change which improves a situation perceived as disadvantageous. To address this issue, we turn once again to the work conducted by Runciman (1966).

**Effects of personal and collective relative deprivation**

In distinguishing between personal, and collective relative deprivation, Runciman (1966) argued that both forms of deprivation differ in their ability to trigger certain sets of activities. Specifically, this author argues that collective relative deprivation accounts for strategies aiming to improve the situation of the ingroup. For example, in reaction to felt
deprivation on behalf of the ingroup, women managers will endorse strategies which offer valuable job opportunities for their group. Personal relative deprivation, however, is believed to induce individually oriented initiatives aiming to enhance an individual's personal situation. For example, women managers who experience a strong sense of personal deprivation may come to choose to enrol in advanced computer training to broaden their job prospects.

The importance of collective relative deprivation in determining collective over individual action has received wide support in research and confirms the claim made by Runciman (1966). One of the first clear demonstrations of the link between collective relative deprivation and collective action is found in the work conducted by Guimond and Dubé-Simard (1983). In a study conducted among Francophone university students in Québec, these authors proceeded to examine the association of personal and collective relative deprivation with socio-political attitudes. Relative deprivation was measured in terms of the level of discontent due to the perceived salary distribution between either Francophones, and Anglophones in Québec (collective relative deprivation) or self and other (personal relative deprivation). Results demonstrated no significant link between personal relative deprivation, and socio-political attitudes. Rather, it was found that collective relative deprivation is a better correlate of nationalist attitudes among Francophones in Québec. In other words, discontent due to the
perceived disadvantaged situation of Francophones, relative to
that of Anglophones, was associated with support the nationalist
movement. A more recent study conducted by Dubé and Guimond
(1986), revealed a similar pattern of results as collective,
rather than personal relative deprivation, accounted for activism
among Francophone students in Québec.

Endorsement of collective action among women has also been
the focus of the work conducted by Tougas and her colleagues.
Their work is based on the premise that women will support
strategies designed to eliminate discrimination in an
organization, if they experience a strong sense of collective
relative deprivation. In a study conducted among French Canadian
female undergraduate students, Tougas, Dubé and Veilleux (1987)
found that collective relative deprivation was linked to the
promotion of women in the workforce. Specifically, the sense of
collective deprivation on behalf of the ingroup was significantly
linked to behavioural intentions such as signing a petition and
endorsement of employment equity programmes. The link between
collective relative deprivation and favourable reactions to
employment equity programmes was further demonstrated in studies
conducted with French Canadian women housewives, office workers
and professionals (Tougas & Veilleux, 1988), managers and
professionals (Tougas, Beaton & Joly, 1990; Tougas, Beaton &

Moreover, research has demonstrated the link between
perceived group deprivation and a wide set of group related
behaviours and attitudes such as protest (Orbell, 1967; Opp, 1988; Sears & McConahay, 1970; Taylor, Wright & Ruggiero, 1991; Usseem, 1980; Veilleux, Tougas & Rinfret, 1992), support of social movement (Usseem, 1980; Walker & Mann, 1987), militancy (Abeles, 1976; Birt & Dion, 1987; Dion, 1992), and negative attitudes towards the outgroup (Appelgryn & Nieuwoudt, 1988; Van Dyk & Nieuwoudt, 1990). Furthermore, in a study conducted by Lalonde and Cameron (1993), perception of group disadvantage among immigrants was found to be related to the a collective acculturation orientation, that is, the endorsement of strategies designed to improve the social conditions of the ingroup.

In sum, as predicted by Runciman (1966), research has permitted to demonstrate that: "The key form of relative deprivation for producing social unrest is group-to-group, fraternalistic comparisons..." (Vanneman & Pettigrew, 1972, p.483). However, very little attention has been paid to the predictive role of personal relative deprivation.

The hypothesis whereby personal relative deprivation determines self-enhancement activities has been discussed at length (Abèles, 1976; Crosby, 1976; Martin, 1981), but scarcely investigated (Kawakami & Dion, 1993). In fact, only recently has the effect of personal, and collective relative deprivation on their respective individual and collective behaviours been addressed among women in the workforce.

In a study conducted with women full-time workers, Hafer and Olson (1993) proceeded to demonstrate, following a delayed
testing technique, the causal relationship of personal, and collective relative deprivation with their expected outcomes. To accomplish this task, participants were asked to complete two questionnaires presented on different occasions. The first questionnaire was designed to assess personal, and collective relative deprivation. On the one hand, the measurement of personal relative deprivation included items assessing general dissatisfaction, and resentment with personal job situation. Two additional items were included in the measurement of personal relative deprivation: a comparison between personal job situation in contrast to that of other women, and a similar comparison with other men. On the other hand, collective relative deprivation was assessed with two items tapping into general dissatisfaction with the job situation of women in general, and discontent following a comparison between the job situation of women, and men. One month later, a second questionnaire was administered to participants, containing a range of possible attitudes and behaviours. For example, a distinction was made between self-directed initiatives such as seeking another job or information concerning courses, and collective action as in support of affirmative action or signing a petition. A hierarchical regression procedure revealed that personal relative deprivation was associated with self-directed behaviours, while group enhancement activities were best accounted by collective relative deprivation.

Although the Hafer and Olson (1993) study represents a
significant step in understanding the impact of personal relative deprivation, this work cannot be considered a complete or sufficient test. One problem detected in this study is the confound between two separate types of personal relative deprivations included in the measurement aspect of this concept. According to Hafer and Olson (1993), personal relative deprivation was conceived as the feeling of discontent involving a disadvantageous comparison with two different referent others, that is, women and men. Interestingly, both types of comparisons did not trigger similar responses. In fact, it was found that women reported greater dissatisfaction when comparing their own situation with that of men rather than women. The question remains whether the self-outgroup form of personal relative deprivation is a sufficient factor in triggering individual enhancement initiatives.

In sum, as proposed by Runciman (1966), studies have demonstrated that personal, and collective forms of relative deprivation are linked to separate outcomes. Indeed, there exists a consensus among researchers that collective relative deprivation is related to group, rather than individual enhancement behaviours and attitudes. Research has further demonstrated that personal relative deprivation is associated with individual, rather than collective attempts at enhancing a disadvantaged situation (Hafer & Olson, 1993; Kawakami & Dion, 1993). In the present study, this argument will be tested among women managers in light of individual, and collective behaviours
which are presented in the following section.

**Individual and group enhancement initiatives**

The first group of strategies involves social mobility initiatives taken within an organization. Social mobility activities have been considered by Morrison and her colleagues (1987), as helpful in the career advancement of managerial and professional women. In light of this proposal, McKeen and Burke (1991) attempted to investigate the effects of certain work experiences on career success among a sample of women business graduates. Results indicated that the career prospects of managerial and professional women increase as they participate in more training and development activities such as participation in technical training, key project assignments, management development training, supervisory coaching and the career development programme.

The second category of self-enhancement activities includes the intention to leave the organization. Research has revealed that in comparison to men, women in management are leaving their present employment at an alarming rate (Schwartz, 1989; Treasury Board of Canada, 1990). The question remains: What factors are affecting women's decision to leave their current job? In the present study, two factors are proposed to affect women's intention to leave the organization. First, the sense of personal relative deprivation is believed to have a direct bearing over any self-enhancement means, in this case, the intention to leave (Runciman, 1966; Hafer & Olson, 1993).
Second, researchers have argued that opting out represents a choice activity for women managers who have come to realize that the necessary job experiences leading to aspired goals are ineffective or insufficient (Cotton & Tuttle, 1986; Miller & Wheeler, 1992) or have not been met (Rosin & Korabik, 1991). In other words, dissatisfaction with available opportunities for career development is believed to be a second factor leading women to entertain thoughts of leaving their present job situation for more challenging options. Moreover, research in the area of relative deprivation has uncovered a link between personal relative deprivation and the level of satisfaction with available opportunities among disadvantaged group members.

In a study conducted among Chinese students, Dion (1992) proceeded to investigate the effect of personal, and collective relative deprivation on perceived satisfaction with certain areas of life in their city. For instance, participants were asked to indicate whether they were satisfied with educational, cultural and residential opportunities. This author found that personal, rather than collective relative deprivation was negatively related to satisfaction with opportunities. In other words, Chinese students who felt personally deprived reported greater dissatisfaction with opportunities available in their city. We now turn to the effects of dissatisfaction with opportunities on turnover intention among women managers.

In sum, two individual enhancement strategies are investigated in the present study. It is believed that personal
relative deprivation is associated with both social mobility initiatives and the intention to leave the organization. In addition, the opportunity will be taken to investigate an additional reason for women to leave, that is, dissatisfaction with current career development possibilities. Finally, based on research conducted by Dion (1992), the link between personal deprivation and the level of satisfaction with departmental opportunities will be investigated. In the next section, strategies designed to promote the ingroup are presented.

The aim of any collective action strategy is to promote social change, and the means to achieve this goal can take various forms. In the present case, the choice has been made to opt for collective strategies that represent relevant, realistic and non-confrontational means. The collective strategies presented are those encouraged by authorities and thus can be readily integrated within an organizational context. In this sense, however, these strategies do not represent an exhaustive list of possibilities. For example, the decision has been made to exclude striking, participation in demonstrations to expose discriminatory practices and signing a petition to endorse policies which promote the situation of women in the workforce. In the following, in terms of collective initiatives, three categories can be drawn: (a) mentoring, (b) networking, and (c) attitudes towards employment equity policies.

Mentoring is understood as a relationship established between a subordinate or peer, and a more experienced colleague
which fulfils career development functions (Kram, 1986). For instance, a woman in management who has gained experience in the organization will become a mentor if she takes an active part in the career planning, and development of another woman peer or junior. Certain authors suggest that mentoring is particularly critical for women in management who require support, and guidance in their career development path (Morrison & Von Glinow, 1990; Morrison, White & Van Velsor, 1987).

A mentoring relationship provides many benefits to women protégés. A more senior woman mentor can offer a protégé valuable insight into strategies to adapt to the organizational culture (McKeen & Burke, 1989), and enhance self-confidence (Burke, 1984; McKeen & Burke, 1989). This relationship may further expose protégés to techniques such as problem solving (Burke, 1984; Scandura, 1992; Willbur, 1987), and stress management (McKeen & Burke, 1989).

Mentoring among women is also a valuable strategy for group enhancement as a whole. For instance, by supporting the mentoring process, women managers expose and make visible women’s talents, and abilities (Noe, 1988). Mentoring further heightens recognition from peers (Kram, 1986). As a result, by highlighting the potential of young women managers, female mentors enhance the disadvantaged image of women in management.

The advantages of visibility and recognition within the organization is also met through networking among women managers. Networking, more specifically, informal networking,
represents a collective strategy defined as "... discretionary patterns of interaction, where the content of relationships may be work related, social, or a combination of both" (Ibarra, 1993, p.58). Networking offers women the opportunity to share important information including career guidance (Morrison & Von Glinow, 1990), and social support (Greenglass, 1993; Morrison & Von Glinow, 1990). Furthermore, networking can benefit women as a group. For instance, networks for women managers may provide an effective first step in achieving influence in an organization (Brass, 1985). It is believed that through a common goal and voice, women members of a network may gain the necessary exposure to exercise influence over activities, and decisions within the organization.

The last collective strategy considered in the present study is the support of employment equity policies. Employment equity measures have been implemented in an attempt to increase the representation of women in all sectors of activities, and at the higher levels of the hierarchy. Studies have demonstrated that women are indeed favourable to general employment equity policies (Tougas & Beaton, 1993; Tougas, Brown, Beaton & Joly, in press). However, within employment equity programmes particular strategies are included which are often not welcomed by women, such as preferential treatment.

Preferential treatment involves two steps. In the first step, numerical objectives based on the available pool of target group members are set. The second step involves designing pro-
active strategies to reach these objectives. For example, to meet a fixed objective, women can be given preference over male candidates when applying for a job or a promotion, if they are equally qualified. Research on reactions to preferential treatment strategies has become timely. On the one hand, preferential treatment is considered as an effective means of increasing the number of women (Tougas & Beaton, 1992), without negatively affecting organizational productivity (Leonard, 1984; Lovrich, Steel & Hood, 1986; Steel & Lovrich, 1987). Secondly, preferential treatment strategies have not received the expected support by women (Heilman, Lucas & Kaplow, 1990; Heilman, Rivero & Brett, 1991).

In summary, collective relative deprivation, is hypothesized to be linked with group rather than individual enhancement strategies. In this sense, it is proposed that women managers who feel deprivation on behalf of their group will endorse measures which serve to promote the disadvantaged ingroup within the organization such as mentoring, networking, employment equity and preferential treatment.

In the next section, hypotheses presented to date will be reviewed. This will offer both the opportunity for a brief overview of main arguments, and illustration of predictions in an integrated model.
Integration of Concepts and Hypotheses

The present study will address the experiences of women who have gained access to managerial ranks. To account for their experiences, different theoretical perspectives were taken into consideration. In some instances, either new links have been proposed or the opportunity was taken to challenge differing modes of explanation. In this section, hypotheses based on theoretical grounds are revisited. For the purpose of clarity, hypotheses were grouped in Figure 1. It is important to bear in mind that Figure 1 is presented only for illustration purposes and does not imply causal direction among variables. In the following, a brief outline of the theoretical background supporting hypotheses is discussed.

Figure 1. Conceptual Framework of Proposed Hypotheses.
Tokenism and personal relative deprivation

According to Kanter (1977) the personal experiences of women within an organization vary in light of their proportional representation relative to men. Her observations have brought her to argue that due to their numerical minority status, women are more likely to experience discrimination in the workplace. For instance, research has demonstrated that in a minority situation, women report being unfavourably perceived (Floge & Merrill, 1986; Heilman, 1980; Ott, 1988; Yoder, Adams & Prince, 1983; Yoder et al., 1985), and inequitably treated (Yoder, 1985) in the organization. It is important to point out that, upon examining the effect of women's level of representation, Kanter (1977) refers to discrimination which has been experienced at the individual level.

However, research has not consistently supported the contention that numerical scarcity is a sufficient factor affecting women's perception of discrimination (South et al., 1982; South et al., 1987). In an attempt to address these mixed results, Yoder (1991) has proposed additional factors which are to be considered in line with the proportional representation of women to account for the discrimination experienced by token women.

Yoder contends that perceived discrimination on the basis of sex is likely when a token: 1) works in a nontraditional environment; 2) is a member of a low status group; 3) represents a numerical minority in a work group and 4) has witnessed a large
number of new recruits within the work group. It is thus proposed that as the representation of women managers relative to men decreases while a surge of female recruits is on the rise, participants will report greater incidence of sex discrimination. To account for the experiences of discrimination, the concept of personal relative deprivation is most relevant.

