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The Origins of Management

During the initial stages of capitalism, the capitalist himself used to perform the dual roles of the owner as well as the manager. In course of time, the general decline of traditional family-owned firms and the rise of the joint stock company led to the distinction between the owner of capital and the manager of capital. Marx (1967: 387-88) observes,

"Stock companies in general - developed with the credit system - have an increasing tendency to separate this work of management as a Junction from the ownership of capital, be it self-owned or borrowed. The mere manager who has no title whatever to the capital, whether through borrowing it or otherwise, performs all the real functions pertaining to the functioning capitalist as such, only the functionary remains and the capitalist disappears as superfluous from the productionprocess".

Wright (1979) holds that the concentration and centralization of capital growing out of accumulation process and technological change led to the partial separation of economic ownership from possession. With the expansion of capitalist enterprise, it was less feasible for the capitalist to be equally involved in both functions, which led to the rise of professional managers to deal with specific aspects of production and to coordinate production as a whole,

Braverman (1974) opines that while the managerial stratum continues to be drawn from among those endowed with capital, family connections and other ties within the network of the class as a whole, it is not dosed to some who may rise from either social classes, not through the acquisition of wealth on their part, but through co-optation of their talent on the part of the capitalist organization which they serve. The operating control is vested increasingly in a specialized management staff for each enterprise. Since both capital and professional management - at its top levels - are drawn, by and large; from the
same class, it may be said that the two sides of the capitalist, owner and manager, formerly united in one person, now became aspects of the class.

Though the managerial stratum is small in the total population, this stratum has become very large in comparison with the pre-monopoly situation. Today the institutionalization of capital and the vesting of control in a specialized stratum of the capitalist class correspond chronologically to an immense growth in the scale of management operations. Today the management process is subdivided among functional departments, each having a specific aspect of the process for its domain: personnel management and training; planning, marketing etc. (Braverman, 1974),

The management function is exercised not just by a manager nor even by staff but by an organization of workers under the control of staff of managers, assistant managers, supervisors etc. Thus the relations of purchase and sale of labour power, and hence of alienated labour, have become part of the management apparatus itself. Taken together, this becomes the administrative apparatus of the corporation. Management has become an administrative apparatus, which is a labour process conducted for the purpose of control within the corporation, and it is conducted as a labour process exactly analogous to the process of production, although it produces no product other than the operation and coordination of the corporation (Braverman, 1974),

Salaman (1982) views that the main thrust of Braverman's overall analysis, and his analysis of management in particular, is the relationship between the organization of enterprise and the requirements of capitalism. According to Braverman (1974), the new, expert and crucial management function not only attempted to reduce the uncertainties of the enterprise's external environment particularly the market, it was also concerned to monitor and control the activities and efficiency of internal process. 'Management', according to Braverman (1974:267)" is a labour process conducted for the purpose control within the corporation'. In other words; management represents a distinct class
(capitalist) interest, serves explicit class functions, and constitutes a major element in the oppression of working class employees.

According to Salaman, Braverman's analysis of management also relates closely to recent attempts by writers such as Carchedi, Wright and Poulantzas to establish the class position of 'intermediate class groups', including management. Despite their important differences, writers like Braverman, seek to establish 'class boundaries' and hence 'class locations' in terms of the functions performed by a class of capital (Salaman, Graeme, 1982).

Marxists recognize the growing importance of the occupational division of labour of professionals, administrators and managers representing an evolution of an 'intermediate strata', which extends back to Marx's own attempts to analyze the class structure of the 19th century capitalist society. Bottomore (1963) holds that Marx had made references to the 'middle class' in his contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right written in 1844. He, however, did not specify the constituent elements of the middle class there. Nevertheless, he was aware of "...the constantly growing number of the 'middle classes' those who stand between the workman on the one hand and the capitalist and landlord on the other" (Marx, 1969:573). In contrast to the (old) middle class, whom Marx regarded as non-revolutionary, but conservative - "Nay more, they are reactionary, for they try to roll back the wheel of history." The (new) middle class", according to Marx "are a burden weighing heavily on the working base and increase the social security and power of the upper ten thousand" (quoted by Giddens, 1973:177).

But Marx regarded such strata as essentially temporary and epiphenomenal in relation to the basically dichotomous class structure proper to the capitalist economic system. Marx holds that through the dynamics of this system, the members of these strata are destined to become assimilated either into the working class via a process of 'proletarianisation' or conceivably, but to a far lesser extent, into the capitalist class via a process of incorporation.
French Marxist writers of the 1960s, such as Belleville, Mallet and Gorz (Goldthorpe:1982) treat expanding groupings of relatively well-qualified while collar employees not as being proletarianised in any conventional sense, but rather as forming a key component of a 'new working class'. According to this conception, the 'new working class' are the representatives of 'technical and scientific labour'. They use the word 'new' in the double sense: it refers to occupations that are new in the sense of having been recently created or enlarged, and also in the sense of their gloss, presumed advancement, and 'superiority' over the old. The 'new working class' is thus 'an educated labour' and it seems to have the capacity to revitalize the struggle for socialism by countering 'economistic' tendencies with the labour movement and by bringing issue of 'control' to the center of its concerns. However, the thesis of the new working class seem to be rapidly losing support (Goldthorpe, 1982).

Poulantzas (1975) argues that the new wage-earning groups constitute a distinct class, the *new petite bourgeoisie*. Poulantzas brings out the distinction between mental and manual labour. Mental labour, first, is labour that is distinguished from the 'simple', manual labour of the working class by various 'ideological symbols' (rituals, know-how, secret knowledge - 'general culture' as opposed to 'technical skills') such that it is perceived as intellectually superior, privileged and respectable. Mental labour is also bureaucratized, a process that 'materializes' mental labour as 'separate' from manual labour and reproduces the whole relationship of domination and subordination within itself. It thus reproduces bourgeois political relations and embodies and reproduces class powers as such, by virtue of the feet that its agents both subordinate themselves and subordinate others.

The new *petite bourgeoisie* is also seen as inherently fractionalized by cleavages drawn within it, and the transformations affecting unproductive mental labour are seen to "reinforce still mote the polarization... fractions' in the direction of the working class' by being massively focused upon them" (Poulantzas, 1975, pp. 302-3). Moreover, the statistically predominant fractions
are precisely those, which do have proletarian polarization, and it is these fractions which are heavily feminized. The three major fractions are, first, that of low level sales and service workers; second, that of bureaucratized workers in banking, administration, the civil service, education and so on; and third, that of low level technicians and engineers.

Rennet; (Bottomore, 1978) develops the idea of "service class" which comprises of three main elements:

a. employees in public — that is, governmental service (civil service and other officials);

b. employees in private economic service (business administration, managers; technical experts etc.) and

c. employees in social services (distributive agents of welfare).

Wright (1979) distinguishes the 'new middle classes' from the petty bourgeoisie that the new middle classes can be defined as social categories that occupy contradictory locations within class relations.