Personal relative deprivation is defined as the feeling of personal discontent or dissatisfaction stemming from an unfavourable social comparison (Crosby, 1976; Runciman, 1966). Although different forms of personal deprivations have been identified (Walker & Pettigrew, 1984), the present study will focus on felt deprivations based on disadvantageous comparisons between the self and members of an advantaged outgroup. In choosing this form of relative deprivation, the experience of discrimination is understood as based on a comparison between the self and men. This form of perceived discrimination lends itself well to the type of individual experiences of discrimination, as discussed by researchers in the area of tokenism (Kanter, 1977; Yoder, 1991).

Link between personal and collective relative deprivation

In seeking to understand the experiences of women managers in an organization it is necessary to go beyond their personal experiences of discrimination. In light of previous studies, a clear distinction has been made between personal and collective forms of relative deprivation (Guimond & Dubé-Simard, 1983; Runciman, 1966; Walker & Pettigrew, 1984). In this sense,
collective relative deprivation has been defined as the feeling of dissatisfaction following a disadvantaged social comparison between one's ingroup and an advantaged outgroup.

In considering both types of relative deprivation, one challenge is to understand how they are linked. In the present study, two competing hypotheses will be tested. On the one hand, Runciman (1966) has proposed the generalization hypothesis whereby a personal sense of deprivation will spontaneously generalize to a feeling of collective relative deprivation. On the other hand, it has been suggested that the link between personal and collective relative deprivation is mediated by the concept of social identity (Dibble, 1981; Dion, 1986; Kawakami & Dion, 1993; Petta & Walker, 1992; Usseem, 1980; Vanneman & Pettigrew, 1972). According to Tajfel (1978), social identity is that part of one's self-concept which contains three dimensions, that is, recognition of one's group membership as well as the emotions and evaluation of this membership. Thus, an evaluation of the validity of both the generalization hypothesis (Runciman, 1966) and the consolidating role of social identity (Dibble, 1981; Dion, 1986) will be undertaken.

Behaviours, intentions and attitudes

Another challenge to be met concerning personal and collective relative deprivation, involves investigating their ability to predict behaviours and attitudes of women managers. It is within this context that women managers are considered as agents of social change. Research has demonstrated that personal
and collective relative deprivation trigger different courses of action. For instance, in light of studies conducted, collective relative deprivation has been found to be a more important predictor of collective action than personal relative deprivation (Dion, 1986; Guimond & Dubé-Simard, 1983; Smith & Gaskell, 1990; Vanneman & Pettigrew, 1972; Walker & Pettigrew, 1984). On the other hand, personal relative deprivation has been more successful in accounting for strategies which enhance one’s personal rather than group circumstance (Hafer & Olson, 1993).

In this sense the predictive power of personal and collective relative deprivation will be investigated in light of behaviours and attitudes deemed relevant in an organizational context. Among these, individual enhancement activities include personal promotion initiatives and the intention to leave the present job. Collective means to group enhancement consist of supporting employment equity programmes, preferential treatment measures as well as mentoring and networking among women in the organization.

In the present study, special attention has been given to the prediction of one among the individual enhancement means, that is, the intention to leave the organization. Based on previous research, it has been demonstrated that dissatisfaction with current opportunities in the organization is a salient predictor of the intention to leave among women (e.g., Miller & Wheeler, 1992). In turn, a study conducted by Dion (1992) among Chinese students has revealed that dissatisfaction with current
opportunities in a community is triggered by a sense of personal relative deprivation.

In sum, hypotheses to be tested in the present study are summarized in the following:

(H1): Women managers will express more personal relative deprivation as (a) they are less represented in comparison to men and (b) as more new female recruits enters the work group.

(H2): In comparison to women who report low levels of personal relative deprivation, women managers who express intense levels of personal relative deprivation will be more likely to also report feelings of collective relative deprivation.

(H3): (i) Women who experience a strong sense of personal relative deprivation will be more likely to identify with their ingroup than women who report a lower level of personal relative deprivation. (ii) In turn, women who identify strongly with their ingroup will feel more collectively deprived than women who identify less with their ingroup.

(H4): In comparison to women who feel less personally deprived, women who experience a strong sense of personal deprivation will be more inclined to engage in individual enhancement strategies such as personal promotion strategies and entertain thoughts of leaving the organization than collective means at group enhancement.
(H5): In comparison to women who express less deprivation on behalf of the group, those who report stronger levels of collective relative deprivation will engage more frequently in collective action including endorsing employment equity, preferential treatment, mentoring and networking schemes than participating in individual enhancement activities.

(H6): (i) Women who experience a strong sense of personal relative deprivation will be less satisfied with opportunities in the organization than women with a weaker sense of personal relative deprivation. (ii) Women who express dissatisfaction with career enhancement possibilities will be more likely to report intentions of leaving the organization than women who are more content with these opportunities.
CHAPTER 2: Description of the Study

Method

Participants

Participants were recruited from a Canadian public sector Department where employment equity initiatives have been implemented since 1986 at which time the Employment Equity Act (Bill C-62) was introduced. The purpose of this Act was to attract and retain members of designated groups to produce a diversified workforce. In order to reach this goal, all Departments were required to design and implement employment equity programmes. The major aim of these programmes was to identify and eliminate systemic discrimination. The programme also included strategies to increase the representation of target groups within a reasonable time frame.

Yet, results of an audit revealed that the Department under study had only met the minimum requirements of the employment equity policy. For instance, specific strategies to achieve equitable representation of target groups were not planned or implemented. The impact of this situation has been felt by women in the Department. A demographic profile revealed that in management, women remained underrepresented in senior positions (16%) although concentrated in junior levels (58%).

In response to the report produced by the Departmental Audit Branch, (1991), measures were taken in 1991 to promote the representation of target groups within the Department. Specifically, based on feedback received by focus groups, four
recommendations were presented to facilitate the upward mobility of women in management. These recommendations included: (1) making career counselling available; (2) promoting participation in a Career Enhancement Program; (3) expanding secondment opportunities; (4) integrating career counselling, planning and succession planning under one unit and (5) implementing a bridging programme. This latter measure was designed specifically for women in support groups who wished to gain access to managerial ranks. Special efforts were made to identify these candidates and offer the necessary training and experience to permit them to pursue their career in management. At the time of this study (1993), authorities were in the process of gathering data concerning the reactions of women managers to measures contemplated and implemented in promoting their situation.

A total of 800 bilingual questionnaires were sent to women holding managerial positions across Canada through internal mail. Each questionnaire was accompanied by a stamped return envelope addressed to the University of Ottawa. A letter was attached to the questionnaire providing information concerning the object of the study, and assurance of the confidentiality and anonymity of responses. In all, 257 questionnaires were completed and returned for a 32.1% return rate. A review of these questionnaires revealed that, on average, participants spent 19.3 years in the labour market and 10.5 years as employees in this particular Department. A demographic profile of respondents is
presented in Table 1.

**Table 1. Demographic Profile of Women Respondents.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 25:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 to 29:</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 34:</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 39:</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 49:</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 50:</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French:</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English:</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single:</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married:</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced:</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing:</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of children</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no children:</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 2:</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 and more:</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing:</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education completed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School:</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College:</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacc.:</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters:</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate:</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing:</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervision</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes:</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No:</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupational category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management:</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific and Professional:</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative and Foreign Service:</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical:</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational:</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Support:</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing:</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervise women staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes:</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No:</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing:</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term:</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate:</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>92.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing:</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic:</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Québec:</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario:</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Capital:</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba:</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan:</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta:</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.:</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWT:</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yukon:</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing:</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>under 40K $:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40K to 49,999$:</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50K to 59,999$:</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60K to 69,999$:</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70K to 79,999$:</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 80K $:</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing:</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instrumentation

The questionnaire was first created in English. Using a back-to-back translation procedure, an equivalent French version was produced. Items measuring constructs depicted in Figure 1 were embedded in a larger questionnaire. The relationship between the constructs in Figure 1 represent the hypothesized links.

Participants were further asked to complete information such as age category, occupational group, years of experience in the Department and labour market. The comments of women were solicited by providing a space for this purpose. In the following section, items are presented according to the variable they measure.

Perceived tokenism. To account for the token experience of women in the Department, two items were presented. Both items were introduced with the following set of instructions: "In responding to the following questions, we ask you to think of your colleagues who occupy your group at (name of the Department) and with whom you interact on a regular basis for work purposes (e.g., meetings). For instance, if your occupational group and level is a PM5, think of your colleagues who also occupy the PM5 group and with whom you interact regularly." The first item assessed women’s perceived level of representation: "Among your colleagues, estimate the percentage of women who occupy your group and level in (name of the Department)". The second item tapped into women’s perceived level of intrusiveness, and
involved the following: "Within the last two years, estimate the percentage of women who have gained access to your group and level in (name of the Department)". In both instances, participants were asked to circle the appropriate estimation using an 11-point scale, ranging from 0% to 100%. Such an estimation procedure has been used in previous studies and proposed to be a more valid assessment of women's work group composition (South et al., 1982; South et al., 1987). Although more global statistics on the representation of women in the Department are available, it is believed that such a subjective measure of women's level of representation and the level of intrusiveness offers an immediate representation of the individual perceived situation of each woman.

**Personal relative deprivation.** Women were asked to assess their personal work situation. Specifically, items were presented to examine women's discontent due to perceived discrepancies between their personal situation and that of their male colleagues. This personal relative deprivation scale included six items, that is three cognitive and three adjacent affective components. The cognitive items were: "Within (name of the Department), do you believe that, compared to your male colleagues, you are disadvantaged as to opportunities for promotion?"; "Within (name of the Department), do you believe that, compared to your male colleagues, your performance is evaluated more harshly?"; "Within (name of the Department), do you believe that, compared to your male colleagues, you are less
likely to have the opportunity to participate in training?" Each cognitive item was followed by a question asking women the extent to which they felt satisfied with the particular situation: "To what extent are you satisfied with this situation?". All items were rated on a 7-point Likert-type scale where 1 indicated "not at all" and 7 meant "absolutely". However, satisfaction questions were recoded in order that high scores represented dissatisfaction with the specific circumstance. The level of internal consistency was .90. As a result, all six items were added to form a composite score.

**Collective relative deprivation.** This scale included six items, that is, three cognitive and three adjacent affective elements. The cognitive component of the collective relative deprivation scale consisted of the following items: "Within management, do you believe that, compared to men, women are disadvantaged as to their opportunities for promotion?"; "Within management, do you believe that, compared to men, the performance of women is evaluated more harshly?"; "Within management, do you believe that, compared to men, women are less likely to have the opportunity to participate in training?". Each of these cognitive items were followed by a satisfaction question: "To what extent are you satisfied with this situation?" All items were measured on a 7-point Likert-type scale where 1 indicated "not at all" and 7 referred to "absolutely". Satisfaction items were recoded whereby high scores revealed dissatisfaction with the situation presented. The reliability coefficient was .88 was
obtained. Thus, all six items were added.

The collective relative deprivation scale has been used in past studies and demonstrated strong reliability coefficients ranging from .90 (Tougas, Beaton & Joly, 1991) to .93 (Tougas, unpublished data, 1991). However, it should be noted that the present collective relative deprivation scale was adjusted based on feedback received by Departmental officials. It is believed that the present formulation better accounts for the specific conditions faced by women in the Department.

**Ingroup identification.** A set of items measuring women's social identity was presented to participants in the study. Completion of the social identity scale involved two parts. In the first, participants were presented the following instructions: "In light of your own experiences, you may have come to form an image of career women. While filling out this section, please refer to your image of career women. What is this image? What characteristics either physical, psychological, moral, etc. best depict your image of career women? Please list the characteristics which come to mind:" This section served to prime participants in completing the social identity scale.

In the second step, participants were asked to complete the social identity scale containing 18 items that tapped into the three dimensions of social identity as defined by Tajfel (1978). Six of these items (three positive and three negative items) assess the cognitive dimension such as "In general, I identify with "career women". ; "In general, my ideas are similar to those
of "career women"; "I think that I am a part of a group we could call "career women"; "In general, I behave quite differently from "career women"; "I believe that I am quite different from "career women"; "The way I live is different from that of "career women"; six of these items (three positive and three negative items) measure the evaluative dimension as in: "There are many advantages to being a "career woman"; "I consider myself superior because I am a "career woman"; "It is a disadvantage to adopt a way of life similar to that of "career women"; "It is disadvantageous to be categorized as a "career woman"; Sometimes I prefer that others forget the fact that I am a "career woman"; "It is important for me to be a part of the group we could call "career women". Finally, the six last items (three positive and three negative items) tap into the affective dimension: "I feel proud to be a "career woman"; "I like being a part of the group we could call "career women"; I like to emphasize the fact that I am a "career woman"; "I often feel restricted in the career woman's role"; "I often feel required to act like a "career woman"; "I often feel uncomfortable due to the fact that I am a "career woman". All social identity items were measured with a 7-point Likert-type scale where 1 referred to "strongly disagree" and 7 meant "strongly agree". The coefficient for internal consistency was .88. The social identity scale has served in a previous study, and reached a level of internal consistency of .87 among women managers and professionals (Tougas, Beaton & Joly, 1991).
Satisfaction with opportunities in the department. This section is designed to evaluate satisfaction with opportunities offered in the Department. Four items were included in this scale: "To what extent are you satisfied with career development opportunities in (name of the Department)?"; "To what extent are you satisfied with promotion opportunities in (name of the Department)?"; "To what extent are you satisfied with training opportunities in (name of the Department)?"; "To what extent are you satisfied with opportunities for personal development in (name of the Department)?". All items were assessed on a 7-point Likert-type scale whereby 1 indicated "not at all" and 7 referred to "absolutely". Results revealed a level of internal consistency of .84, and items were added to form a composite score.

In the next section, the list of individual and collective strategies examined in the present study are described. It is important to note, however, that, when appropriate, psychometric properties of each concept will be discussed in light of previous research. Tests of internal consistency for each activity will be presented following an exploratory factor analysis of all individual and collective activities.

Personal promotion initiatives. The personal promotion initiatives scale consisted of five items designed, in conjunction with Departmental officials, to account for the rate of participation in career development activities. Participation in the following activities was investigated: a) developmental
opportunities (e.g., participation in the Career Enhancement Program, acting assignments, secondment, job rotation, personal development); b) lateral transfers (e.g., between Regions, various Programs/Sectors, other Departments); c) participation on various committees, information sessions (e.g., recognition and rewards committee, brown bag sessions, various (name of the Department) workshops, special event days, voluntary team projects such as United Way); d) involvement in training sessions, courses (e.g., college or university level); e) promotion opportunities (e.g., competitions within or outside (name of the Department). All activities were measured on a 7-point Likert-type scale whereby 1 indicated "not at all" and 7 referred to "extremely frequently". This list of activities was further accompanied by the following item: "To what extent do you plan to pursue your education with or without departmental support?" In this case, measurement was obtained using a 7-point Likert-type scale where 1 meant "not at all", and 7 indicated "absolutely".

Intent to leave. The intent to leave was measured with the following four items: "At this time in your career, to what extent would you want to quit your job if it were possible?"; "To what extent are you actually planning to leave your job within the next six months?"; "To what extent are you actively searching for another job right now?"; "To what extent are you thinking of leaving your current job?" Responses were assessed on a 7-point Likert-type scale whereby 1 indicated "not at all", and 7 meant
"absolutely". This scale was previously used in a study by Rosin and Korabik (1991), whereby they reported an alpha of .82. Meta-analyses conducted among studies on employee turnover have revealed a significant association between the intention to leave and actual turnover (Carsten & Spector, 1987; Cotton & Tuttle, 1986; Steel & Ovalle, 1984).

Collective strategies. Collective strategies include items tapping into the level of support of policies designed to promote the situation of women in the Department. Responses to all collective strategies were rated on a 7-point Likert-type scale whereby 1 meant "strongly disagree", while 7 indicated "strongly agree".

Support of preferential treatment. This measure consisted of the following two items: "When equally competent, give preference to women over men when recruiting for positions where women are underrepresented."; "When equally competent, give preference to women over men for promotions to positions where women are underrepresented." The preferential treatment scale has served in previous research among women managers and professionals (Tougas, Beaton & Joly, 1990) where the level of internal consistency reached .93.

Support of employment equity programmes. To measure women's endorsement of general employment equity policies, the following three items were presented: "If there are no employment equity programs helping women in employment, women will continue to be treated unfairly."; "After years of discrimination, it is only
fair to set up special programs to make sure women are given fair and equitable treatment."; "All in all, do you favour the implementation of employment equity programs for women in organizations?"

This scale has served to evaluate general attitudes towards employment equity among male students and managers (Tougas et al., in press). Results indicated acceptable levels of internal consistency, reliability coefficients ranging from \( g = .81 \) among students to \( g = .86 \) among male managers.

**Support of the bridging programme.** Women were asked to react to the following initiative: "Implementing bridging programs for women in support groups who wish to access officer-level positions".

**Support of networking among women in the department.** Two questions were used to evaluate support of networking mechanisms for women in the Department: "I would like to take an active role in developing a network for women in this Department."; "I would encourage the implementation of a women's networking system among women employees in this Department."

**Support of mentoring among women in the department.** The last collective strategy considered was mentoring. Participants were asked to rate the following two items: "I would accept to become a mentor for a woman employee in this Department."; "I would be ready to encourage mentoring among women in this Department."

**Analysis of Data**

As a prerequisite to the major analyses of the study, two
sets of preliminary analyses were conducted: (a) to determine whether women's reactions to the variables under study differed with respect to demographic phenomena and (b) to evaluate the extent to which the assumptions of normality and linearity had been met, and to screen for univariate and multivariate outliers, and multicollinearity. It is worth noting that the data screening analyses were conducted with the BMDP statistical package; all remaining analyses were performed using the SPSSx programme. The primary hypotheses of the study were tested subsequently using both univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) and multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) procedures. The following discussion describes the use of these techniques in testing each of the hypotheses.

**Hypothesis I.** To test for the impact of perceived tokenism on personal relative deprivation, a two-way between-subject ANOVA was conducted. Specifically, a 4 (perceived level of representation: 0%-10%, 20%-30%, 40%-60%, 70%-100%) X 4 (perceived level of intrusiveness: 0%, 10%, 20%-40%, 50%-100%) ANOVA for the dependent variable, personal relative deprivation was performed. The Scheffé test was used in conducting the post hoc comparisons because of its known conservative approach in addressing such analyses (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989).

**Hypotheses II and III.** The relationship between personal and collective relative deprivation was tested using two sets of analyses. First, using a median split for the continuous variable, personal relative deprivation, a MANOVA was conducted
to determine whether differences emerged in light of the combination of the two dependent variables, social identification and collective relative deprivation. Second, a t-test was carried out to investigate whether different reactions to the dependent variable, collective relative deprivation will emerge between those who have high or low scores on the independent variable, level of social identification.

**Hypotheses IV, V and VI.** Finally, the last set of analyses tested the behavioural and attitudinal consequences of personal and collective relative deprivation. This step was accomplished with two separate between-subject MANOVAs. Provided with findings of significant group differences, post hoc tests were conducted using discriminant function analyses.

Although in the past, univariate F-tests have been the generic approach to post hoc analyses used following significant MANOVA findings, there has been considerable debate over the adequacy of this technique. Indeed, the approach has been shown to be seriously limited in at least two ways. First, it is subject to Type 1 error due to the capitalization of chance factors in the conduct of multiple univariate tests (Bray & Maxwell, 1982; Huberty & Morris, 1989; Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989). Although, historically, researchers have conducted multiple univariate F tests under the assumption that the overall MANOVA protects for Type 1 error, Huberty and Morris (1989), have argued that the notion of "protected" post-hoc univariate tests has not received any empirical support and thus remains a myth.
In reality, the MANOVA procedure does not offer such protection against experimentwise error since individual alpha levels are never adjusted for the multiple univariate tests conducted. Second, the post-hoc univariate F-test is unable to account for correlations among dependent variables (Bray & Maxwell, 1982; Huberty & Morris, 1989; Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989). Appropriate use of MANOVA procedures assume that the dependent variables are correlated; if indeed they are not, the use of MANOVA procedures lacks a statistical and logical rationale.

In light of these limitations, the present study used a discriminant function analytic approach to the post-hoc analysis. The purpose of this analysis is to identify a linear set of variables which best accounts for group separation. As explained by Tabachnick and Fidell (1989), the discriminant analysis and the MANOVA differ on conceptual grounds: While the main issue in MANOVA is whether group membership is linked to differences in the combination of the dependent variables, the main issue in discriminant function analysis is whether the combination of predictors can determine group membership.

The relative contribution of each variable in distinguishing between groups can be identified through an examination of the structure coefficients. Structure coefficients are correlations between each predictor variable, and the linear discriminant function. In this sense, squared structure coefficients represent the proportion of variance shared between each predictor and the underlying composite of variables. According
to Bray and Maxwell (1982), structure coefficients offer two benefits. The first is an assessment of the independent contribution of each variable to group separation. Values of .30 or higher are considered significant (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989). Second, structure coefficients offer the opportunity to impose an order to the relative contribution of each variable. For instance, it is argued that: "... in cases where some variables have large correlations with the discriminant function and others have small correlations, then those with the larger correlations contribute most to group separation" (Bray & Maxwell, 1982, p. 346). The following section presents a summary and discussion of results arising from these analyses.
CHAPTER 3: Testing Hypotheses

Results

Two sets of preliminary analyses were conducted prior to testing hypotheses. First, MANOVAs were carried out to examine whether demographic variables accounted for different reactions to variables included in the study. No significant differences were detected and women were pooled to form one sample group. Second, data screening was conducted. The level of skewness and kurtosis for each item included in the study was investigated to test the assumption of normality. These values are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Skewness and Kurtosis of Each Item of Variables Included in the Study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Tokenism:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pour1a</td>
<td>-.54</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pour2</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Relative Deprivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cprd1</td>
<td>-.94</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aprd1</td>
<td>-1.38</td>
<td>-.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cprd2</td>
<td>-.67</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aprd2</td>
<td>-1.61</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cprd3</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aprd3</td>
<td>-1.52</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Relative Deprivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ccrd1</td>
<td>-.92</td>
<td>-.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acrd1</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ccrd2</td>
<td>-.93</td>
<td>-.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acrd2</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>-1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ccrd3</td>
<td>-.68</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acrd3</td>
<td>-1.25</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 2. Skewness and Kurtosis of Each Item of Variables Included in the Study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opp1</td>
<td>-.80</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opp2</td>
<td>-.71</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opp3</td>
<td>-.71</td>
<td>-.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opp4</td>
<td>-.86</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support of Preferential Treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pt1</td>
<td>-.95</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pt2</td>
<td>-1.01</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support of Bridging Programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bridge</td>
<td>-.89</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support of Employment Equity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pap1</td>
<td>-.67</td>
<td>-.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pap2</td>
<td>-.74</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pap3</td>
<td>-.98</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Identification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cog1</td>
<td>-.88</td>
<td>-.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cog2</td>
<td>-1.15</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cog3</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cog4</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cog5</td>
<td>-.91</td>
<td>-.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cog6</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aff1</td>
<td>-1.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aff2</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aff3</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>-.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aff4</td>
<td>-.85</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aff5</td>
<td>-.82</td>
<td>-.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aff6</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eval1</td>
<td>-.99</td>
<td>-.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eval2</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eval3</td>
<td>-1.05</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eval4</td>
<td>-.65</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eval5</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eval6</td>
<td>-.66</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intent to Leave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exit1</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>-.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exit2</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exit3</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exit4</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 2. Skewness and Kurtosis of Each Item of Variables Included in the Study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Promotion Initiatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>freq1</td>
<td>-.81</td>
<td>-.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>freq2</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>-1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>freq3</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>freq4</td>
<td>-.73</td>
<td>-.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>freq5</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educ</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>-.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support of Mentoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mentor1</td>
<td>-.66</td>
<td>-.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mentor2</td>
<td>-.86</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support of Networking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>net1</td>
<td>-.57</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>net2</td>
<td>-.80</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Item labels: pour1=perceived level of representation; pour2=perceived level of intrusiveness; cprdi=personally disadvantaged in terms of promotion; aprdi=satisfaction with promotion; cprd2=personal harsh evaluation; aprd2=satisfaction with evaluation; cprd3=personally disadvantaged in terms of training; aprd3=satisfaction with training; ccrd1=group disadvantaged in terms of promotion; acrd1=satisfaction with promotion; ccrd2=group harsh evaluation; acrd2=satisfaction with evaluation; ccrd3=group disadvantaged in terms of training; acrd3=satisfaction with training; opp1=satisfied with career development; opp2=satisfied with promotion; opp3=satisfied with training; opp4=satisfied with personal development; pt1=give preference for recruits; pt2=give preference for promotion; bridge=favour bridging programme; pap1=treated unfairly; pap2=ensure fair treatment; pap3=favour employment equity measures; cog1=different from career women; cog2=different life than career women; cog3=similar ideas to career women; cog4=identify with career women; cog5=behave differently from career women; aff1=feel restricted in career women role; aff2=feel required to act like career women; aff3=feel proud to be a career woman; aff4=like to emphasize being a career woman; aff5=feel uncomfortable being a career woman; aff6=like to be a part of career women group; eval1=disadvantage to have life of career woman; eval2=advantages to being a career woman; eval3=disadvantaged to be categorized as a career woman; eval4=prefer to forget being a career woman; eval5=consider superior because of career woman; eval6=important to be career woman; exit1=plan to quit; exit2=plan to leave; exit3=seeking new job; exit4=thinking of leaving; freq1=developmental opportunities;
freq2=lateral transfers; freq3=committee participation; freq4=training sessions; freq5=promotion opportunities; educ=plan to pursue education; mentor1=accept to be a mentor; mentor2=encourage mentoring; net1=take active role in network; net2=encourage networking

Results of data screening revealed that two cases represented significant multivariate outliers. In addition, two respondents did not sufficiently complete their questionnaires. As a result, these four participants were excluded from analyses. Thus the sample consisted of 253 women respondents.

Exploratory factor analysis: Individual and collective strategies

An exploratory factor analysis (EFA) of the individual and collective strategies was conducted to investigate whether separate factors could be extracted. All items of individual and collective strategies were submitted to a three, four and five-factor solution using a maximum likelihood extraction. Two rotation methods were selected, that is, oblimin and varimax. The oblimin rotation offers a solution whereby the extracted factors are permitted to correlate. Significant correlations among factors will exceed the .30 cutoff point (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989). In contrast, the varimax rotation method offers a solution whereby all factors are considered to be orthogonal.

Results indicated that a five-factor extraction with an oblimin rotation produced the most appropriate solution for the main reason that a simple and meaningful structure was obtained. In other words, in comparison to other solutions, a five-factor structure with an oblimin rotation method did not produce cross-
loadings of items among the factors, all loadings were significant and this pattern of loadings were theoretically meaningful.

The selection of the five-factor solution is supported by additionally satisfactory results. For instance, results of the five-factor oblimin EFA indicated that factors account for 54.5% of the variance within the data set. Furthermore, for the most part, communalities were moderate to high indicating that the variances of items were adequately accounted for by their respective underlying factor. A final evidence of the adequacy of a five-factor solution is that factor loadings are all considered interpretable, that is, meeting the .30 cutoff point (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989). However, it should be noted that three loadings, although statistically significant, were substantially weak. These loadings were obtained for the following items: bridge "favour bridging programme", freg2 "participation in lateral transfers" and educ "plan to pursue education". Furthermore, a very high loading was detected for the item pt1 "give preference for recruits". This result indicated that this item almost constitutes the entire factor. Factor loadings and communalities are presented in Table 3.
Table 3. Pattern Matrix and Communalities ($h^2$) for Five-Factor Oblimin Solution of Individual and Collective Strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>$F_1^a$</th>
<th>$F_2$</th>
<th>$F_3$</th>
<th>$F_4$</th>
<th>$F_5$</th>
<th>$h^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pt1</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pt2</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>net1</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>net2</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mentor1</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mentor2</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exit1</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exit2</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exit3</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exit4</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pap1</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.62</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pap2</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.79</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pap3</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.90</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bridge</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>freq1</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>freq2</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>freq3</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>freq4</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
Table 3. Pattern Matrix and Communalities ($h^2$) for Five-Factor Oblimin Solution of Individual and Collective Strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>$F_1$</th>
<th>$F_2$</th>
<th>$F_3$</th>
<th>$F_4$</th>
<th>$F_5$</th>
<th>$h^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>freq5</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educ</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of Variance

16.8 15.4 10.7 4.9 6.8

a Factor labels:
$F_1$ Support of Preferential Treatment
$F_2$ Support of Women Advocacy Strategies
$F_3$ Intention to Leave
$F_4$ Opposition to Employment Equity
$F_5$ Personal Promotion Initiatives

b Item labels:

$pt1$=give preference for recruits; $pt2$=give preference for promotion; $pap1$=treated unfairly; $pap2$=ensure fair treatment;
$pap3$=favour employment equity measures; $bridge$=favour bridging programme; $mentor1$=accept to be a mentor; $mentor2$=encourage mentoring; $net1$=take active role in network; $net2$=encourage networking; $exit1$=plan to quit; $exit2$=plan to leave; $exit3$=seeking new job; $exit4$=thinking of leaving; $freq1$=developmental opportunities; $freq2$=lateral transfers; $freq3$=committee participation; $freq4$=training sessions; $freq5$=promotion opportunities; $educ$=plan to pursue education

However, the five-factor solution does contain a limitation which deserve to be addressed. The problem encountered is an eigenvalue of .97, for Factor 4 (Opposition to Employment Equity) which did not reach the >1.0 cutoff point, as determined by Cattell (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989). Given that eigenvalues indicate the variance explained by each linear composite of
variables, this low value suggests that one of the factors may not be prominent. A summary of correlations among all five factors is provided in Table 4. In addition, results of test of internal reliability for each resulting scale are presented.