According to Carchedi (1977: 44) "a manager is the production agent who under monopoly capitalism is capital personified". Poulantzas (Op. Cit.) considers the bureaucratized agents as part of an 'intermediate class' not because they are a link or transmission belt in the bourgeoisie's domination over the working class, 'not because it is directly the effective intermediary...' but because of the relations the hierarchy expresses. Even so, it might, in principle, be worth asking whether, even if many or most unproductive workers do not directly dominate the working class, they are none the less agents of those who do; that is, whether or not they are part of the whole complex apparatus of control, domination and surveillance. It has been suggested that the labour of employees (clerical, commercial and so on) increasingly has to do with the functions of co-ordination and unity of the labour process, and that
such workers are thus no longer petty functionaries ('subaltern') of capital fat agents of capital (Carchedi, 1975:365-90).

In contrast to this approach, John and Barbara Ehrenreich propose a new 'professional managerial class' (PMC) as a formation specific to the monopoly stage of capitalism. It is characterized as a class of non-productive workers, made possible by the growth of social surplus, whose function is to ensure the 'reproduction' of class and cultural relations. As the main agency of social control under monopoly capitalism, the professional managerial class stands in evident opposition to the working class; but at the same time it is also seen as being in necessary opposition to the capitalist class over issues of ownership and control, and in fact as forming an enduring reservoir of radicalism (Goldthorpe: 1982).

West (1978) criticizes Braverman, Poulantzas, Carchedi and a Dumber of analysts of the contemporary class structure, and of the class position of white-collar labour. She argues that Braverman has a simplistic conception of the working class as he does not take sufficient account of differentiation and cleavages within the class apart from those of sex. West also has certain objections regarding Poulantzas's account of the working class under monopoly capitalism and criticizes the same for focusing almost exclusively on the labour process. She also criticizes these writers for having a mistaken conception of productive labour, which refers only to the production of material commodities. for having an exceptionally narrow conception of the working class; and for tailing to consider that many women work in occupations which have become increasingly proletarianized. West also questions how Poulantzas, discussion of these very same processes of bureaucratization and the reproduction of the mental-manual division create fractions as it is applicable only to particular cases,

West holds that Braverman, Poulantzas and Carchedi concentrated on class to such an extent that they virtually excluded gender. On the other hand, writers
like Giddens are concerned at several points with the relationship of feminization to the bases of working and middle-class structurarioin, namely differing market capacity, 'paratechnical' and authority relations, neighborhood segregation, class awareness and unionization. Giddens (1973) states that women's dominance of the routinized, lowest-level, white-collar occupations must lead us to reject sweeping assertions about proletarianisation. Feminization is seen as the objective changes in white-collar work, or at least as altering their significance. His remarks imply that, whatever the systematic discrimination against women in the labour market, the character of certain jobs in that market depends on who occupies them. Indeed it may depend on the meaning of such jobs for their occupants, particularly in that they mean something very different for men and women (West, 1978).

Clegg (1989) does consider the significance of gender inequality within organizations and enquires into the ways in which organizations reproduce gender division as largely a contingent matter. Wright (1985) is keen to separate class from gender. For Wright, class structures are based on forms of exploitation, whilst gender inequalities are instances of oppression and hence any attempt to suggest interconnections at a theoretical level is misconceived. He argues that organizational hierarchies are central to the analysis of class relations with his emphasis on the way in which class relations are based on 'organization assets' as well as property and skill assets. He also argues that gender is only continently related to organizational hierarchies,

Goldthorpe sees the project of class analysis as specifying the impact of class factors on life chances. In his eyes, class must be rigorously distinguished from gender, in order that their relative importance in affecting life chances is tested (Goldthorpe and Marshall, 1992).

Savage (1992) opines that the major reason why there has been little sustained attempt to think about the way in which gender influences middle class formation, lies in the way that gender processes are normally conceptually
distinguished from class processes. He holds that, whilst this has the merit of allowing both gender and class inequality to be recognized, and hence in preventing gender being reduced to class, it leads to a damaging inability to comprehend the connections between class and gender inequality at anything other than at purely empirical level.

Some of the feminist writers like Christine Delphy, and Sylvia Walby have handled the relationship between gender and class in more varied ways. Delphy (1984) argues that the relationship between 'male husbands' and 'female wives' is a class, one in which men exploit women's labour. Walby (1986, 1990) recommends the views of Delphy. The result is to posit two overlapping sets of class relations in contemporary societies: firstly, those based around capitalist forms of exploitation, and secondly, those based around the patriarchal mode of production within the household.

Crompton and Witz (1986) are more concerned with the interplay between class and gender. The alternative to emphasizing the separation of class from gender is to see class formation as in part based on gendered processes, and vice versa. Pringle (1989) has shown how the very existence of job structures is related to gendered principles.

Savage (1992) argues that there is no intrinsic reason why the types of processes leading to exploitation, closure, and possible class formation should be seen as distinct from gendered processes.

It is vital also to show how specific classes are gendered and it is necessary to indicate how differing types of exclusion and exploitation on the basis of gendered processes operate in such specific social classes.

The central focus of this chapter is the relationship between gender and power within organizational settings. If we look into the history of organizations a variety of social forces might have shaped the patriarchal power relations of
organizational forms, and gender being one of the major forces amongst them. The development of modern bureaucratic organization shows that gender is woven into the very fabric of bureaucratic hierarchies and authority relations.

Savage (1992) holds that whilst women have moved into professional and 'skilled' jobs within the middle classes - loosely defined, they have rarely been able to secure positions of managerial authority within organizational hierarchies. Women have moved into positions of high 'expertise', but not into positions of high 'authority'. Women's careers depend upon enhancing their expertise, making themselves 'indispensable', whilst men have the additional resource of being able to wield authority within organizational hierarchies. While the possession of expertise may prevent a woman from being demoted from an expert job, it is not a precondition to advancement or promotion. Savage (Op. Cit.) argues that the apparently dramatic rise in the number of women in managerial rank is largely cosmetic. He suggests that the growing number of women in middle class jobs is not an indication that women are moving into positions of effective power. But as organizations restructure, growing numbers of professionals and managers are employed in ways which do not involve them in line management. Savage (Op. Cit.) holds with regard to the figures pertaining to rise of women managers and professionals in various organizations and countries, that 'these figures should not be taken as evidence that women are moving into positions of authority. Rather, the expansion of women in managerial jobs is closely associated with the restructuring of management, and women are located in specific areas within the new management structure. These positions demand high levels of expertise but do not give important organizational authority'.

Organization Theories and Gender

Gender and bureaucratic workplace organizations are closely inter-linked in many a ways, though it has been neglected for a long period. Emerging literature in this area has described, analyzed and theorized the agendered
nature of organizations and organizational life. They have been insensitive towards the gender issues in their study on organizations. Mills (1989) criticizes organization and management theorists for presenting a picture of corporate reality, which excludes gender from the dynamics of organizational experience and from the construction of organizational culture. Even the feminist writers had little interest in organizations, except in so far as they provide examples of a more general set of patriarchal practices.

Writing about the origin of organization theory, Clegg and Dunkerly (1977) holds that organization theory has a control function, which exists as another metaphor for social order and domination. This was the original function of theories of 'organic' society and of organizations as developed in the writings of Europeans such as Compte, Saint-Simon and Durkheim. Clegg and Dunkerly (Op. Cit.) opine that in their writings, can be seen the germinal seed of present day organization theory. Equally, if we turn to the industrial revolution, market theories of possessive individualism and laissez-faire emerge as moral justification for nineteenth century capitalism In time, from these early beginnings, many of the important themes in contemporary organization theory can be seen to have emerged.