Table 4. Factor Intercorrelations Among the Five Individual and Collective Strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>F₂</th>
<th>F₃</th>
<th>F₄</th>
<th>F₅</th>
<th>Alpha&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F₁&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.54</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F₂</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F₃</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F₄</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F₅</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Cronbach's Alpha

<sup>b</sup> Factor labels:

F₁ Support of Preferential Treatment
F₂ Support of Women Advocacy Strategies
F₃ Intention to Leave
F₄ Opposition to Employment Equity
F₅ Personal Promotion Initiatives

In the following section, items representing each factor are identified. The first factor was named "support of preferential treatment" and consisted of the following two items: "When equally competent, give preference to women over men when recruiting for positions where women are underrepresented."; "When equally
competent, give preference to women over men for promotions to positions where women are underrepresented." The second factor is named "endorsement of women advocacy strategies", and groups the following networking and mentoring items: "I would accept to become a mentor for a woman employee in this Department."; "I would be ready to encourage mentoring among women in this Department."; "I would like to take an active role in developing a network for women in this Department."; "I would encourage the implementation of a women's networking system among women employees in this Department." The third factor, is entitled "intention to leave", and is formed by five items: "At this time in your career, to what extent would you want to quit your job if it were possible?"; "To what extent are you actually planning to leave your job within the next six months?"; "To what extent are you actively searching for another job right now?"; "To what extent are you thinking of leaving your current job?". A fourth factor, was named "opposition to employment equity programmes", and contains negative loadings of the following four items: "If there are not employment equity programs helping women in employment, women will continue to be treated unfairly."; "After years of discrimination, it is only fair to set up special programs to make sure women are given fair and equitable treatment."; "All in all, do you favour the implementation of employment equity programs for women in organizations?"; "Implementing bridging programs for women in support groups who wish to access officer-level positions." Finally, the fifth
factor is named "personal promotion initiatives", and refers to the level of participation in the following five types of activities: "a) developmental opportunities (e.g., participation in the Career Enhancement Program, acting assignments, secondment, job rotation, personal development)"; "b) lateral transfers (e.g., between Regions, various Programs/Sectors, other Departments)"; "c) participation on various committees, information sessions (e.g., recognition and rewards committee, brown bag sessions, various (name of the Department) workshops, special event days, voluntary team projects such as United Way)"; "d) involvement in training sessions, courses (e.g., college or university level)"; "e) promotion opportunities (e.g., competitions within or outside (name of the Department))." This factor also included the following item: "To what extent do you plan to pursue your education with or without departmental support?".

In the next section, analyses conducted to test primary hypotheses will be presented. All variables included in the study are identified in Table 5 along with their mean, standard deviation, skewness and kurtosis. In addition, the Pearson correlation matrix for all variables is presented in Table 6.
### Table 5. Means, Standard Deviation (SD), Skewness and Kurtosis of All Variables Included in the Study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Level of Representation</td>
<td>35.98</td>
<td>26.49</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>-.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Level of Intrusiveness</td>
<td>21.26</td>
<td>21.72</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Relative Deprivation</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Identity</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Relative Deprivation</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>-.56</td>
<td>-.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Opportunities in the Department</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Promotion</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>-.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to Leave</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support of Preferential Treatment</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>-.97</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support of Employment Equity</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>-.54</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support of Women Advocacy Strategies</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>-.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6. Pearson Correlations Among All Variables Included in the Study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PCT2</th>
<th>PRD</th>
<th>IDEN</th>
<th>CRD</th>
<th>OPPORT</th>
<th>EXIT</th>
<th>ACTIV</th>
<th>PT</th>
<th>EE</th>
<th>ADVOC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PCT1a</td>
<td>.54†</td>
<td>-.22†</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCT2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTIV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05  
** p<.01  
† p<.001  

a Variable labels:

PCT1: Perceived Level of Representation  
PCT2: Perceived Level of Intrusiveness  
PRD: Personal Relative Deprivation  
IDEN: Social Identity  
CRD: Collective Relative Deprivation  
OPPORT: Satisfaction with Opportunities in the Department  
EXIT: Intention to Leave  
ACTIV: Personal Promotion Strategies  
PT: Support of Preferential Treatment  
EE: Support of Employment Equity  
ADVOC: Support of Women Advocacy Strategies
Perceived tokenism and personal relative deprivation (H1)

The object of this section is to examine the effect of perceived tokenism. Specifically, analyses were conducted to test whether differences in the expression of personal relative deprivation could be explained by an interaction between two independent variables, that is, "perceived level of representation", and the "perceived level of intrusiveness". To test this prediction, a 4 (perceived level of representation) by 4 (perceived level of intrusiveness) ANOVA was performed with the dependent variable, personal relative deprivation. It must be pointed out that, to attain groups of comparable sizes, each independent variable was divided into four separate groups. For instance, the variable "perceived level of representation" was divided into the following four groups which differed according to women's assessment of their level of representation within their work group: Group 1 (n = 72) includes women who represented 0% to 10% of their work group; Group 2 (n = 69) consists of women representing 20% to 30% of their work group; Group 3 (n = 57) refers to women who made up 40% to 60% of the group and finally, Group 4 (n = 47) refers to women who occupied 70% to 100% of their work group.

The second independent variable, "perceived level of intrusiveness" was also divided into four groups varying according to respondents' estimate of the percentage of new female recruits within their work group: Group 1 (n = 45) includes women who estimated 0% of new female recruits in their
work group; Group 2 (n = 86) refers to respondents who estimated 10% of new female recruits; Group 3 (n = 61) is comprised of women who estimated between 20% to 40% of new female recruits within their work group, and finally Group 4 (n = 53) includes women who estimated the percentage of new female recruits between 50% to 100%. The distribution of participants among the groups formed with the independent variables, "perceived level of representation" and "perceived level of intrusiveness" is provided in Table 7.

Results of the 4(perceived level of representation) by 4(perceived level of intrusiveness) ANOVA did not support the Hypothesis 1. Analyses revealed no significant interaction (F(9,244)=.754, p>.05). However, two significant main effects were found with respect to the variable "perceived level of representation" (F(3,244)=3.19, p<.05), and "perceived level of intrusiveness" (F(3,244)=2.73, p<.05). A summary of ANOVA results is presented in Table 8.
Table 7. Distribution of Women Across the Four Levels of Perceived Representation and the Four Levels of Perceived Intrusiveness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived level of intrusiveness</th>
<th>1(^a)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)(^b)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(a\) Group labels:
1 0\% to 10\%
2 20\% to 30\%
3 40\% to 60\%
4 70\% to 100\%

\(b\) Group labels:
1 0\%
2 10\%
3 20\% to 40\%
4 50\% to 100\%
Table 8. Univariate Analysis of Variance of Personal Relative Deprivation by Perceived Level of Representation and Intrusivenes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>26.80</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.93</td>
<td>3.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>22.95</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>2.73*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R by I</td>
<td>18.96</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>640.19</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>729.16</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05

<sup>a</sup> Variable labels:

R  Perceived Level of Representation
I  Perceived Level of Intrusiveness

Post-hoc analyses were conducted to determine differences among groups. Specifically, a post-hoc oneway procedure using the Scheffé method was selected to identify differences in the expression of personal relative deprivation among the groups formed with the independent variables, "perceived level of representation" and "perceived level of intrusiveness".

The first post-hoc test was performed to determine whether differences could be discerned among the four groups formed with the variable "perceived level of representation". Results indicated the presence of significant differences ($F(3,246)=5.20$, $p<.01$). In light of analyses women in Group 1, (women forming 0%
to 10% of their work group) were more likely to feel personally deprived than women in the remaining three groups. Means are presented in Figure 2.

Figure 2. Means of Personal Relative Deprivation Among the Four Perceived Level of Representation Groups.
Furthermore, the One-way Scheffé test revealed significant differences in the level of personal relative deprivation among the four groups formed with the independent variable, "perceived level of intrusiveness" ($F(3, 244) = 5.05, p < .01$). According to results, women in Group 1, who reported no increase of new female recruits in their work group felt more personally deprived than women forming Group 2 who had estimated an increase of 10% of new female recruits, and women in Group 4, who estimated between 50% and 100% of new female recruits. Means are presented in Figure 3.

Figure 3. Means of Personal Relative Deprivation Among the Four Perceived Level of Intrusiveness Groups.
Link between personal and collective relative deprivation (H2 and H3)

In this section, analyses were conducted to determine the relationship between two forms of relative deprivation, that is, personal and collective. Two competing hypotheses were tested. On the one hand, according to Runciman (1966), there is a direct association between the level of personal relative deprivation and collective deprivation. On the other hand, it has been argued that social identification will act as a mediating variable between personal and collective deprivation (Dibble, 1981; Dion, 1986). To test these two hypotheses, a oneway between-group MANOVA was conducted with a median split for the independent variable "personal relative deprivation" (MD=3.66). In this manner, comparisons were made between the following two groups: Women with low scores (n = 115), and women with high scores (n = 101) on the personal relative deprivation scale. This analysis permitted the examination of whether both groups differed in reactions to the combination of two dependent variables, that is, "social identification" and "collective relative deprivation".

Upon testing assumptions, this analysis revealed a significant Box's M test ($X^2=17.3$, $p=.001$). This result suggests a violation of the assumption of homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices and implies a drop in power of the multivariate test statistic. Although this test is notoriously sensitive to the slightest departure from normality (Tabachnick &
Fidell, 1989), an examination of the variance-covariance matrices for each group was conducted to determine whether the multivariate tests will be liberal or conservative. The test is deemed conservative, if the variance-covariance values in the matrix for the larger sample cell (n = 115) are indeed greater than those values found within the variance-covariance matrix for the smaller group (n = 101) (Stevens, 1992; Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989). An investigation of matrices revealed that all variances and covariances for the larger group did exceed those of the smaller group, with the exception of the covariance between "social identification" and "collective relative deprivation". Within the variance-covariance matrix of the large group, the covariance between "social identification" and "collective relative deprivation" was smaller (.02) in comparison to that found in the matrix for the small group (.05). This slight difference was not believed to be evidence of a serious departure from normality. In fact, given that the Box’s M statistic is indeed sensitive to the slightest departure to homogeneity of variance-covariance, this result was disregarded, and the multivariate test was considered conservative (Olson, 1974; Stevens, 1992; Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989).

Results of the between-group MANOVA revealed a significant overall effect (Pillai’s trace = .27; F(2,213) = 40.62, p<.001). In light of the Pillai’s trace, the independent variable personal relative deprivation (F(2,213)=40.62, p<.001) was shown to produce significant differences in reactions to the combined
dependent variables. The $\eta^2$ (eta square) statistic indicates the proportion of variance in the composite dependent variables that is explained by the independent variables. According to analyses, the linear combination of the two dependent variables is moderately associated to the independent variable, personal relative deprivation ($\eta^2 = .27$).

Post-hoc tests using a discriminant function analysis were conducted to determine the extent to which each dimension accounts for the separation between the two personal relative deprivation groups. Results of this analysis are provided in Table 9. Inspection of the structure coefficients reveals that only one among the two dependent variables, that is, collective relative deprivation contributes significantly to group separation. Social identification does not meet the .30 cutoff point (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989). In other words, no significant differences were uncovered in the level of ingroup identification between women who held high or low scores on the measure of personal relative deprivation. Rather, as suggested by Runciman (1966), respondents with high scores on the personal relative deprivation scale expressed greater collective relative deprivation than respondents with low scores on the personal relative deprivation scale.

\[^1\eta^2 = 1 - \text{Wilk's Lambda}\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor variable</th>
<th>Structure coef.</th>
<th>Low PRD</th>
<th>High PRD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Identity</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Relative Deprivation</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To complete the test of the hypothesis concerning the mediating role of social identity, a t-test was carried out. The purpose was to examine whether women who obtained low or high scores on the social identity scale ($ND = 4.5$) differed in their sense of collective relative deprivation. Contrary to the hypothesis, no significant differences were detected ($t(216) = .58$, $p > .05$). The expression of collective deprivation between women who either had high scores or low scores on the social identity scale did not differ significantly.

However, the validity of these results could certainly be questioned. It is possible to argue that the strong connection between personal and collective relative deprivation is due to the similarity in the measurement items for both concepts. For instance, although the referent in both social comparisons differed (self; women), the comparison other (men) as well as the
domains compared (e.g. evaluations, training opportunities) remained identical. Consequently, legitimate concern could be raised as to whether personal and collective relative deprivation tap into separate and unique dimensions. To address this concern, a post-hoc exploratory factor analysis was conducted with all items forming the personal and collective deprivation scales. In the following, these results will be briefly presented.

An exploratory factor analysis was performed to investigate whether a two-factor solution with an oblimin or varimax rotation would account for the underlying structure of personal and collective relative deprivation. Results suggest that a two-factor solution with an oblimin rotation is the most appropriate procedure for the main reason that a significant correlation between both factors was obtained ($\rho = .53$). The cutoff size for loadings is selected to be .40 to facilitate the interpretation of factors. Factor loadings of the pattern matrix and communalities are presented in Table 10.
Table 10. Pattern Matrix and Communalities \((h^2)\) for Two-Factor Oblimin Solution of Personal and Collective Relative Deprivation Items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>(F_1^a)</th>
<th>(F_2)</th>
<th>(h^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cprd1(^b)</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cprd2</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cprd3</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aprd4</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aprd5</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aprd6</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ccrd1</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ccrd2</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ccrd3</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acrd4</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acrd5</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acrd6</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of Variance

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(F_1)</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(F_2)</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Factor labels:

\(F_1\) Personal Relative Deprivation
\(F_2\) Collective Relative Deprivation

\(^b\) Item labels:

cprd1=personally disadvantaged in terms of promotion; cprd2=personal harsh evaluation; cprd3=personally disadvantaged in terms of training; aprd1=satisfaction with promotion; aprd2=satisfaction with evaluation; aprd3=satisfaction with training; ccrd1=group disadvantaged in terms of promotion; ccrd2=group harsh evaluation; ccrd3=group disadvantaged in terms of training; acrd1=satisfaction with promotion; acrd2=satisfaction with evaluation; acrd3=satisfaction with training
Results indicated that personal and collective relative deprivation accounted for two separate components. All personal relative deprivation items loaded significantly on the first factor. However, with respect to collective relative deprivation, although all items were found to load significantly on the second factor, one cross-loading did emerge. It was found that the collective deprivation item "group disadvantaged in terms of training" loaded significantly on both factors\(^2\). In spite of this cross-loading, there is reason to believe that personal and collective relative deprivation, represent different forms of deprivation.

Predictors of individual and collective strategies

The following set of analyses sought to examine whether reactions to the five sets of enhancement strategies presented, that is, preferential treatment, women advocacy, employment equity programmes, personal promotion activities and intention to leave were contingent upon the level of collective or personal relative deprivation experienced. Specifically, it was predicted that personal relative deprivation is a better predictor of reactions to individual rather than collective enhancement strategies. In contrast, collective relative deprivation was hypothesized to be a more salient determinant of collective rather than individual strategies for social change. In the

\(^2\)It should be noted that hypotheses were tested anew with the variable "Collective relative deprivation" containing only five items. Results obtained with the five item variable were identical to those found with all six collective relative deprivation items.
following, results of two separate MANOVA's used to test each hypothesis will be discussed.

The role of personal relative deprivation (H4). A between-group MANOVA was performed with a median split for the independent variable, personal relative deprivation (MD = 3.66), and the five enhancement strategies. The purpose of this analysis was to determine whether women who held low scores (n = 120) vs high scores (n = 107) on the personal relative deprivation scale differed with respect to the combination of enhancement strategies presented. Evaluation of assumptions revealed, however, a significant Box's M ($X^2=40.84, p<.001$), suggesting violation of the homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices. An investigation of variance-covariance matrices revealed that, in comparison to the values found in the variance-covariance matrix of the large group (n = 120), greater variability was obtained among almost half (46%) of variance-covariance values for the smaller group (n = 107). Consequently, there is reason to believe that the multivariate test statistics will not be conservative. One of the recommended approaches to dealing with the violation of the homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices is to evaluate the significance of the MANOVA with a more conservative statistic such as Pillai's trace (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989).

In light of the Pillai's trace criterion, significant differences were obtained between both low vs high personal relative deprivation groups with respect to the combined
dependent variables (Pillai's trace criterion = .14; \( F(5,221) = 7.39, p<.001 \)). The measure of strength of association (\( \eta^2 = .14 \)) indicated a poor association between the independent variable, personal relative deprivation and the combination of all five enhancement strategies.

Post-hoc tests using a discriminant analysis were performed to identify the most important variables in discriminating between the two levels of personal relative deprivation (low and high personal relative deprivation scores). Results of the post-hoc test, as demonstrated in Table 11, partially confirm the hypothesis. As predicted, structure coefficients revealed that the most important variable in contributing to group separation was the intention to leave. It was found that women who expressed greater personal deprivation were more likely to consider leaving their current job compared with women who felt less personally deprived. Yet, in contrast to predictions, the variable, personal promotion initiative did not reach significance. Furthermore, unexpected results were obtained for the collective action variables. In light of the structure coefficients, it was found that the variables -- support of employment equity, endorsement of women advocacy strategies and support of preferential treatment -- all contributed significantly in discriminating between the two levels of personal relative deprivation. Among these collective strategies, the most important contribution of group separation was obtained with the variable, support of employment equity.
measures. It was found that women who held high scores on the personal relative deprivation scale were more likely to endorse such measures than women who obtained low personal relative deprivation scores. Following the employment equity variable, the endorsement of women's advocacy strategies was the next most important contributor to group separation. Results indicated that a high level of the sense of personal deprivation triggered more support for women advocacy strategies than a low level of felt deprivation. Finally, the variable, support of preferential treatment was found to contribute, although marginally, to group separation. In this manner, it was found that greater endorsement of preferential treatment policies emerged among women who felt strongly personally deprived, rather than women who sensed little personal deprivation.

Table 11. **Results of Post Hoc Discriminant Analysis of Collective and Individual Strategies Among Participants with Low and High Personal Relative Deprivation Scores (PRD).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variable</th>
<th>Structure coef.</th>
<th>Low PRD</th>
<th>High PRD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intent to Leave</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support of Employment Equity</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support of Advocacy Strategies</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support of Preferential Treatment</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Promotion Initiatives</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The role of collective relative deprivation (H5). In this next section, analyses were conducted to determine whether the level of perceived collective deprivation triggers different reactions to the five enhancement strategies presented. To address this issue, a between-group MANOVA was performed with a median split for the independent variable, collective relative deprivation (MD=4.83). The MANOVA was conducted to investigate whether, women who felt strongly collectively deprived (n = 106) differed from women who sensed less collective deprivation (n = 102) with respect to the combination of the following five dependent variables: support of preferential treatment, women advocacy, employment equity, personal promotion initiatives and the intention to leave. Tests of assumptions revealed satisfactory results. Specifically, homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices was tenable ($\chi^2$=27.31, p<.05).  

In light of the Pillai's trace, it was found that reaction to the combined dependent variables varied significantly between women with high and low levels of collective relative deprivation (Pillai's trace = .12; $F(5,202) = 5.96$, p<.001). The strength of association between the dependent variables and the level of collective relative deprivation was poor ($n^2 = .12$).

Results of post-hoc discriminant analysis revealed that all individual and collective strategies contributed significantly in distinguishing between women with high and low levels of

---

3 According to Tabachnick and Fidell (1989), the homogeneity assumption is violated if Box's M statistic is significant at the p<.001 level.
collective relative deprivation (see Table 12). As predicted, collective action strategies were more important predictors of group separation. Women who expressed great collective deprivation were more likely to support measures such as employment equity programmes than women who felt less collectively deprived and endorse preferential treatment in comparison to the less deprived women. Furthermore, in accordance to hypotheses, women who felt a strong sense of deprivation on behalf of their group were more likely to favour women advocacy strategies than women who felt less deprivation on behalf of their group.

However, contrary to predictions, in light of structure coefficients, it was found that both individual strategies, that is, personal promotion and intention to leave, also contributed significantly in discriminating between both levels of collective deprivation. Analyses indicated that women who expressed strong feelings of collective relative deprivation participated in more personal promotion activities than the less deprived and had stronger intentions of leaving their current job than women who felt less collectively deprived.
Table 12. Results of Post Hoc Discriminant Analysis of Collective and Individual Strategies Among Participants with Low and High Collective Relative Deprivation Scores (CRD).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor variable</th>
<th>Structure coef.</th>
<th>Low CRD</th>
<th>High CRD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support of Employment Equity</td>
<td>-.85</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support of Advocacy Strategies</td>
<td>-.75</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support of Preferential Treatment</td>
<td>-.48</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Promotion Initiatives</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intent to Leave</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Antecedents and consequences of satisfaction with opportunities in the department (H6)

In this section, t-tests were conducted to test the following two hypotheses: (1) the level of personal relative deprivation will affect satisfaction with opportunities in the Department; (2) the level of satisfaction with opportunities in the Department will have an impact on intentions to leave. The first t-test was conducted with a median split for the independent variable, personal relative deprivation (MD = 3.66) which formed two groups of women, that is, those who felt strongly deprived (n = 115), and those who felt less personally deprived (n = 129). This analysis investigated whether both groups differed in their level of satisfaction with opportunities offered in the Department. In light of predictions, a
significant t-test ($t(242)=8.78$, $p<.001$) revealed that women who felt strongly deprived were less satisfied with opportunities (mean satisfaction with opportunities = 2.9) than women who felt less personally deprived (mean satisfaction with opportunities = 4.2).

A second t-test was performed to investigate whether different levels of satisfaction with opportunities affected women's intentions to leave their current job. To examine this issue, a t-test with a median split for the independent variable, satisfaction with opportunities ($MD = 3.5$) formed two groups, that is women who felt strongly satisfied with opportunities ($n = 121$) and women who felt rather dissatisfied with opportunities ($n = 128$). Results of the t-test confirmed hypotheses and revealed that both groups differed in their intentions of leaving their job ($t(232.92)=4.77$, $p<.001$). As expected, women who were less satisfied with opportunities in the Department expressed stronger intentions of leaving their job (mean intent to leave = 2.8) than women who were more satisfied with departmental opportunities (mean intent to leave = 2.0).
CHAPTER 4: Theoretical and Practical Implications

Discussion

The purpose of the present study was to investigate the reactions of women managers to perceived obstacles hindering their career progression. In the next section, results obtained are discussed in light of three issues: 1) perceived tokenism; 2) the relationship between personal and collective relative deprivation, and finally, 3) relative deprivation and individual and collective attempts at social change. This presentation will be followed by an outline of the practical impact of these findings.

Perceived tokenism

The point of departure of this study was to investigate the consequences of occupying a token position. In light of arguments presented by Yoder (1991), a significant interaction between the perceived level of representation of women, and the perceived level of intrusiveness was expected. However, this hypothesis received only partial support. Results indicated that both the perceived level of representation of women, and the perceived level of intrusiveness independently accounted for differences in the expression of personal relative deprivation.

With respect to the perceived level of representation of women, results support Kanter’s position. In other words, in comparison to other groups, greater discontent due to a disadvantageous situation was expressed among women who are the least represented. Difficulties associated with the
underrepresentation of women managers have been demonstrated by Rinfret and Lortie-Lussier (1993), among employees of the Federal public service. In their study, perceptions of women managers were compared among four groups whereby women represented either 9%, 20%, 35% or 50% of mid and upper-level management. The first two percentages were based on departmental statistics of the representation of women in mid and upper-level management. The latter two percentages were fictitious. In this manner, respondents were asked to place themselves in a situation whereby the level of representation of women managers reached either 35% or 50%. Results indicated that women managers were perceived less favourably and were believed to contribute less to the organizational culture when they represented 9% of management in comparison to the three remaining percentages, that is, 20%, 35% and 50%.

It is interesting to emphasize the differences between the work conducted by Rinfret and Lortie-Lussier (1993) and the present study in the technique used to assess women’s level of representation. While Rinfret and Lortie-Lussier (1993) opted for an objective approach, based on the actual and hypothetical representation of women in the organization, the present study has adopted a subjective measure, based on respondents’ estimate of women’s representation within their particular work group. Despite these different approaches in the measurement of women’s level of representation, both studies have served to demonstrate the difficulties associated with the underrepresentation of women
managers.

In contrast, results obtained with the independent variable, perceived level of intrusiveness were unexpected. According to Yoder, (1991), it was hypothesized that intrusiveness was associated with experiences of personal relative deprivation. However, it was found that, much like the effect of perceived level of representation, women who reported no increase of female recruits in recent years expressed greater discontent due to personal experiences of discrimination. Furthermore, these differences in the expression of personal relative deprivation only occurred with two of the remaining three groups, that is, Group 2 (10%) and Group 4 (50%-100%). No difference in terms of personal relative deprivation was reached between women in Group 1 where no recent recruits were present and Group 3 whereby 20% to 40% of new female recruits have been reported.

Given that these results run counter to Yoder’s (1991) arguments, it is possible to wonder whether this author was mistaken in her assessment of the impact of intrusiveness on the situation of women in an organization. However, to determine the validity of Yoder’s hypothesis, it would be advisable to first consider whether the intrusiveness issue is applicable in an organization where employment equity programmes are in place.

Implementing employment equity policies involves designing strategies to eliminate discrimination and discourage detrimental gender stereotypes to ensure the fair evaluation of women’s competencies. In this case, the increase of women in management
is seen in a different light. Instead of invoking discriminatory practices, the increase in female recruits is an effective demonstration that the employment equity guidelines are respected. Given this situation, it is believed that further studies should be conducted to investigate whether the effects of intrusiveness on the situation of women in the organization, as proposed by Yoder (1991) vary in light of the presence or absence of employment equity programmes.

**Relationship between personal and collective relative deprivation**

A further goal of the present study was to determine the relationship between personal and collective relative deprivation. Two different hypotheses were tested. Based on arguments raised by Dibble (1981) and Dion (1986), it was proposed that personal and collective forms of deprivation are consolidated with the concept of social identity. However, results did not support this hypothesis. Identification to the ingroup "career women" was not associated with discontent due to perceived personal or group discrimination. It is believed that this lack of support may lie in the approach selected in the measurement of social identity. A study conducted by Veilleux (1989), suggests an alternative measurement method.

In contrast to the present study, Veilleux (1989) has sought to assess the salience of the social identity of women among Francophone university female students. The purpose of her study was to investigate the link between the salience of the identification to the group of women and deprivation on behalf of
the ingroup. To complete the social identity scale, participants were first asked to picture different stages of their career development and to indicate whether, being a "woman" features as an important category during these stages. This approach to measuring women's social identification was demonstrated as appropriate since results of the study indicated a significant link between social identity and collective relative deprivation. However, caution is advised given that the social identity scale devised by Veilleux (1989) was somewhat crude, containing four items tapping into only the cognitive and affective components. It is thus believed that a further test of the consolidating role of social identity, as proposed by Dibble (1981) and Dion (1986) is needed. Future research should examine whether the salience of women's identification to a particular image, using a social identity scale containing the three dimensions defined by Tajfel (1978), is associated with personal and collective relative deprivation.

An alternative explanation of the link between personal and collective relative deprivation was proposed in the present study. In light of the generalization hypothesis (Runciman, 1966), it was predicted that the level of personal relative deprivation affects the sense of collective deprivation. Results supported this hypothesis and illustrate the dictum: the personal is political. Women who felt a strong sense of personal deprivation were more likely to experience greater deprivation on behalf of the ingroup in comparison to women who expressed less
personal deprivation.

In sum, results of the present study support the generalization hypothesis proposed by Runciman (1966). Among women managers, dissatisfaction with personal experiences of discrimination are generalized to feelings of deprivation on behalf of the ingroup. Furthermore, an exploratory factor analysis suggests that both personal and collective deprivation scales account for two distinct forms of deprivation. The next issue to be examined is whether both concepts are associated with separate forms of social change activities. Relative deprivation and individual and collective attempts at social change

A further issue addressed in the present study involved the link between personal and collective relative deprivation with individual, and group enhancement initiatives. Based on previous research, it was proposed that both forms of deprivation account for different activities (Guimond & Dubé-Simard, 1983; Hafer & Olson, 1993; Runciman, 1966). On the one hand, personal relative deprivation was hypothesized to be associated with individual attempts to self-enhancement rather than collective action. On the other hand, collective relative deprivation was proposed to be related to group enhancement activities as opposed to individual strategies. These hypotheses were only partly supported. We begin by addressing results dealing with personal relative deprivation.

In the present study, it was predicted that women who felt
strong personal deprivation would be more eager to engage in individual rather than collective activities than those who felt less deprived. This hypothesis was partly supported. In light of predictions, analyses indicated that personal relative deprivation was associated with only one of the two individual enhancement initiatives presented. Specifically, women who obtained high, rather than low scores on the personal relative deprivation scale were more likely to express their intention to leave their current job. However, in contrast to expectations, participation in personal promotion initiatives, including activities such as competing for promotions, enrolling in training courses, participating on committees, did not vary in light of the level of personal deprivation experienced by women managers. These findings lead one to wonder whether women have reached a subsequent phase in their attempt to correct a personally disadvantaged situation. It is speculated that women may be at the stage where they have recognized that personal promotion efforts are no longer effective means to redress perceived personal discrimination. Rather, alternative strategies are preferred, such as entertaining thoughts of leaving their current job. However, it would be inaccurate to dismiss the importance of personal promotion activities among these women respondents. As descriptive statistics reveal (see Table 5), these strategies are actively sought by women managers. The question remains: What elements are pushing women managers to seek these career enhancement activities?
In addition, in contrast to hypotheses, personal relative deprivation was found to be associated with all collective actions strategies. Specifically, in comparison to women who felt less personally deprived, participants who expressed strong deprivation were more likely to endorse employment equity, preferential treatment and women advocacy strategies. This finding runs counter to results obtained by Hafer and Olson (1993), and is believed to be attributed to the type of personal relative deprivation measure used.