The aims and objectives of the theory and practice of organization and management are not intended for the development of the society as a whole either in the countries of its origin or in the countries which imported it. Contrarily, its aims are, first to keep the less developed countries persistently underdeveloped which has been the historical necessity of capitalism in the epoch of imperialism, and secondly, to protect a small minority of capitalists of their immense wealth and their rights in the ownership of the means of production as their private property (Venkateshwarlu, 1984). These small minority of capitalists are none other than men who dominate the majority men and women in the power hierarchy. In other words, the theory and practice of organization and management is in reality nothing but the theory and practice of exploitation and oppression of small minority of men over a majority
capitalist class rule. These Marxist accounts, while giving a historical account of the development of capitalist mode of production and relations; ignore the operational mechanism of patriarchy in theory as well as in practice. Rationalization, capitalism, bureaucracy and so on reflect the opposition towards the question of gender inequality- a historical process of degendered resume of the organization.

Weberian Bureaucracy

Bureaucracy has been distinguished as a form of organization with particular technical characteristics. Weber presented an influential account of the characteristics of bureaucracy. Weber's model emphasized the following features:

i. A specialized division of labour;

ii. A hierarchy of authority with a clearly defined system of command and responsibilities;

iii. A formal set of rules and procedures governing operations and activities coordinating behavior in a predictable, uniform and impersonal manner,

iv. A body of full-time, permanent officials, appointed according to technical competence, trained in specialized tasks, paid according to rank in the hierarchy and who may develop careen on the basis of their ability and seniority(Abercrombie et.al., 1989).

Weber regarded bureaucracy as the roost efficient and rational form of organization, stressing the virtues of precision, speed, unambiguity, knowledge, continuity, discretion, unity, strict subordination, reduction of friction and of material personal costs (Weber, 1968). For him, bureaucratic organization was the roost technically efficient way of performing any given activity; "...the decisive reason for this advance of bureaucratic organisation has always been its purely technical superiority over any other form of organization' (Weber, 1968:973).
According to Weber (in Gerth and Mills, 1948:245) "bureaucratic and patriarchal structures, though are antagonistic in many ways, yet they have common feature, that is, their permanence in nature". Taking the idea from Weber, Ramsay and Parker (1992:252) express the idea that "...bureaucracy is a form of rationalized patriarchy". The dominant modes of operationalization of the bureaucratic ideal type of Weber are intimately related to patriarchal and capitalist assumptions about the nature of work in organizations. Ramsay and Parker (1992) hold that bureaucracy reflects the rationality of capital accumulation as well as the rationality of patriarchal domination.

The sexual division of labour, according to Ramsay and Parker (1992) "is rooted in the development of capitalist organizations and the patriarchal character of management'. As Gould (1979) argues, the structure of hierarchical organizations and the patriarchal division of labour were founded on the patriarchal family. As a group men retained power and authority in the new organizations partly through legitimizing hierarchical organization structures. The logic of capitalism generated economic decision making theories which supported patriarchal power over women's labour. According to Savage (1992; 10) "the very development of the hierarchical structures which Weber saw as typical of the modern bureaucracy took place along gendered line".

The Weberian ideology has been dominant in organizational and managerial thought throughout most of this century. According to Ramsay and Parker (1992), it reflects as a model to solve the problems of organizing. Thus the 'ideal' in 'ideal type' becomes a prescription for organizational excellence and the 'one best way' to construct an organization. Following the Weberian paradigm Frederick Taylor, Elton Mayo, Urwick and Gatt and others were arguing different versions of the same prescriptive thesis. This is a prescription that specifies a rigid hierarchy, top-down communication, specific role definition, the separation of public and private spheres and so on (Ramsay and Parker, 1992). Ramsay and Parker argue that this is a particular solution to
Weberian problematic that reflects both capitalist and patriarchal assumptions about control, skill and rationality.

**Scientific Management**

The scientific management movement initiated by Taylor (1947) belongs to the chain of development of management methods and the organisation of labour. It is an attempt to produce the universalistic rules and prescriptions for managers to the increasingly complex problems of the control of labour in the rapidly growing large, multi-unit capitalist organizations.

Marxists like Braverman (1977) hold that scientific management investigates not labour in general, but the adaptation of labour to the needs of capital. Godelier (1972: 36) writes that "scientific labour management seeks to establish the conditioned reflex, most profitable for the enterprise, to produce a human production automation physically conditioned and 'stimulated' psychological spring of prestige and material spring of the bonus".

Marxist and neo-marxist critique of the scientific management theory emphasizes the mode of production in the capitalist economy and ignores the fact that the development of modern professional management and its associated and legitimizing theory and thinking represent the development of patriarchal authority.

Taylor's prescriptions as well as suggestions denote how men should behave as organizers and the organized. In the Taylorian analysis (1947), organizations, work and management in their various forms, are the concerns of men. Those are reduced to instrumental and mechanistic forms, and are henceforth, degendered.

'Scientific management', according to Hearn and Parkin (1987:20) 'is assumed to be concerned with the management of men by men. It is this tradition which
informs men that they remain asexual worker-beings, while in contrast women presumably have special qualities, by virtue of their sexuality, as sex objects, that is the features of organizational adornment and so on. They put forth Taylorism's influence on the practice and theory of management as immense. There are, for example, deeply embedded assumptions that organizational leadership is something to be performed by men, that leadership implies maleness, and that maleness carries inherent qualities of leadership that women lack.

Scientific management theory presents a profound silence towards the question of gender, sexual division of labour in the organizations, sexual discrimination etc. It glorifies maleness and masculinity, maintains as if it is agendered, but it creates the possibility of the conflation of femininity and gendered nature (Hearn and Parkin, 1987).

Human Relations Perspective

Human Relations school developed by Hugo Munsterberg, Elton Mayo and others is a reaction to the formalistic structures of scientific management theory. The roots of 'human relations perspective' are in the discipline of organizational psychology that developed in the immediate wake of Taylorism', (that is almost when once the scientific management theory was put into practical test). It dealt primarily with the adjustment of the worker to the ongoing production process.

Mayo and his colleagues, concentrating mainly on the behaviour of the workers and their productive capacity, keeping in view physiological, psychological, physical and economic aspects, came out with the conclusion through their Hawthorne studies that, the whole problem appeared as a problem of human attitudes and sentiments, not capitalist social relations of production. To them, what mattered in industrial efficiency or inefficiency, increase or decrease in productivity was individual's psychological make-up. For this, what is required
is a kind of 'psycho-therapy' and therefore the theory is also described as 'clinical approach'. 'Human Relations' approach on the organization and management reflects the capitalist and patriarchal authority which focuses on the more effective regulation of total social as well as psychic relations of the labour.

Hearn and Parkin (1987), whose focus is on the sexuality in the organizations, hold that the men researchers, and subsequently the men managers, had as a pan of their concern and supposed responsibility, the personal and emotional lives of the workers. They criticize the human relations approach stating that 'management of the human relations type is beginning to own not just asexualized labour, or the controlled body, as in the case of classical theory, but the 'person' as a whole including mind, body, and emotions, leading to a form of psychic totalitarianism.