The present study represents the first attempt to isolate a form of personal relative deprivation involving a comparison between one’s personal situation and that of an outgroup. Such a measure of personal relative deprivation may have more implications than what was originally believed. Although it is speculative, it is possible to argue that women who come to feel discontent due to perceived inequities between their personal situation and that of male colleagues may conclude that their disadvantaged status is not due to personal deficits but rather to their group membership. Thus, to correct their disadvantaged situation, these women managers will select means which promote the ingroup as a whole. In other words, women managers who experience a strong sense of personal relative deprivation will translate, at the group level, their attempts for self-enhancement.

Furthermore, and as predicted, dissatisfaction due to perceived personal discrimination was indirectly associated with
the intention to leave. Results revealed that personal relative deprivation was linked to dissatisfaction with opportunities. In other words, women who felt discontent due to a disadvantaged personal situation relative to men, expressed dissatisfaction with departmental career development possibilities. In turn, dissatisfaction with departmental career development opportunities was found to be associated with women managers' intention to leave their current job.

Analyses were also conducted to examine the types of social change activities associated with collective relative deprivation. In light of previous studies (Guimond & Dubé-Simard, 1983; Hafer & Olson, 1993; Runciman, 1966; Vanneman & Pettigrew, 1972), it was predicted that collective relative deprivation would be a better predictor of collective rather than individual action. Results partly support this hypothesis. It was found that women managers who felt a strong sense of deprivation on behalf of the ingroup favoured all group enhancement activities, such as support of employment equity, preferential treatment and women advocacy measures. However, and contrary to predictions, collective relative deprivation was also associated with individual attempts at self-enhancement including both personal promotion initiatives and intention to leave their current job. In other words, women who reported strong discontent due to perceived group discrimination were more likely to engage in personal promotion strategies or consider leaving their current job, than women who feel less deprived. Thus, there is reason to
believe that collective relative deprivation is a better, but not sole predictor of group enhancement strategies.

The link discovered between collective deprivation and individual action does shed light on one element which may account for women's personal promotion activities. However, this link does present an inconsistency: Why are individual enhancement initiatives associated with discontent due to the disadvantaged situation of the ingroup? It is speculated that the answer to this question rests in the meaning women managers give to individual activities performed. For instance, personal enhancement initiatives, such as competing for promotions, participation on committees, seeking training opportunities or even considering leaving may be perceived by women managers as symbolic gestures of women's abilities and potential. In this manner, in undertaking self-enhancement measure, a woman manager who is strongly discontent due to the disadvantaged position of the ingroup relative to that of men in the organization, assumes the role of a representative of the ingroup. Such activities are initiated with the intention of having an impact on the image of the ingroup as a whole.

Research on the effects of relative deprivation on social change strategies remains incomplete. Few studies (e.g. Hafer and Olson, 1993) have attempted to distinguish certain forms of relative deprivation and examine their association with various social change activities. Although other forms of relative deprivation have been identified (Walker & Pettigrew, 1984),
research has yet to demonstrate their association with distinct patterns of behaviour and attitudes. For instance, it is believed that it would be useful to examine whether two forms of personal relative deprivation, that is, involving either a comparison between the self and ingroup or outgroup members, lead to different types of individual enhancement activities.

In conclusion, results of the present study have shed light on certain theoretical issues and offered some direction for future research. However, these findings also contain some practical value. In the following, the impact of the present study will be discussed.

The first set of results have indicated that women's perceptions of their level of representation and intrusiveness were independently associated with dissatisfaction due to perceived personal experiences of discrimination. In other words, women who were either greatly underrepresented or who occupied work groups containing no new female recruits expressed dissatisfaction due to perceived inequities between their personal situation and that of male colleagues. To address such dissatisfaction with perceived personal experiences of discrimination, an effective strategy would include means to reduce the isolation among women managers. For instance, one of the solutions offered by Kanter (1977) to correct the negative impact of women's underrepresentation involves batch hiring. Batch hiring, as its name implies, involves hiring at least two women at a time, in a given category where women are few. The
benefits of such a strategy are twofold. First, batch hiring avoids creating situations where women will be underrepresented in given work groups. Second, batch hiring will ensure a generous proportion of new female recruits in the organization. As discussed above, results of the present study have revealed that both of these advantages may have a positive effect on women managers' perceived personal experiences of discrimination.

However, in spite of such benefits, batch hiring is not believed to be a realistic measure in our times of fiscal restraint and organizational downsizing. In this manner, a more adaptive strategy, to reduce isolation among women managers in an organization, may involve introducing means for women managers to facilitate their proximity within the organization. For instance, women managers could be encouraged to participate in women's groups or committees dealing with various issues related to the organizational process. Such a strategy may foster greater contact between women in the organization and women managers who perceive themselves either as underrepresented or lacking female recruits.

Results of the present study further revealed that women managers, dissatisfied with perceived personal discrimination, feel discontent due to perceived inequities between women and men in the Department. To correct either for a perceived personal or group disadvantageous situation, women were asked to react to particular remedial activities. Specifically, both forms of relative deprivation were associated with activities which help
women to help themselves and endorsement of programmes implemented by the organization to promote the situation of women. Thus, based on these findings, it is possible to argue that, paradoxically, dissatisfaction with perceived discrimination is actually a beneficial ingredient for the situation of women managers. For instance, the argument could be made that such dissatisfaction ensures that women managers not remain apathetic to their disadvantaged personal or group situation and actively endorse in enhancement strategies. In this manner, such dissatisfaction leads women to assume the role of active agents seeking means to promote their individual and group situation.

However, these findings do point to some serious drawbacks for any corporation. First, a study conducted by Health and Welfare Canada (1989) has demonstrated the effect of discrimination against women on Canada's capacity to produce. According to their predictions, by the year 2006, if discrimination against women was eliminated, the Gross Domestic Product for each Canadian would increase by 20%. Thus, removing the discriminatory practices preventing women's access in an organization clearly makes good business sense. It is time to recognize that discrimination against women is an organizational imperative rather than an issue which only concerns female employees.

In addition, the present study suggests further costs incurred due to the consequences of discrimination against women
in an organization. According to results, it was found that dissatisfaction with perceived personal or group discrimination may potentially accelerate the turnover rate among women managers in the organization. Organizations can difficulty afford the costs of losing experienced employees and undermining employment equity efforts (Treasury Board of Canada, 1990).

The second drawback to discrimination of women in the organization is its impact on women’s work performance and productivity. For instance, a study conducted by Berg (1991) has revealed that perceived inequities have a negative effect on work satisfaction (Berg 1991). In turn, a study of women managers has revealed that dissatisfaction with work is negatively linked to job involvement (McKeen & Burke, 1991).

Finally, a third negative consequence to discrimination against women in the workforce is the toll it may take on women’s mental and physical health. For instance, it has been proposed (Crosby, 1976) and confirmed (Walker & Mann, 1987) that discontent due to a personally disadvantageous situation is associated with stress symptoms. However, future research should be conducted to determine whether the effect of stress contributes in any way to increased absenteeism among women managers who experience dissatisfaction due to perceived discrimination.

In sum, the present study investigated factors which account for both women’s discontent due to perceived discrimination and activities selected by women to promote their situation.
Findings shed some light on potential strategies to foster a women-sensitive environment in an organization. However, by focusing exclusively on the perceptions, attitudes and behaviours of women, this research has only considered one side of the coin. The situation of women in the workplace represents an intergroup dynamic; any attempt to reach parity in the organization requires the participation of both women and men. Therefore, the next step involves an investigation of the reactions of men. Specifically, future research will need to determine the reactions of men in light of women’s intrusiveness in nontraditional domains of work – this issue has not received much attention. In addition, further information should be gathered concerning the effects of the employment equity policies on men. For instance, are men willing to endorse the measures to correct the situation of women in management? Do differences in men’s evaluation of women emerge, depending upon the presence or absence of firm policies? These issues are of great importance given that the present situation is thus that women managers are actively recruited at lower levels while their progress in reaching upper management has remained, for the last two decades, limited.
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Appendix A
Your experience in this department may have led you to develop a general impression of women and men in support groups. Refer to this impression to complete this first part of the questionnaire.

To what extent do you agree with the following statements? Please respond using the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not</td>
<td>very</td>
<td>a bit</td>
<td>more</td>
<td>much</td>
<td>very</td>
<td>absolutely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>at all</td>
<td>little</td>
<td>or less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>much</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1a. In ------, women in support groups have the necessary qualifications to do their work.

b. In ------, women in support groups are competent in general.

c. In ------, men in support groups have the necessary qualifications to do their work.

d. In ------, men in support groups are competent in general.

2a. I feel that the work performed by support group employees could be done by just about anyone.

b. I believe that the contribution of support group employees is significant in this department.

c. I feel that I could get by in my job without depending on the work performed by support group employees.

3a. In general, I believe that women support group employees have the potential to reach management positions.

b. In general, I believe that women support group employees have the necessary level of motivation to reach management positions.

c. In general, I believe that women support group employees are sufficiently resourceful to reach management positions.

d. In general, I believe that men support group employees have the potential to reach management positions.

e. In general, I believe that men support group employees have the necessary level of motivation to reach management positions.

f. In general, I believe that men support group employees are sufficiently resourceful to reach management positions.

4a. In general, I believe that women support group employees are satisfied with their current duties.

b. In general, I believe that women support group employees would welcome a career change.

c. In general, I believe that men support group employees are satisfied with their current duties.

d. In general, I believe that men support group employees would welcome a career change.
In the following sections, we ask you to compare the situation of both women and men in support groups.

Please respond using the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>very little</td>
<td>a bit</td>
<td>more or less</td>
<td>much</td>
<td>very much</td>
<td>absolutely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_____ 5a. Within support groups, do you believe that, compared to men, women are disadvantaged as to their opportunities for promotion?

_____ b. To what extent are you satisfied with this situation?

_____ c. Within support groups, do you believe that, compared to men, the performance of women is evaluated more harshly?

_____ d. To what extent are you satisfied with this situation?

_____ e. Within support groups, do you believe that, compared to men, women are less likely to have the opportunity to participate in training?

_____ f. To what extent are you satisfied with this situation?

In the following, a list of activities which may assist you in your career planning are presented. We ask that you indicate whether you have sought to participate in these activities.

6. In the past, to what extent have you sought to participate in the following activities:

Please respond using the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>very little</td>
<td>a bit</td>
<td>more or less</td>
<td>much</td>
<td>very much</td>
<td>extremely frequently</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_____ a. developmental opportunities (e.g. participation in the Career Enhancement Program, acting assignments, secondments, job rotation, personal development)

_____ b. lateral transfers (e.g. between Regions, various Programs/Sectors, other Departments)

_____ c. participation on various committees, information sessions (e.g. recognition and rewards committee, brown bag sessions, various ------ workshops, special event days, voluntary team projects such as United Way)

_____ d. involvement in training sessions, courses (e.g. college or university level)

_____ e. leave (e.g. special family leave, self-funded leave)

_____ f. promotion opportunities (e.g. competitions within or outside ------)

_____ g. alternative working arrangements (e.g. job-sharing, compressed work week, working at home)
Please respond using the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>very little</td>
<td>a bit</td>
<td>more or less</td>
<td>much</td>
<td>very much</td>
<td>absolutely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7a. To what extent do you believe you would be supported by your co-workers or superiors when choosing to participate in the activities listed above?

7b. To what extent do you feel that your responsibilities towards others affect your work life (e.g. parents, persons with disabilities, etc.)?

8. In the space provided, please indicate what factor(s) is(are) limiting you from seeking these opportunities for career development:

9. To what extent do you feel the following areas have presented barriers to your career movement in ______:

Please respond using the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>very little</td>
<td>a bit</td>
<td>more or less</td>
<td>much</td>
<td>very much</td>
<td>absolutely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. management style and behaviors (e.g. insensitivity, authoritative, lack of communication abilities, discriminatory practices)

b. career planning/counselling (e.g. lack of information material on career counselling/planning)

c. balancing work and family (e.g. small children, dependent persons with special needs, elder care)

d. work schedules (e.g. management unwillingness to accommodate alternative work arrangements, insensitivity towards employees being unable to travel or work overtime on short notice)

e. harassment in the workplace (e.g. sexual, abuse of authority, racist attitudes)

f. staffing procedures (e.g. overstating prerequisite for positions, various testing mechanisms, membership of selection boards)

g. lack of education and/or required skills

h. other

please explain:
10. How often have you encouraged departmental women to seek the following activities:

Please respond using the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>very little</td>
<td>a bit</td>
<td>more or less</td>
<td>much</td>
<td>very much</td>
<td>extremely frequently</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_____ a. developmental opportunities (eg. participation in the Career Enhancement Program, acting assignments, secondments, job rotation, personal development)

_____ b. lateral transfers (eg. between Regions, various Programs/Sectors, other Departments)

_____ c. participation on various committees, information sessions (eg. recognition and rewards committee, brown bag sessions, various workshops, special event days, voluntary team projects such as United Way)

_____ d. involvement in training sessions, courses (eg. college or university level)

_____ e. leave (eg. special family leave, self-funded leave)

_____ f. promotion opportunities (eg. competitions within or outside)

_____ g. alternative working arrangements (eg. job-sharing, compressed work week, working at home)

11. In the space provided, please indicate strategies which you feel should initiate to respond to the needs of women in support groups:

Your experience in this department may have led you to develop a general impression of women and men in management. Refer to this impression to complete this part of the questionnaire.

Please respond using the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>very little</td>
<td>a bit</td>
<td>more or less</td>
<td>much</td>
<td>very much</td>
<td>absolutely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_____ 12a. In -----, women in management have the necessary qualifications to do their work.

_____ b. In -----, women in management are competent in general.

_____ c. In -----, men in management have the necessary qualifications to do their work.

_____ d. In -----, men in management are competent in general.
In the following questions we ask you to compare between the situation of women managers to that of their male colleagues.

Please respond using the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>very little</td>
<td>a bit</td>
<td>more or less</td>
<td>much</td>
<td>very much</td>
<td>absolutely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

______ 13a. Within management, do you believe that, compared to men, women are disadvantaged as to their opportunities for promotion?

______ b. To what extent are you satisfied with this situation?

______ c. Within management, do you believe that, compared to men, the performance of women is evaluated more harshly?

______ d. To what extent are you satisfied with this situation?

______ e. Within management, do you believe that, compared to men, women are less likely to have the opportunity to participate in training?

______ f. To what extent are you satisfied with this situation?

In light of your own experiences, you may have come to form an image of career women. While filling out this section, please refer to your image of career women. What is this image? What characteristics either physical, psychological, moral, etc. best depict your image of career women?

14. Please list the characteristics which come to mind:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

The following series of questions refer to your image of career women. In particular, we ask that you to relate to this image of career women. Do not forget to answer every question.

To what extent do you agree with the following statements? Please respond using the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>moderately disagree</td>
<td>slightly disagree</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>slightly agree</td>
<td>moderately agree</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

______ a. It is a disadvantage to adopt a way of life similar to that of “career women”.

______ b. There are many advantages to being a “career woman”.

______ c. I believe that I am quite different from “career women”.

______ d. It is disadvantageous to be categorized as a “career woman”.

Please respond using the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>moderately disagree</td>
<td>slightly disagree</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>slightly agree</td>
<td>moderately agree</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e. The way I live is different from that of “career women”.
f. In general, my ideas are similar to those of “career women”.
g. I often feel restricted in the “career woman’s” role.
h. Sometimes I prefer that others forget the fact that I am a “career woman”.
i. I often feel required to act like a “career woman”.
j. In general, I identify with “career women”.
k. In general, I behave quite differently from “career women”.
l. I consider myself superior because I am a “career woman”.
m. I feel proud to be a “career woman”.
n. I like to emphasize the fact that I am a “career woman”.
o. I often feel uncomfortable due to the fact that I am a “career woman”.
p. I like being a part of the group we could call “career women”.
q. I think that I am a part of a group we could call “career women”.
r. It is important for me to be a part of the group we could call “career women”.

Here is a series of strategies generally used to improve women’s situation at work. To what extent do you agree with these strategies?

Please respond using the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>moderately disagree</td>
<td>slightly disagree</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>slightly agree</td>
<td>moderately agree</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15a. When equally competent, give preference to women over men when recruiting for positions where women are under-represented.

b. When equally competent, give preference to women over men for promotions to positions where women are under-represented.

c. If there are no employment equity programs helping women in employment, women will continue to be treated unfairly.
Please respond using the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>moderately disagree</td>
<td>slightly disagree</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>slightly agree</td>
<td>moderately agree</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**d.** After years of discrimination, it is only fair to set up special programs to make sure women are given fair and equitable treatment.

**e.** All in all, do you favor the implementation of employment equity programs for women in organizations?

**f.** Implementing bridging programs for women in support groups who wish to access officer-level positions.

**g.** I would accept to become a mentor for a woman employee in this department.

**h.** I would be ready to encourage mentoring among women in this department.

**i.** I would like to take an active role in developing a network for women in this department.

**j.** I would encourage the implementation of a women's networking system among women employees in this department.

**Now think of the way you feel at work and indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements.**

Please respond using the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>moderately disagree</td>
<td>slightly disagree</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>slightly agree</td>
<td>moderately agree</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**16a.** Despite my efforts, my work is never recognized by my colleagues.

**b.** Despite my efforts, my work is never recognized by my superiors.

**c.** In general, I feel motivated in my work.

**d.** In general, I feel motivated to continue working in this department.

**e.** I am satisfied with my job as a whole.

**f.** I am satisfied with the opportunities I have to accomplish meaningful work.

**g.** In general, I believe I am qualified to fulfill my job requirements.

**h.** In general, I believe I am effective in my work.

**i.** In general, I believe that I am competent in my work.
j. At work, I generally feel:

Please circle:  
1 Calm  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 Nervous

Please circle:  
1 Stressed  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 Not at all stressed

Please circle:  
1 Tense  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 Relaxed

In this section we ask you to indicate the extent to which you are satisfied with the opportunities offered in this department.

Please respond using the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 not at all</th>
<th>2 very little</th>
<th>3 a bit</th>
<th>4 more or less</th>
<th>5 much</th>
<th>6 very much</th>
<th>7 absolutely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

17a. To what extent are you satisfied with career development opportunities in ------?

b. To what extent are you satisfied with promotion opportunities in ------?

c. To what extent are you satisfied with training opportunities in ------?

d. To what extent are you satisfied with opportunities for personal development in ------?

e. To what extent do you feel fully informed of career opportunities?

f. To what extent do you plan to pursue your education with or without departmental support?

g. At this time in your career, to what extent would you want to quit your job if it were possible?

h. To what extent are you actually planning to leave your job within the next six months?

i. To what extent are you actively searching for another job right now?

j. To what extent are you thinking of leaving your current job?

In responding to the following questions, we ask you to think of your colleagues who occupy your group and level in ------ and with whom you interact on a regular basis for work purposes (eg. meetings). For instance, if your occupational group and level is a PM5, think of your colleagues who also occupy the PM5 group and level and with whom you interact regularly.

18a. Among your colleagues, estimate the percentage of women who occupy your group and level in ------:

Please circle:  
0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%
b. Within the last two years, estimate the percentage of women who have gained access to your group and level in ------:

Please circle: 0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

This section refers to your personal work situation.

Please respond using the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>very little</td>
<td>a bit</td>
<td>more or less</td>
<td>much</td>
<td>very much</td>
<td>absolutely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

______ 19a. Within ------, do you believe that, compared to your male colleagues, you are disadvantaged as to opportunities for promotion?

______ b. To what extent are you satisfied with this situation?

______ c. Within ------, do you believe that, compared to your male colleagues, your performance is evaluated more harshly?

______ d. To what extent are you satisfied with this situation?

______ e. Within ------, do you believe that, compared to your male colleagues, you are less likely to have the opportunity to participate in training?

______ f. To what extent are you satisfied with this situation?

To what extent do you agree with the following statements? Please respond using the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>moderately disagree</td>
<td>slightly disagree</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>slightly agree</td>
<td>moderately agree</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

______ 20a. Universities are wrong to admit women in costly programmes such as medicine, when in fact, a large number will leave their jobs after a few years to raise their children.

______ b. In order not to appear sexist, many men are inclined to overcompensate women.

______ c. Only qualifications, and not the sex of the candidate should be taken into consideration when awarding jobs or promotions.

______ d. Women shouldn’t push themselves where they are not wanted.

______ e. It is difficult to work for a woman boss.

______ f. Over the past few years, women have gotten more from government than they deserve.

______ g. Women will make more progress by being patient and not pushing too hard for change.

______ h. Women’s requests in terms of equality between the sexes are simply exaggerated.
Please respond using the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>moderately disagree</td>
<td>slightly disagree</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>slightly agree</td>
<td>moderately agree</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

______ i. In a fair employment system, men and women would be considered equal.
______ j. I consider the present employment system to be unfair to women.
______ k. Discrimination against women in the labor force is no longer a problem in Canada.
______ l. Due to social pressures, managers frequently have to hire underqualified women.

**General information:**

*Gender:*  
( ) Male ( ) Female

*Age category:*  
( ) Under 25 years  
( ) 26 to 29 years  
( ) 30 to 34 years  
( ) 35 to 39 years  
( ) 40 to 49 years  
( ) 50 years or over

*What language do you speak at home?*  
( ) French ( ) English ( ) Other

*Marital status:*  
Single ( ) Married ( ) Divorced ( ) Other ( )

*How many children do you have living at home?* ______

*What ages are your children?*  
Less than 5 years ______  
Between 5 and 10 years ______  
More than 10 years ______

*Highest level of education completed:*  
( ) Elementary ( ) College ( ) Masters  
( ) High School ( ) Baccalaureate ( ) Doctorate

*How many years have you been in the labor market?* ______

*How many years have you been a public servant?* ______

*How many years have you worked in the Department?* ______
In _____, indicate whether you are
( ) Indeterminate employee
( ) Term employee

Indicate the region in which you are currently working:
( ) Atlantic
( ) Quebec
( ) Ontario
( ) National Capital Region
( ) Manitoba
( ) Saskatchewan
( ) Alberta
( ) British Columbia
( ) Northwest Territories
( ) Yukon

Indicate your occupational category:
( ) Management Category
( ) Scientific and Professional Category
( ) Administrative and Foreign Service Category
( ) Technical Category
( ) Operational Category
( ) Administrative Support Category

Does your position involve supervising staff?
Yes ( ) No ( )

Do you supervise women staff?
Yes ( ) No ( )

What is your annual gross income from _____?
( ) Under $40,000
( ) $40,000 to $49,999
( ) $50,000 to $59,999
( ) $60,000 to $69,999
( ) $70,000 to $79,999
( ) $80,000 and over

COMMENTS:
Votre expérience dans ce ministère vous a sûrement permis de vous former une impression générale des hommes et des femmes dans le groupe de soutien. Référez à cette impression pour remplir cette première partie du questionnaire.

À quel point êtes-vous d'accord avec les énoncés suivants?
Veuillez répondre en vous servant de l'échelle suivante:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>pas du tout</th>
<th>très peu</th>
<th>peu</th>
<th>ni peu</th>
<th>assez</th>
<th>très</th>
<th>tout à fait</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a.</td>
<td>Au -----, les femmes dans le groupe de soutien ont en général les qualifications nécessaires pour accomplir leur travail.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b.</td>
<td>Je crois que le travail exécuté par les personnes dans le groupe de soutien pourrait être accompli par à peu près n'importe qui.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c.</td>
<td>Je crois que je pourrais me débrouiller dans mon emploi sans dépendre du travail accompli par les personnes dans le groupe de soutien.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a.</td>
<td>En général, je crois que les femmes dans le groupe de soutien ont le potentiel d'atteindre des postes de cadre.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b.</td>
<td>En général, je crois que les femmes dans le groupe de soutien ont le niveau de motivation nécessaire pour atteindre des postes de cadre.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c.</td>
<td>En général, je crois que les femmes dans le groupe de soutien sont assez débrouillardes pour atteindre des postes de cadre.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2d.</td>
<td>En général, je crois que les hommes dans le groupe de soutien ont le potentiel d'atteindre des postes de cadre.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e.</td>
<td>En général, je crois que les hommes dans le groupe de soutien ont le niveau de motivation nécessaire pour atteindre des postes de cadre.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2f.</td>
<td>En général, je crois que les hommes dans le groupe de soutien sont assez débrouillards pour atteindre des postes de cadre.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a.</td>
<td>En général, je crois que les femmes dans le groupe de soutien sont satisfaits de leurs tâches actuelles.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b.</td>
<td>En général, je crois que les femmes dans le groupe de soutien seraient ouvertes à un changement de carrière.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c.</td>
<td>En général, je crois que les femmes dans le groupe de soutien sont satisfaits de leurs tâches actuelles.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d.</td>
<td>En général, je crois que les hommes dans le groupe de soutien seraient ouvertes à un changement de carrière.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pour les questions suivantes, nous vous demandons de comparer la situation des femmes à celle des hommes dans le groupe de soutien.

Veuillez répondre en vous servant de l'échelle suivante:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pas du tout</td>
<td>très peu</td>
<td>peu</td>
<td>ni peu</td>
<td>assez</td>
<td>très</td>
<td>tout à fait</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_____ 5a. Dans le groupe de soutien, croyez-vous que les femmes soient défavorisées par rapport aux hommes, quant à leurs chances d'obtenir une promotion?

_____ b. Par rapport à cette situation, à quel point êtes-vous satisfaite?

_____ c. Dans le groupe de soutien, croyez-vous que, par rapport aux hommes, le rendement des femmes soit évalué plus sévèrement?

_____ d. Par rapport à cette situation, à quel point êtes-vous satisfaite?

_____ e. Dans le groupe de soutien, croyez-vous que les femmes ont, par rapport aux hommes, moins de chances de suivre des cours de formation?

_____ f. Par rapport à cette situation, à quel point êtes-vous satisfaite?

Dans ce qui suit, nous vous présentons une série d'activités qui peuvent vous servir dans la planification de carrière. Veuillez indiquer à quel point vous avez cherché à entreprendre chacune de ces activités.

6. Dans le passé, dans quelle mesure avez-vous cherché à entreprendre les activités suivantes:

Veuillez répondre en vous servant de l'échelle suivante:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pas du tout</td>
<td>très peu</td>
<td>peu</td>
<td>ni peu</td>
<td>assez</td>
<td>très</td>
<td>extrêmement souvent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_____ a. possibilités axées sur le développement (ex. participation au Programme d'enrichissement de la carrière, nominations intérimaires, détachements, affectations par rotation, développement personnel)

_____ b. mutations latérales (ex. entre les régions, divers programmes/secteurs, autres ministères)

_____ c. participation à divers comités, sessions d'information (ex. comité de reconnaissance et récompenses, réunion casse-croûte, divers ateliers du -----, journée d'événements spéciaux, projets d'équipes bénévoles comme Centraide)

_____ d. participation à des sessions de formation, cours (ex. niveau collégial, niveau universitaire)

_____ e. congé (congé spécial pour obligations familiales, congé auto financé)

_____ f. perspectives de promotions (ex. compétitions à l'intérieur ou à l'extérieur du -----)

_____ g. réaménagement des horaires de travail (ex. partage d'emploi, semaine de travail comprimée, travail à la maison)
Veuillez répondre en vous servant de l'échelle suivante:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pas du tout</td>
<td>très peu</td>
<td>peu</td>
<td>ni peu</td>
<td>assez</td>
<td>très</td>
<td>tout à fait</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7a. Dans quelle mesure croyez-vous recevoir l'appui de vos collègues ou supérieurs pour votre participation aux activités précédentes?

7b. Dans quelle mesure croyez-vous que vos responsabilités à l'endroit des autres affectent votre vie au travail (ex. parents, personnes handicapées, etc.)?

8. Dans l'espace fourni, veuillez indiquer le(s) facteur(s) qui vous ont empêchée d'entreprendre ces activités favorisant le progrès de la carrière:

9. À quel point croyez-vous que chacun des éléments suivants a ralenti votre progression de carrière au ------:

Veuillez répondre en vous servant de l'échelle suivante:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pas du tout</td>
<td>très peu</td>
<td>peu</td>
<td>ni peu</td>
<td>assez</td>
<td>très</td>
<td>tout à fait</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. styles de gestion et comportements (ex. insensibilité, autoritarisme, manque de compétence en communication, pratiques discriminatoires)

b. planification de carrière/orientation professionnelle (ex. manque d'information par rapport à la planification de carrière/orientation professionnelle)

c. équilibre entre le travail et la famille (ex. jeunes enfants, personnes dépendantes ayant des besoins spéciaux, soins de personnes âgées)

d. horaire de travail (ex. manque d'ouverture de la part des gestionnaires à des arrangements de travail flexible, manque de sensibilité à l'endroit des employé(e)s incapables de voyager ou de faire du temps supplémentaire sans préavis)

e. harcèlement au travail (ex. sexuel, abus d'autorité, attitudes racistes)

f. méthode de dotation (ex. critères d'embauche non-pertinents, divers types d'épreuves, appartenance à des comités de sélection)

g. manque d'éducation et/ou compétences requises

h. autre

Veuillez expliquer:
10. Dans quelle mesure avez-vous encouragé les femmes de ce ministère à entreprendre les activités suivantes:

Veuillez répondre en vous servant de l'échelle suivante:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pas du tout</td>
<td>très peu</td>
<td>peu</td>
<td>ni peu</td>
<td>assez</td>
<td>très</td>
<td>extrêmement souveni</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

____ a. possibilités axées sur le développement (ex. participation au Programme d'enrichissement de la carrière, nominations intérimaires, détachements, affectations par rotation, développement personnel)

____ b. mutations latérales (ex. entre les régions, divers programmes secteurs, autres ministères)

____ c. participation à divers comités, sessions d'information (ex. comité de reconnaissance et récompenses, réunion casse-croûte, divers ateliers du -----, journée d'événements spéciaux, projets d'équipes bénévoles comme Centraide)

____ d. participation à des sessions de formation, cours (ex. niveau collégial, niveau universitaire)

____ e. congé (congé spécial pour obligations familiales, congé auto financé)

____ f. perspectives de promotions (ex. compétitions à l'intérieur ou à l'extérieur du -----)

____ g. réaménagement des horaires de travail (ex. partage d'emploi, semaine de travail comprimée, travail à la maison)

11. Dans l'espace réservé, veuillez énumérer les stratégies que le -----, selon vous, devrait initier afin de répondre aux besoins des femmes dans le groupe de soutien:

Votre expérience dans ce ministère vous a sûrement permis de vous former une impression générale des hommes et des femmes dans les emplois de cadre. Référez à cette impression pour remplir cette partie du questionnaire.