**Feminist views on Bureaucracy**

Gender oppression, according to Ramsay and Parker (1992) is common to most, if not all organizations, but it takes unique form within each organization according to their local histories, symbolic languages and senses of commitment or opposition They hold that " within the organizations women experience a double oppression As subordinates they are subject to bureaucratic regulation of their behavior, and as women they are excluded as equal organizational participants by patriarchal structures and processes" (Ramsay and Parker, 1992 259) Therefore, the sexual division of labour and authority is rooted in the development of capitalist organizations and the patriarchal character of management The logic of capitalism generated economic rational decision making theories which supported patriarchal power over women's labour and created what Kanter (1977) describes as the "masculine ethos" of managerialism

Kanter's book *Men and Women of the Corporation* (1977) represents a pioneering account of the ways in which gender influences corporate bureaucracies and they look forward to the day when women can inhabit bureaucratic hierarchies as the equals to men.

Witz and Savage bold that Kanter, like Weber, is convinced that bureaucratic organization is here to stay, but unlike Weber, she is hopeful that the 'tragedy' of bureaucracy - that hierarchies resulting in self-defeating traps for those who find themselves in subordinate and disadvantaged positions as they struggle for autonomy in the context of constraints, can be balanced by a more hopeful vision in which situations can be modified. The net of rewards and constraints can be reweoven. New tools can be provided. The people who are stuck can be offered challenge. The powerless can be given more discretion, more influence over decisions' (Kanter, 1977:11).

According to Savage and Witz (1992:14) at the centre of Kanter's analysts of the gendered corporate experience, is the view that power differences, not sex differences, explain the different corporate experiences and fortunes of men and women of the corporation. Kanter denies that there are any intrinsically different, gendered modes of behavior and orientation within organizations, and insists instead that, what look like gender differences are really power differences. The problems facing women in managerial roles are problems of powerlessness, not sex. Therefore she suggests that power *wipes out sex*. In other words, once women have organizational power, their gender pales into insignificance. Nonetheless, the current state of affairs is that male bureaucrats and managers not only possess power, but also strategically exclude women from access to the resources of power and efficacy. Women in organizations
are dispossessed of power in a myriad of ways and one among them is male homo sociability.

Male homo sociability represents one of the main ways in which management becomes a closed and gendered circle. This discussion of the male managerial elite and the problems men have in communicating with women, leads Kanter to invoke the notion of a 'bureaucratic kinship system' based on homo social/sexual reproduction whereby men effectively 'done' themselves in their own image, guarding access to power and privilege to those who fit in, to those of their own kind - in short, to other men (Savage & Witz, 1992). Therefore male homo sociability thus represents one way in which women are excluded from the corporate resources of power, simply because of the fact that they are women and not men.

Kanter not only reveals the terms on which women are included within bureaucratic organizations, but she also shows how their inclusion is very much shaped by the terms of their subordination to corporate men. The exclusion of women from organizational positions has more to do with their exclusion from the resources of power, whilst their inclusion in the corporate hierarchy has more to do with their subordination within the relational aspects of (male) dominance and (female) subordination. This point is not explicitly recognized or developed by Kanter according to Witz and Savage (1992).

Kanter holds that gender discrimination within bureaucracy is presented as an irrational impulse within the otherwise rational tenor of bureaucratic organizational life. Witz and Savage hold that she reads Weber in a 'de-gendered' way and accepts the core truths of Weber's account of the rationality and goal-directedness of bureaucracies. Pringle (1989) holds that Kanter may be seen to be operating within a Weberian discourse of bureaucratic rationality without unpacking its gendered sub-text.
Ferguson (1984) argues that the present bureaucratic structure and discourse are fundamentally alien to, and oppressive of women and urges women to seek alternative organizational forms rather than their inclusion within male-inflected bureaucratic organizations. Though Ferguson agrees with Weber at the macro level analysis, as bureaucratic administrative structures develop alongside advanced capitalism at the level of systemic processes, but she draws more on Foucault's notion of 'bureaucratic discourse' to establish the connections between macro-institutional and micro-individual levels. The term 'bureaucratic discourse' refers to the speech of the administrative discipline which both express and reflect a particular structure of institutions and practices, and operates as a kind of verbal performance, placing people and objects within a network of social, political and administrative arrangements,

Ferguson (Op. Cit.) holds that, the bureaucratic discourse and structure are masculinist and antithetical to feminist modes of organizing. She argues that the bureaucratic power creates an organizational arena in which the 'feminization' of subordinates is encouraged. Ferguson argues that a feminist project lays the ground for an alternative to the bureaucratic discourse, an alternative that is inflected by women-centred ways of organizing activity.

Ferguson (1984) in the long term advocates an androgynous revisioning of bureaucratic activities in the public sphere. According to her, real androgyny is defined not as simply adding together misshapen halves of male and female, but rather as a complex process of calling out that which is valuable to each gender and carefully disentangling it from that which is riddled with the effects of power, is a 'political struggle'. In the short term, however, Ferguson advocates a separatist solution for women, who need to evolve their own organizational forms rather than become co-opted into existing male bureaucratic structures. The long-term aim, is the elimination, not the reform, of male-centred bureaucratic modes of organization. Thus Ferguson argues a
Witz and Savage, hold that Pringle provides a radical critique of bureaucracy as underpinned by discourses of power and sexuality in her book *Secretaries Talk* (1989). Pringle marks out the gender roles in the bureaucratic workplace. She poses the most fundamental challenge to Weber's analytical framework and represents a poststructuralist undermining of Weber, neither accepting the Weberian paradigm of bureaucratic rationality, as Kanter does, nor using discourse analysis to complement Weber's analysis, as Ferguson does. Pringle wants to establish that, forms of power and control in the bureaucratic organization revolve round the construction of sexuality*. In other words, the bureaucratic organization is not 'desexualized' but is saturated with sexuality, embodied in its gendered occupants. Pringle effectively re-reads Weber in order to bring out what might be described as an unthematized gender sub-text in his account of rationality:

"It can be argued that while the rational-legal or bureaucratic form presents itself as gender-neutral, it actually constitutes a new land of patriarchal structure. The apparent neutrality of rules and goals disguises the class and gender interests served by them. Weber's account of 'Nationality' can be interpreted as a commentary on the construction of a particular kind of masculinity based on the exclusion of the personal, the sexual and the feminine from any definition of 'rationality'" (Pringle, 1988:88).

Pringle adopts a Foucauldian view of power as not something that is possessed, nor something of which there is a fixed amount somehow circulating through an organizational structure. Rather, power is a relation - although not in the Weberian sense of a relation of dominance and subordination, nor a social relation, but a discursive relation. As Pringle insists, power relations cannot simply be read off from structural inequalities nor do they merely reflect these, rather, power refers to a complex strategic situation, always to flux. The vital element present in Foucault's definition of power is that power continually creates the possibility of resistance. Thus Pringle insists, "Male power" is not
simple and unilaterally imposed on women -gender relations are a process involving strategies and counter-strategies of power. (Pringle, 1989a :92)_

Sexuality in the Organizations

This theme is broadly based on Foucauldian or post-structuralist framework of organizational analysis which focus around power and gender within organizations. There is distinction between those who focus on 'gender' as a matter of their analysis and those who focus on 'sexuality': The sexuality paradigm views gender as underpinned by the more complex embeddedness of sexuality, of our bodily existences in organizations, and assumes that by analyzing sexuality one also analyzes gender. Hearn and Parkin (1987) hold that there is a "booming silence" about sexuality in the literature on organization theories which locate organizations with asexual figures. Hearn and Parkin (Op. Cit.) write that,

"Enter most organizations and you enter a world of sexuality. ... This can include a mass of sexual displays, feelings, fantasies, and innuendoes, as part of everyday organizational life, right through to sexual relationships, open or secret, occasional sexual acts, and sexual violations, include rape ".

There are two parallel discussions regarding sexuality in organizations (Savage and Witz, 1992). Burrell (1984) holds that the historical process of desexualization parallels those of rationalization and capitalism. This involves the repulsion and expulsion of many human feelings out of the organization. The process of organizational desexualization has historical roots in the civilizing process, the development of religious morality, the development of calculative rationality and the development of control over time and the body. Burell's analysis of organizational desexualization becomes a dimension of the development of modern administrative forms neglected by Weber.

Savage and Witz (1992) bold the two ways in which Burrell (1984) on one hand, and Hearn and Parkin (1987), and Pringle (1989) on the other, key their
analyses of sexuality and organizations into Weber’s classic account of bureaucracy: one which ‘adds on’ historical dimension neglected by Weber — the process of desexualization; the other which ‘adds in’ serialization as a fundamental, but neglected, structuring principle of bureaucracy.

Adkins (as quoted by Savage and Witz, 1992) criticizes Hearn and Parkin that ‘although they appear to be fore-grounding sexuality in organization, ultimately reduce instances of sexuality, such as sexual harassment and displays of pornography, to a by-product of capitalist processes’. Adkins continues to claim that ‘they simultaneously essentialize and naturalize heterosexual relations, which simply become ‘acted out’ under capitalist work relations*. Adkins (Op. Cit.) questions ‘why should capitalist hierarchies call into being a sexuality in which women are sexually exploited by men’?

Sexual Harassment

Sexual harassment surveys represent a part of the broader concerns of women against male violence and objectification in its various forms. Feminist exposure of the widespread occurrence of sexual harassment of women at the work place is the most obvious example of the gendered power of sexuality in organizations according to Halford (1992). Halford opines that the naming of sexual harassment can take place in varying degrees and it can be argued that there is an almost seamless joint with the broader organizational culture,

Hearn and Parkin (1987:93) claim that:

"Male managers with female subordinates may use sexuality, harassment, joking and abuse as a routine means of maintaining authority. This may be thoroughly embedded in the taken-for-granted culture of the organization”.

Sexual harassment has been defined by various agencies in various ways, Definition of sexual harassment used by surveys and government agencies provide some guidance, but nothing definitive, according to sex role theorists.
The U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) in 1980 pointed out sexual harassment as an unwelcome sexual advances, requests for favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature when submission to or rejection of the conduct enters into employment decisions and/or the conduct interferes with work performance or creates a hostile work environment.

In the cases litigated to date, the courts have had little difficulty in determining if sexual harassment was present. Legal Defense and Educational Fund, 1980, defines that "any remark made which is "offensive or objectionable to the recipient" could be sexual harassment. Another definition on sexual harassment by Federal Government of U.S.A. maintains that any contact which makes women "uncomfortable" will be illegal. CLUW News, 1980 defines sexual harassment as,

"Sexual harassment Includes the continued or repeated verbal abuse of a sexual nature, including but not limited to, graphic commentaries on the victim's body, sexually suggestive objects or pictures in the work place, sexually degrading words used to describe the victim, or propositions of a sexual nature. Sexual harassment also includes the threat or insinuation that lack of sexual submission will adversely effect the victim's employment, wages, advancement, assigned duties or shifts, academic standing or other conditions that affect the victim's "livelihood"

Unenberger and Keaveny (1985) view that a narrow definition of sexual harassment would guard against inundating the courts with unfounded claims of harassment, a concern expressed by several courts.

Powell (1981) views that these definitions are influenced by both personal and situational factors. The personal characteristic that has the strongest effect is sex: women consistently see more sexual harassment than men do. Managerial level is a situational factor influences definitions of sexual harassment. Managers at lower levels are more likely to see sexual harassment as a problem than those at middle level, and top managers who are mostly isolated from the rank and file in their perceptions of sexual harassment.
Powell (1981) continues that 'it may be sexual harassment in the eyes of some workers and for others, it may amply be the harmless expression of individuals' basically sexual nature. Some people are flattered by sexual attention that others find repulsive. In short, drawing a line between acceptable and unacceptable sexually oriented behavior in the work place is not easy. It has become very difficult to draw a fine for organizations to carry out their legal obligation to discourage sexual harassment within their boundaries'. Three general models have been offered as explanations for sexual harassment (Tangri, Burt and Johnson, 1982).

According to the 'socio cultural model', sexual harassment has little to do with sexuality - it is an expression of power and hostility. In this view, individuals with the least amount of power in society, meaning women in male cultures, are the most likely to be harassed.

The opposite view of sexual harassment is that it has everything to do with sexuality. Individuals with strong sex drives are sexually aggressive towards others due to biological necessities. Therefore, it should be neither surprising nor of particular concern that individuals exhibit such aggressiveness in work settings as well as elsewhere. It is also assumed that men and women are naturally attracted to each other and like to interact in sexually oriented ways in the work place. This view, labeled the 'natural biological model' of sexual harassment, trivializes the issue and claims that sexual harassment represents a harmless behavior to accept, rather than a problem to solve. This model can also legitimize sexual harassment.

A third explanation, labeled the 'organizational model', suggests that certain organizational characteristics can set the stage for sexual harassment. For example, the hierarchical structure of organizations gives some individuals authority over others, granting them the opportunity to use the promise of rewards or the threat of punishments to obtain sexual gratification form the subordinates.
Sex Role Theory

Liberal perspectives view gender inequality as the result of individual cases of discrimination combined (sometimes) with the existence of sex-role stereotyping in education and labour market. This sex role theory draws heavily on Parsonian systems theory.

Parsons and Bales (1955) first developed systems theory by synthesizing some of the insights of psychoanalytic theory, particularly at the intra personal level into a more comprehensive framework. They made the distinction between the task/maintenance roles, instrumental/expressive roles on the basis of gender segregation of role performance. For instance, Parsons argues that if all members of the family were equally involved in competition within the occupational structure, there might be a serious strain on the solidarity of the family unit. Thus a segregation of sex roles has emerged to ensure that their respective incumbents do not come into competition with each other. Parsons defines this sex role differentiation, which corresponds to the differentiation of family and economy in industrial societies, in terms of a structural differentiation between instrumental roles performed by men and by removing woman from competition within the occupational system by her confinement within the family to the performance of the expressive roles. It laid the basis for a conservative sociology of gender, which took its place in the great expansion of American social science in the 1950s and 1960s.

The nuclear family with a clear gender division of labour between the 'externally-oriented' male and the 'integrative' female is drawn as a paradigm case for application to groups and organizations (Hare. 1962). This kind of theorizing can be used to justify and perpetuate the 'maintenance' roles of women in less powerful and lower paid organizational positions.

The empirical studies of sex role theorists have based their work on the Parsonian functionalist framework. As mentioned above, Parsons' analysis
focuses on theorizing the functions of the family and of sex role differentiation for the maintenance of the society as a whole whereas empirical sociological studies of 'women's dual role' have been developed within British sociology, which combine a modified structural functionalist framework with empirical research on working women and the family structure.

A significant number of British and American studies on women managers have been conducted from sex role perspective. The post war Britain focused on sociological studies concerned with married working women in relation to their respective familial positions, Myrdal and Klein's "Women's Two Role" first appeared in 1956 followed by Fogarty, Rapoport and Rapoport's (1971) "Sex, Career and Family". These have restricted themselves to women engaged in professional occupations. Other studies have considered the impact of women working on the structure of the family (Rapoport & Rapoport's "Dual Career Families" etc).

Varied literature that has come on women in management from sex role perspective holds that certain historic attitudes have curtailed the placement of women in management profession, especially, at top echelons and their success attached to it. Ames and Heide (1988), present various aspects of sex role theory as follows:

a. Women are reluctant to prepare for business careers because it is inconsistent with their self-image (i.e., women find it difficult to violate culturally induced sex rote stereotypes).

b. Women want to do the work and could do well if the "male system" let them do.

c. Women are not temperamentally suited for managerial roles (for example, they are irrational, non-competitive and unambitious) (Brown, 1979).

4 Women experience tow power which results from recency of their hiring, lack of entry to male-dominated key group, and networks, being tokens and a lack of familiarity with the "rules of the game" (Kanter, 1977).
e. Women do not have a clear notion of a successful career pattern because of lack of role models and mentors to guide them through organizational maze and teach them political skills (Cooper, 1982).

f. Women are generally recruited at 'assisting' jobs rather than at visible professional activities (Greenfield, Sue and Racur and Rawson, 1979).

g. Women face attitudinal barriers to successful managerial performance both their own and those of male managers.

h. Women's labour participation rate compared to men's is lower because of familial commitments.

I. Women encounter non-intentional discrimination patterns at work. That is, women managers are not automatically part of the organization's information and decision networks.

j. Women face role conflict of equally demanding domestic and professional sphere.

k. They experience lots of stress due to social, familial and organizational pressures.

The studies have shared the assumption that married women are an important source of labour at all levels of the occupational structure, and have investigated the social characteristics of women who work, and the problems they face when they work and so on.

Marxist, radical and socialist feminists point out these ideas as inadequate because they missed the significance of power in gender relations. Women's liberation groups argued that women are oppressed because men have power over them; and that changing the situation of women means contesting, and eventually breaking, this power.

Frawnzway and Lowe (1978) observe in their critique of sex role literature which focuses on attitudes that, the sex role literature misses the realities of what the attitudes are about. The political effect is to highlight the pressures that create an artificially rigid distinction between women and men, and to play
down the economic, domestic and political power that men exercise over women. Zimmer (1988: 71) maintains that, "The major Imitation of this approach is its failure to acknowledge the degree to which organizational structures and the interactions that take place within them are embedded in a much broader system of social and cultural inequality between the sexes".

Edwards (1983) has observed how drastically sex role theory simplifies the complexities of gender, reducing all masculinities and femininities to one dualism; sweeping all women into one feminine role, which in turn is equated to being a housewife and located in the family.

Connell, (1993) summarizes the critique of sex role theory as a framework for the social analysis of gender in four basic considerations,

a. its voluntarism and inability to theorize power and social interest;
b. its dependence on biological dichotomy and its consequently non-social conception of structure;
c. its dependence on a normative standard case and systematic misrepresentation of an instance;
d. and the absence of a way of theorizing the historicity of gender.

Barren and Norris (in Beechey. 1987:168) in their paper point out that,

"Sociologists who have looked at the position of women in the labour market have traditionally assumed the general subordination of women in the family and the society and have then gone onto consider the factors underlying the decisions of women to participate in the labour market. Thus they have stressed the role conflicts that a working wife may experience, the importance of the household structure and the stage of the life cycle, and the family income position. In doing so, they have taken for granted, for example, the fact that men can go out to work without experiencing role conflicts (indeed men will experience them if they stay at home) and that men will be considered the primary breadwinner. In other words, they have set aside some of the more important sociological puzzles by concentrating on the movement of women into and out of the labour force. By focussing attention on the crucial decision about labour force participation, they have to some extent, diverted attention from the question of which jobs are filled by men and which jobs are filled by women -and more importantly, from the difficulty of explaining..."
why it is that there are these pronounced differences between men's and women's jobs”.

Beechey (1987) thoroughly criticizes the sex role theories saying that sociological work which has attempted to describe and analyze the role of women in the labour force in terms of their 'dual role' effectively adopts the terms of the Parsonian functionalist problematic, and in particular ignores 'the economic role of female wage and domestic labour'. The critique of Beechey (1987) is as follows:

a. The domination of the structural functionalist problematic within sociology has led sociologists to divorce the family from an analysis of the forces and relations of production which are in capitalist societies class relations, and to underestimate the importance of both forms of female labour, domestic labour and wage labour.

b. The empirical sociological studies have reduced the question of the contradiction between women's position in the family and female wage labour to a subjective tension between two roles, which are defined in terms of different sets of normative expectations.

c. While sex role studies share with Parsons, a notion of sex roles understood in terms of normative expectations, they lack the macro sociological analysis which Parsons provides, in his early Essays, of the tensions between the demands of the occupational system and the kinship system in industrial societies. Thus, instead of providing an analysis of tensions whose roots are located at a societal level, the empirical studies locate tensions for the individual women as resulting from the existence of different set of normative expectations. Therefore, Beechey holds that the tensions that Parsons locates structurally within the organization of society have become reduced to individual role conflicts, and no explanation of the social/historical foundations is provided for these role conflicts within the organisation of the society.

d. The empirical studies co-relate the entry of women into the labour market to twin sources: the impact of industrialization and the normative inarch towards
democracy. According to Beechey, 'these factors, either alone of taken together, do not provide a satisfactory explanation'. Beechey (19) holds that 'it is inadequate to postulate industrialization per se as an explanatory factor without specifying which elements of the development of industrial capitalism bring about changes, and without showing how these changes affect the demand for female labour. Their analysis is founded on various taken-for-granted assumptions, the basis of which requires explanation.

e. Though these sociological studies provide a great deal of valuable information (such as which women work, when in their life cycles they work, the problems they face when they work) they do not provide any analysis of the distribution of female labour among particular occupations and industries, nor do they consider the functions of the normative expectations they describe, for the maintenance of the sexual division of labour or for the reproduction of the mode of production. No analysis is provided for the conditions which gave rise to the sexual division of labour, the existence of which, in fact, the studies take for granted.

f. More fundamentally, they fail to consider the ways in which the labour process structures the organization of work in the capitalist mode of production and the relationship between the sexual division of labour and the labour process.

Systems thinking has, in many respects, become the new orthodoxy of management thought and theory.

Managerial Unionism and Gender

There is a dearth of writings on women managerial unionism. Even the managerial unions which organize employee managers are quite few and are considered very weak compared to the other trade unions of blue collar and white collar workers.
The character of the trade-union movements in advanced capitalist societies has until quite recently been predominantly blue-collar and working class. Union 'recruitment drives' historically have by-passed those industries in which white-collar workers are most heavily concentrated. The unions were unambiguously male institutions. Women formed a small, secondary labour pool in these industries and were seen as having only a temporary stake in employment. Just as they were marginalized in their employment, so were women largely excluded from attempts at white-collar unionization including managerial unionization.

Lowe, (1987) holds that the gender segregation of the labour market is responsible for lower levels of female unionization by clustering women into a handful of ghetto-like occupations where conditions reinforce an individualistic approach to solving job problems.

Lowe (Op. Cit.) observes further that the expansion, rationalization and fragmentation of managerial work triggered by the administrative revolution led to a shift in recruitment patterns. The overall trend in office work was undeniably toward routinized tasks performed in large bureaucracies. But given that women were hired to perform these new jobs, and that men typically occupied positions defined by a higher degree of authority, responsibility and mobility prospects, few managers of either sex were personally proletarianized.

If we look into the studies on managerial unionism compared to the trade unionism of conventional working class, Arthurs (1983) seeks to illuminate aspects of the character of managerial unionism through a study of unions of managers in three nationalized industries, which were, coal industry, power industry, and the steel industry. He holds that there is no necessary reason why managerial unionism will differ substantially from other kinds of unionism, and moreover that it may be as heterogeneous as traditional unionism. Conflicts of loyalty which may exist for all employees, are however, likely to be greatest for
managers. But Arthurs (Op. Cit) shows that any conflict between a manager's union and managerial rote is likely to be resolved in practice; principally by attenuating union role and through the separation of senior managers into distinct bargaining units.

Simpson (1983) views that what are becoming increasingly bureaucratic organizations, have further divided women from their subordinates. Simpson concludes that for many managers in such situations, individual rather than collective means of resolving their grievances may be preferred and be effective.

According to Arthurs (Op. Cit.1983), management policies toward managerial unions need to take into account the fact that these unions must develop mutually constructive relationships with other, very different unions, whilst not losing faith with their managerial members. He views that managers face conflicts between their managerial and union loyalties which they need to handle with care and discretion, avoiding the distrust of fellow union members, whilst fulfilling their management responsibilities. Increasingly, small managerial unions are merging with the white-collar sections of manual workers' unions or with larger white collar unions.

Simpson (Op. Cit. 1983) opines that the increasing unionization of managers means that managers may have to be studied not only from the perspective of their representing one side in negotiations, but also is employees with grievances of their own. Professionalism is often thought antithetical to trade unionism.

According to Lowe (1987) careerist orientation, founded on a belief in individual success, meshed with a white-collar status consciousness leads to a rejection of unions as blue-collar, working - class institutions. This occupational consciousness was also fostered by employment in small, scattered work places with close employer contact Mills’ (1957) description of
white-collar individualism points out how these employees 'usually remain psychologically the little individual scrambling to get to the top'.

Halford (1992) holds that the organized male interests in bureaucracies can be observed in three principal forms of organization, one among than being trade unions (the other two are the professions and the senior managers group) which (supposedly) coordinates all authority activity. It is opined that although women are increasingly unionized, they remain less likely to hold official posts and the particular interests of female-dominated occupations remain less likely to be addressed. The response of local authority trade unions to positive policies for women varies by union and by geographical location. In general, manual unions are less supportive and while collar unions more so. Where there is a strong and recent tradition of organized male labour dominating local politics, there is also likely to be more resistance to equality policy. Trade unions can disrupt the adoption of new policies during negotiations over changes to the new employment practices. Particularly striking points have been the introduction of disciplinary procedures for cases of alleged sexual harassment, and banning of page *pin-ups*. Unions have also impeded consultation with women workers by failing to pass on information. The situation appears to improve when women take up official posts, as the unions' national organizations of members, particularly when women, begin to make new demands on the grounds of gender.

Elson and Pearson (1984) holds that in many cases women do not identify themselves as workers, or develop 'trade union consciousness'. The employment of women in world market does provide a material basis for 'politicizing the personal' because of the way it masses together women not simply as workers but as a gender. Women are brought together in the factory, simply by virtue of being women, of having the characteristics of a subordinate gender. In factory employment, women are abstracted out of particularized gender ascriptive relations.
The development of conscious co-operation and solidarity between women on the basis of recognition of their common experience of gender subordination, is even more important a goal than any particular weakening of 'machismo' or 'patriarchal attitudes'. Improvements, which come about through capital accumulation or state policy or changing male attitudes, can be reversed. Lasting gains depend upon the relationships built up between women themselves.

Savage and Witz (1992) opine that trade unions, have served to uphold male interests. The best known example of this approach are the powerful writings of Cockburn (1981) and Walby (1986) who view that the trade unions have been extremely important organizational forces excluding women from certain parts of the labour market.

Amsden (1980) opine that 'Women's work' is typically believed to be too difficult to organize due to an unfavorable set of sociological and economic variables. According to Connell (1993), attempts to form unions of working women ran into obstacles that were not faced when unionizing men. Partly this had to do with direct resistance from men; unions controlled by men often would not accept women members.

ALTERNATIVES TO BUREAUCRACY

There are certain alternatives to bureaucracy, such as anti-bureaucracy and neo bureaucracy as understood by Ramsay and Parker (1992), androgynous management proposed by liberal feminists and femocracy of Australian feminists like Eisenstein (1990).

Anti-bureaucracy

Ramsay and Parker (1992) speak of 'anti-bureaucracy', as essentially constituting an attempt to refuse the existence of the functional imperatives
themselves. This would simply not be an organization since it would continually refuse any structure or internal differentiation. It would have no task specialization, no hierarchy and no rules. Members would drift in and out according to their own interests and make no distinction between their selves in the organization and their selves outside it. They hold that if we desire a world that benefits from the products of organized labour, the anti-organization is inadequate because nothing will function in time.

Neo-bureaucracy

Ramsay and Parker (1992) introduce the term 'neo-bureaucracy' which falls between bureaucracy and anti-bureaucracy. Neo-bureaucratic organizations would be continually attempting to refuse the fixity of patriarchal and capitalist imperatives while recognizing the power of organized labour to bring wider social benefits. They would recognize the functional imperatives of bureaucracy whilst refusing the definitions of the solution outlined above. Thus there would be limited task specialization that acknowledged areas of expertise but would not imply that only experts/professionals have power over particular areas of the organization's activity. Individual ownership of success would be replaced by an accent on teamwork and group achievement. Specified roles would be replaced by negotiated allocations of personnel to cope with particular problems or opportunities.

There is a need for a centre, which would be responsible for strategic decision-making and coordination, but its power would be continually re-negotiated by the members of the organization. 'Promotion' would be replaced by an agreement that a particular individual or group had certain skills that required them to take a certain position within the organization for a determined period. The organization would also need to be continually refusing to reproduce itself by only appointing those who were like those in the centre.
A neo-bureaucratic organization would be one that depended on certain rules, such as the circulation of decisions, but never acted as if these rules were other than guides to action.

Finally, and most importantly, the neo-bureaucracy would be an organization, that continually stresses its procedural nature and the necessity to rework organizational rationality for the next task and priority. The members of this form of organization would not be forced to make any clear distinction between the formal/public and informal/private aspects of their selves. The organization would not require them to act without hatred and passion, it would be expected that their hatreds and passions could be negotiated in and through the organization. The individual member must feel that they have a chance to influence the organization in ways they felt were desirable. A continual encouragement of public debate about the nature of the organization would therefore be necessary to ensure that members felt committed to all or part of its activities.

In the light of Kanter's (1977) writings, it is clear that the neo-bureaucratic organization would need to stress the values of uncertainty, vagueness and instability as part of its culture. This would be necessary for two reasons. The first is, in order to change current structures and shared values, the organization would require the information previously used, to make sense of the current situation, but should no longer rely on such information or take it for further actions. The second is to prevent a fixing of any one group as dominant in the organization which would require that the needs, interests and perspectives of all groups be heard and responded to.

Neo-bureaucracies may enable patriarchal and capitalist pressures to be resisted and changed. Ramsay and Parker (1992) argue that it is at the organizational cultural level that such change must be initiated. Specific and local organizational rationalities and practices must be revised if the organization is to develop features that correspond to this model. Neo-bureaucracy is based
on the assumption that organizations need to do certain things in order to be organized but how it manages these things is a cultural matter that reflects the understanding of agents within the organization. The alternative is bureaucratic rules that often become; like equal opportunity policies, pieces of paper that do not reflect or influence the actual texture of life within the organization. Putting it another way, what the proponents are proposing is that the neo-bureaucratic organization needs to capture the hearts and minds of its members in order to ensure its functioning. Since formal rules are largely absent, control must be exercised through consent and common purpose. If this were not the case the organization would cease to function or become, more formally bureaucratic.

Androgynous Management

'Androgynous management' is viewed as a style that blends behaviors previously deemed to belong exclusively to men or women, says Savage (1980). She explains why managers should be androgynous. Firstly, women, who are assumed to have different qualities than men, are entering the profession of management in increasing numbers. Therefore, management theory and practice should expand its definition of what it makes to include the feminine behavior exhibited by the newest members of the managerial ranks. This reason relies on the assumptions about the applicability of gender stereotypes to male and female managers (Sargent, 1980).

A second reason offered in support of androgynous management is that androgyny is the best route to fulfillment in men's and women's personal lives and makes them happier people. If androgyny is also adopted as a standard for managerial profession, androgynous managers will be better able to integrate their personal and professional lives. Sargent takes a valid position about the merits of androgyny, but it is still uncertain as to whether androgynous individuals are truly better off in life.
A third reason offered for androgynous management is that it is particularly appreciated for the climate in which organizations currently operate, Sargent argues that workers increasingly seek fulfillment rather than just a pay-cheque from their work and that, more motivated and committed employees are needed to take advantage of improved technology. Also, in a low growth economy with shrinking or unchanging capital resources, organizations must focus on the contributions of their human resource if they are to improve their efficiency and work output. Behavioral theories of leadership also offer this reasoning to justify managers' showing concern for people as well as concern for the task, but it is the sole justification for androgynous management that has widespread support. Little research has been conducted on whether androgynous individuals actually are superior managers. A strong case can be made for androgynous management, if a broad interpretation of what is meant by androgynous is adopted.

Bern (1977) came to measure androgyny as a propensity to describe oneself as high in both feminine and masculine characteristics. An androgynous behavioral style may mean exhibiting of high amounts of both feminine and masculine behaviors. Bem found, however, that androgynous individuals were actually high in behavioral flexibility and adaptability. Since androgyny is defined in terms of a balance of masculine and feminine-typed characteristics, the androgynous person has both forms of responses in his or her repertoire and presumably derives adaptive behavioral flexibility from this array of options (Bem, 1977).

The Managerial Grid Theory by Sargent (1980) views that better managers are androgynous by advocating a combination of task-oriented and people-oriented behavior. Although they did not offer their own theory of leadership, Donnell and Hall (1980) reached the same conclusion. Managers in their study who were high achievers, successfully integrated their concerns for tasks and people, average achievers concentrated on the tasks, at the expense of the people performing it, and low achievers showed little concern for...
neither tasks nor people. To paraphrase their results in sex role identity terms, high achievers were androgynous, average achievers were masculine; and low achievers were undifferentiated. Donnell and Hall (1980) have provided an explanation for why the ranks of management are filled with individuals who exhibit predominantly masculine behaviors; even though such behaviors are seldom exclusively recommended. These individuals may be organization's average managers, who perform well enough to retain their positions but not well enough to be considered excellent performers. The androgynous manager, who is flexible in his or her response to managerial situations, seems preferable to the masculine manager.

Femocracy

The concept of Femocracy is a new term in feminist theorizing, which emerges out of specific experiences of Australian feminism of 1970s and 1980s, developed by Pringle and Watson (1990) 'Femocrats' are feminists working in the state bureaucracy on women's issues and their credentials as feminists are used as criteria for appointment to a position in the state bureaucracy. Their endeavor is to talk about, and prepare policy proposals concerning women's interests. Their appointments are often linked to affirmative action or equal employment opportunity programs, developing, implementing and monitoring these programs. What is significant about the femocrat phenomenon is that, it provides an historic instance of women working as feminists within male dominated bureaucratic structures. There are two categories of feminist intervention in bureaucracy identified by Eisenstein (1989,1991) One is a 'bureaucratic-individual' intervention where women enter the bureaucracy of state or national government at a policy-making level as self-identified feminists, the other is the 'bureaucratic structural' one, where women create new structures within government or university administrations, specifically designed to benefit women (such as women's policy units, women's studies programmes, or ministries for women's affairs). Other forms of feminist political intervention are 'legal reform' through legislative change, 'political
participation in a leadership role', participation in non-feminist political parties or trade unions as self-proclaimed feminist and, finally, 'alternative structures', where feminists create independent organization outside of existing political and administrative structures (cf. Eisenstein, 1989,1991).

Critics of the femocrat phenomenon would argue that femocrats invariably become co-opted by masculinist modes of acting, and lose touch with the constituency of women whose interests they are there to represent. However, Eisenstein (Op. Cit.) argues that femocrats do make a difference. Their very presence results in an infusion of ideas about women, power and sexuality into the state bureaucracy (Savage and Witz, 1992).

To conclude, this chapter has examined the origins of management that are intimately connected with the evolution and development of Joint Stock Companies. The latter was the reality in the time of Marx himself who took note of its characteristics and made some prognoses concerning its future. An important feature of post-Marx capitalist organization has been the increasing separation of ownership and management. The function of management became specialized and differentiated keeping in pace with the constant expansion and restructuring of capital worldwide, and in one country. This has been the subject of analysis and commentary from Burnheim to Ehrenrich.

Theoretical studies having a gender - sensitive strain have attempted to understand how the practice and theory of management are gendered. These writing have studied Gender in Management / Bureaucracy from the perspective of power (and powerlessness), 'Bureaucratic discourse', 'Sexuality' and 'Sex Role Theory' and so on. These writers have in fact, propose various alternatives to the present management structure; process and ideology. Armed with this understanding, the empirical data collected for the purpose of present study has been subjected to analysis.