Veuillez répondre en vous servant de l'échelle suivante:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pas du tout</td>
<td>très peu</td>
<td>peu</td>
<td>ni peu</td>
<td>assez</td>
<td>très</td>
<td>tout à fait</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

____ 12a. Au -----, les femmes cadres ont en général les qualifications nécessaires pour accomplir leur travail.

____ b. Au -----, les femmes cadres sont en général compétentes.

____ c. Au -----, les hommes cadres ont en général les qualifications nécessaires pour accomplir leur travail.

____ d. Au -----, les hommes cadres sont en général compétents.
Pour les questions suivantes, vous vous demandons de comparer la situation des femmes cadres à celle de leurs collègues masculins.

Veuillez répondre en vous servant de l'échelle suivante:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pas</td>
<td>très peu</td>
<td>peu</td>
<td>ni peu</td>
<td>assez</td>
<td>très</td>
<td>tout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>du tout</td>
<td>ni beaucoup</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>à fait</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13a. Chez les cadres, croyez-vous que les femmes soient défavorisées, par rapport aux hommes quant à leurs chances d'obtenir une promotion?

b. Par rapport à cette situation, à quel point êtes-vous satisfaite?

c. Chez les cadres, croyez-vous que, par rapport aux hommes, le rendement des femmes soit évalué plus sévèrement?

d. Par rapport à cette situation, à quel point êtes-vous satisfaite?

e. Chez les cadres, croyez-vous que les femmes ont, par rapport aux hommes, moins de chances de suivre des cours de formation?

f. Par rapport à cette situation, à quel point êtes-vous satisfaite?

À partir de vos propres expériences, il se peut que vous vous êtes formée une idée des femmes de carrière. Pour répondre aux questions qui suivent, nous vous demandons de référer à cette image des femmes de carrière. À quoi correspond cette image? Quelles sont les caractéristiques, soient physiques, psychologiques, morales, etc. qui permettent le mieux selon vous d'illustrer votre image des femmes de carrière?

14. Indiquez ci-dessous les premières caractéristiques qui vous viennent à l'esprit:

La série de questions qui suit réfère à l'image que vous avez des femmes de carrière. Nous vous demandons plus particulièrement de vous situer par rapport à cette image. N'oubliez pas de répondre à toutes les questions.

Dans quelle mesure êtes-vous d'accord avec chacun des énoncés suivants?
Veillez répondre en vous servant de l'échelle suivante:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pas</td>
<td>très peu</td>
<td>peu</td>
<td>ni peu</td>
<td>assez</td>
<td>très</td>
<td>tout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>du tout</td>
<td>ni beaucoup</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>à fait</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Il est désavantageux d'adopter un mode de vie semblable aux "femmes de carrière".

b. Il y a de nombreux avantages à être une "femme de carrière".

c. Je crois que je suis très différente des "femmes de carrière".
Veuillez répondre en vous servant de l'échelle suivante:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pas du tout</td>
<td>très peu</td>
<td>peu</td>
<td>ni peu</td>
<td>assez</td>
<td>très</td>
<td>tout à fait</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Il est désavantageux d’être catégorisée comme une “femme de carrière”.
2. Ma façon de vivre est très différente de celle des “femmes de carrière”.
3. Dans l’ensemble, mes idées sont semblables à celles des “femmes de carrière”.
4. Je me sens souvent à l’étroit dans le rôle de “femme de carrière”.
5. Il m’arrive de préférer qu’on oublie le fait que je suis une “femme de carrière”.
6. Je me sens souvent obligée d’agir comme une “femme de carrière”.
7. Dans l’ensemble, je m’identifie aux “femmes de carrière”.
8. Dans l’ensemble, j’agis très différemment des “femmes de carrière”.
9. Je me considère supérieure du fait que je suis une “femme de carrière”.
10. Je suis fière d’être une “femme de carrière”.
11. J’aime mettre en valeur le fait que je suis une “femme de carrière”.
12. Il m’arrive souvent d’être mal à l’aise d’être une “femme de carrière”.
13. J’aime faire partie de ce qu’on pourrait appeler le groupe des “femmes de carrière”.
14. Je pense que je fais partie de ce qu’on pourrait appeler le groupe des “femmes de carrière”.
15. Il est important pour moi de faire partie de ce qu’on pourrait appeler le groupe des “femmes de carrière”.

Voici une série de stratégies qui sont généralement utilisées pour améliorer la situation des femmes au travail. À quel point êtes-vous d'accord avec ces stratégies?

Veuillez répondre en vous servant de l'échelle suivante:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pas du tout</td>
<td>très peu</td>
<td>peu</td>
<td>ni peu</td>
<td>assez</td>
<td>très</td>
<td>tout à fait</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15a. À compétences égales aux hommes, donner préférence aux femmes dans l'embauche à des postes où elles sont sous-représentées.

b. À compétences égales aux hommes, donner préférence aux femmes dans l'octroi de promotions à des postes où elles sont sous-représentées.
Veuillez répondre en vous servant de l'échelle suivante:

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
pas du  très peu  peu  ni peu  assez  très  tout
tout  d'accord  d'accord  ni beaucoup  d'accord  d'accord  à fait

___ c. Sans programme d'équité en matière d'emploi, les femmes seront toujours traitées de façon injuste sur le marché du travail.

___ d. Après des années de discrimination, il est tout à fait juste de mettre sur pied des programmes spéciaux pour s'assurer que les femmes soient traitées de façon juste et équitable.

___ e. De façon générale, êtes-vous favorable à l'implantation de programmes d'équité en matière d'emploi pour les femmes dans les organisations?

___ f. Implanter des mécanismes de transition pour les femmes dans le groupe de soutien qui désirent accéder aux postes du niveau d'agent.

___ g. Je serais d'accord à servir de mentor pour une femme dans ce ministère.

___ h. Je serais prêt à encourager le « mentoring » entre femmes dans ce ministère.

___ i. Je désire prendre une part active au fonctionnement d'un réseau de femmes dans ce ministère.

___ j. Je serais prêt à encourager la formation d'un réseau de femmes dans ce ministère.

Pensez maintenant à la façon dont vous vous sentez au travail et indiquez à quel point vous êtes d'accord avec les énoncés suivants.

Veuillez répondre en vous servant de l'échelle suivante:

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
pas du  très peu  peu  ni peu  assez  très  tout
tout  d'accord  d'accord  ni beaucoup  d'accord  d'accord  à fait

___ 16a. Peu importe mes efforts, mon travail n'est jamais reconnu par mes collègues.

___ b. Peu importe mes efforts, mon travail n'est jamais reconnu par mes patrons.

___ c. Je me sens, en général, motivée dans mon travail.

___ d. Je me sens, en général, motivée à continuer à travailler dans ce ministère.

___ e. De façon générale, je suis satisfaite de mon emploi.

___ f. Je suis satisfaite de mes chances d'accomplir quelque chose d'utilile.

___ g. J'ai, en général, l'impression d'être qualifiée pour effectuer mon travail.

___ h. J'ai en général, l'impression d'être efficace dans mon travail.

___ i. J'ai en général, l'impression d'être compétente dans mon travail.
j. Au travail, je suis en général

Dans cette partie, nous vous demandons d'indiquer dans quelle mesure vous êtes satisfaite des conditions qui vous sont offertes dans ce ministère.

Veuillez répondre en vous servant de l'échelle suivante:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pas du tout</td>
<td>très peu</td>
<td>peu</td>
<td>ni peu</td>
<td>assez</td>
<td>très</td>
<td>tout à fait</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17a. Dans quelle mesure êtes-vous satisfaite des possibilités de développement de carrière au -----?

b. Dans quelle mesure êtes-vous satisfaite des possibilités de promotion au -----?

c. Dans quelle mesure êtes-vous satisfaite des possibilités de formation au -----?

d. Dans quelle mesure êtes-vous satisfaite des possibilités de croissance personnelle au -----?

e. Dans quelle mesure croyez-vous être informée des possibilités de carrière?

f. Dans quelle mesure planifiez-vous de poursuivre vos études avec ou sans l’appui du ministère?

18a. Parmi vos collègues, estimez le pourcentage de femmes qui occupent votre groupe et niveau au -----:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>veuillez encercer</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>60%</th>
<th>70%</th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>90%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>calme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stressée</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tendue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nerveuse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pas stressée</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pas tendue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b. Dans les deux dernières années, estimez le pourcentage de femmes qui ont, selon vous, atteint votre groupe et niveau au -----

0%   10%   20%   30%   40%   50%   60%   70%   80%   90%   100%

Cette partie réfère à votre situation personnelle de travail.

Veuillez répondre en vous servant de l'échelle suivante:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pas</td>
<td>du tout</td>
<td>très peu</td>
<td>peu</td>
<td>ni peu</td>
<td>assez</td>
<td>très</td>
<td>tout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19a. Au ----, comparativement à vos collègues masculins, croyez-vous que vous êtes défavorisée quant à vos chances d'obtenir une promotion?

b. Par rapport à cette situation, à quel point êtes-vous satisfaite?

c. Au ----, comparativement à vos collègues masculins, croyez-vous que votre rendement soit évalué plus sévèrement?

d. Par rapport à cette situation, à quel point êtes-vous satisfaite?

e. Au ----, comparativement à vos collègues masculins, croyez-vous avoir moins de chances de suivre des cours de formation?

f. Par rapport à cette situation, à quel point êtes-vous satisfaite?

À quel point êtes-vous d'accord avec les énoncés suivants?

Veuillez répondre en vous servant de l'échelle suivante:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pas</td>
<td>du tout</td>
<td>très peu</td>
<td>peu</td>
<td>ni peu</td>
<td>assez</td>
<td>très</td>
<td>tout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tout d'accord</td>
<td>d'accord</td>
<td>ni beaucoup</td>
<td>d'accord</td>
<td>d'accord</td>
<td>à fait</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20a. Les universités ont tort d'admettre autant de femmes dans les programmes coûteux comme la médecine alors qu'un grand nombre quitteront leur emploi après quelques années pour élever leurs enfants.

b. Pour ne pas paraître sexistes, beaucoup d'hommes sont portés à donner des passe-droits aux femmes.

c. Seulement les qualifications et non le sexe des candidats devraient être prises en considération dans l'attribution d'emplois ou de promotions.

d. Les femmes ne devraient pas essayer de percer là où on ne les veut pas.

e. Il est difficile de travailler sous les ordres d'une femme.

f. Au cours des dernières années, les femmes ont obtenu des gouvernements plus que ce qu'elles méritent.
Veuillez répondre en vous servant de l'échelle suivante:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pas du tout</td>
<td>très peu d'accord</td>
<td>peu d'accord</td>
<td>ni peu d'accord</td>
<td>assez d'accord</td>
<td>très d'accord</td>
<td>à fait</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

______ g. Les femmes feront plus de progrès en étant patientes et ne revendiquant pas trop de changements.

______ h. Les demandes des femmes en termes d'égaleité entre les sexes sont tout simplement exagérées.

______ i. Dans un système d'emploi juste, les hommes et les femmes devraient être considérés comme égaux.

______ j. Je considère le système d'emploi actuel comme injuste à l'endroit des femmes.

______ k. La discrimination envers les femmes sur le marché du travail est une chose du passé au Canada.

______ l. À cause de pressions sociales, les cadres doivent souvent engager des femmes qui ne sont pas qualifiées.

### Information générale:

**Sexe:**
- ( ) homme
- ( ) femme

**Catégorie d'âge:**
- ( ) moins de 25 ans
- ( ) entre 25 et 29 ans
- ( ) entre 30 et 34 ans
- ( ) entre 35 et 39 ans
- ( ) entre 40 et 49 ans
- ( ) 50 ans ou plus

**Quelle langue parlez-vous à la maison?**
- ( ) français
- ( ) anglais
- ( ) autre

**Statut civil:**
- célibataire
- mariée
- divorcée
- autre

**Nombre d'enfants à charge:** __________

**Âge des enfants:**
- moins de 5 ans ______
- 5 à 10 ans ______
- 10 ans et plus ______

**Niveau de scolarité complété:**
- ( ) primaire
- ( ) collégial
- ( ) maîtrise
- ( ) secondaire
- ( ) baccalauréat
- ( ) doctorat
Depuis combien d'années êtes-vous sur le marché du travail: 

Depuis combien d'années êtes-vous fonctionnaire: 

Depuis combien d'années êtes-vous à l'emploi du ministère ----: 

Au ----, je suis une employée:\n\(\_\_\_\_\) nommée pour une période indéterminée\n\(\_\_\_\) nommée pour une période déterminée

Indiquez la région dans laquelle vous travaillez actuellement:\n\(\_\_\_\) Atlantique\n\(\_\_\_\) Manitoba\n\(\_\_\_\) Colombie-Britannique\n\(\_\_\_\) Québec\n\(\_\_\_\) Saskatchewan\n\(\_\_\_\) Territoires du Nord-ouest\n\(\_\_\_\) Ontario\n\(\_\_\_\) Alberta\n\(\_\_\_\) Yukon\n\(\_\_\_\) région de la capitale nationale

Catégorie d'emploi:\n\(\_\_\_\) Gestion\n\(\_\_\_\) Scientifique et professionnelle\n\(\_\_\_\) Technique\n\(\_\_\_\) Administration et service extérieur\n\(\_\_\_\) Exploitation\n\(\_\_\_\) Soutien administratif

Votre poste implique-t-il la surveillance de personnel? Oui ( ) Non ( )

Votre personnel inclut-il des femmes? Oui ( ) Non ( )

Salaire annuel brut au ----:
\(\_\_\_\) moins de 40 000$\n\(\_\_\_\) entre 40 000$ et 49 999$\n\(\_\_\_\) entre 50 000$ et 59 999$\n\(\_\_\_\) entre 60 000$ et 69 999$\n\(\_\_\_\) entre 70 000$ et 79 999$\n\(\_\_\_\) plus de 80 000$

COMMENTAIRES: