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Dans cette communication, nous étudions le rôle du sexe dans l'organisation des rapports de production sur le marché du travail post-industriel au Canada. L'article s'appuie d'abord sur les données des recensements de la période de 1941 à 1986 pour décrire les spécificités liées au sexe de la transition au post-industrialisme telle que vécue par les hommes et les femmes. Le post-industrialisme a entraîné un départ d'un grand nombre d'hommes de l'agriculture et les industries du secteur primaire, mais le secteur manufacturier est resté jusqu'à récemment relativement stable. Pour les femmes, le post-industrialisme a surtout provoqué le passage du travail domestique non rémunéré au travail salarié dans les industries de services. Par conséquent, la répartition de l'emploi chez les hommes demeure essentiellement celle d'une économie industrielle traditionnelle; or, dans les industries de services ‘post-industrielles,’ ce sont les femmes qui prédominent. Donc nous analysons les données de l'Enquête sur les structures de classe et démontrons que la prédominance numérique des femmes dans les services n’a strictement rien changé à l’écart entre les sexes en ce qui concerne l’accès aux postes de pouvoir et d’autorité. Dans les secteurs traditionnels, producteurs de marchandises, les hommes commandent généralement aux hommes, tandis que dans le secteur des services, les hommes commandent maintenant aux femmes. Nous terminons par une analyse des données de recensement qui montre en quoi les différences entre hommes et femmes en matière d’accès au pouvoir et à l’autorité ont évolué dans le temps.

In this paper we examine the gendered nature of production relations in the context of Canada’s postindustrial labour market. We begin by describing gender-specific features of the transition to postindustrialism with census data for the period from 1941–1986. For men, postindustrialism brought considerable movement out of agriculture and other extractive industries but, until recently, relative stability in the manufacturing sector. For women, postindustrialism has
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mainly meant a shift from unpaid domestic labour to paid employment in the service industries. As a consequence, male employment patterns continue to resemble those of a traditional industrial economy while women predominate in the 'postindustrial' service industries. We then use data from the 1982 Class Structure Survey to show that women's numerical dominance in services has in no way altered the gender gap in access to positions of power and authority. In the traditional goods-producing sectors, men mainly rule other men while the service economy is the site where men now rule over women. We end with an analysis of change over time in male-female differences in access to power and authority using census data.

1 WOMEN AND MEN IN CANADA'S POSTINDUSTRIAL TRANSITION

Throughout this century, Canada led the way in the transition to a postindustrial labour market. The shift of employment into services began sooner in Canada than elsewhere (Singelmann, 1978) and services account for a larger share of total employment in Canada than in any other developed nation (OECD, 1988: Table 7). A postindustrial labour market is one where most labour is now employed in the provision of services and advanced technologies that release labour from direct production (Block, 1987: xx). This does not mean that manufacturing no longer matters. Manufacturing does matter both as a generator of wealth and of employment (Cohen and Zysman, 1987). Manufacturing now generates more information and data-based occupations (engineers, lawyers, accountants, designers, clerks) – producer services and the 'direct producers' – craft workers and factory operatives – continue to decline. At the same time, productivity gains in goods production are releasing more labour for what could be called 'people services,' including the welfare state industries (health education and welfare) and retail and personal services (the 'servant' industries such as food and accommodation). The concept of postindustrialism captures both dimensions.1

Postindustrialism, then, has a double meaning: a change in the mix of labour required to produce a fixed quantity of goods, and a change in the amount or share of labour required for goods production. The first change has been manifested in the shift of employment into 'producer services' (engineering, legal, financial etc.) and the second in a shift of employment into 'consumer services' both personal and social.

Based on the classification of Singelmann and his associates (Browning and Singelmann, 1978; Singelmann, 1978; Wright and Singelmann, 1982) we document the parameters of this transition for Canada between 1941 and 1986 in Table 1. We divide the economy into seven broad sectors. The extractive sector includes agriculture, forestry, fishing, and mining. The transformative sector is composed of all manufacturing industries, construction, and utilities. Distributive services include transportation, communication, and wholesale trade. Though often counted as part of the 'service economy,' distributive services (e.g., railways) grew as part of the industrial revolution and were often considered synonymous with it.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total N (1)</th>
<th>Percent Total (2)</th>
<th>Extractive (3)</th>
<th>Transformative (4)</th>
<th>Distributive (5)</th>
<th>Producer (6)</th>
<th>Social Services (7)</th>
<th>Public Administration (8)</th>
<th>Consumer Services (9)</th>
<th>Retail (10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>4,364,562</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>5,218,596</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>6,313,257</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>7,944,985</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>11,600,985</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>12,371,675</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Panel 2, Female labour force

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total N (1)</th>
<th>Percent Total (2)</th>
<th>Extractive (3)</th>
<th>Transformative (4)</th>
<th>Distributive (5)</th>
<th>Producer (6)</th>
<th>Social Services (7)</th>
<th>Public Administration (8)</th>
<th>Consumer Services (9)</th>
<th>Retail (10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>828,719</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>1,151,309</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>1,724,318</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>2,659,970</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>4,676,740</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>5,284,865</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Panel 3, Male labour force

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total N (1)</th>
<th>Percent Total (2)</th>
<th>Extractive (3)</th>
<th>Transformative (4)</th>
<th>Distributive (5)</th>
<th>Producer (6)</th>
<th>Social Services (7)</th>
<th>Public Administration (8)</th>
<th>Consumer Services (9)</th>
<th>Retail (10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>3,535,843</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>4,067,287</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>4,588,939</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>5,285,015</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>6,924,250</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>7,088,810</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE I contd.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total N</th>
<th>Percent Total (1)</th>
<th>Extractive (2)</th>
<th>Transformative (3)</th>
<th>Distributive (4)</th>
<th>Producer (5)</th>
<th>Social Services (6)</th>
<th>Public Administration (7)</th>
<th>Consumer Services (8)</th>
<th>Retail (9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Panel 4, Female as a percent within industry sectors

a The 1970 Standard Industrial Codes (SIC) were recoded as follows: Extractive (SIC 001-099); Transformative (SIC 101-421; 572-579); Distributive (SIC 501-548; 602-629); Producer (SIC 701-737; 851-869; 891-899); Social Services (SIC 801-831); Public Administration (SIC 902-991); Consumer (SIC 841-849; 871-879; 881-886); Retail (SIC 631-699). Data for 1941–1961 were grouped to conform to this classification. The data for 1941 include persons in active service. For 1951 and 1961, the data exclude 'a few persons seeking work who have never been employed'; and for 1971 and 1981, the data exclude unemployed persons 15 years of age and over who have never worked or who had worked only prior to January 1970 or January 1980, as applicable. Ns represent the sum of the numbers for the various sectors

b Excludes persons for whom industry was not specified or defined

Sources: Dominion Bureau of Statistics. Eighth Census of Canada 1941, Volume VII, Table 17; Ninth Census of Canada 1951, Volume IV, Table 16; 1961 Census of Canada, Volume III, Part 2 (catalogue 94-518), Table 1a; Statistics Canada, Census 1986. Industrial Trends, 1951–1986 (catalogue 93-152), Tables 1 and 2
Producer services are composed of firms that mainly provide services to other firms providing goods and services. They include banking and finance, insurance, real estate, lawyers offices, labour unions and miscellaneous business services. In contrast, the remaining service industries are primarily consumption oriented. These include social services (health education and welfare), public administration (federal, provincial and local government), consumer services (the 'servant' industries including accommodation, food, and personal services) and retail services.

The distributions in Table 1 (panel 1) show the marked decline in employment in extractive industries from 32 per cent in 1941 to 14 per cent in 1961 and then dropping to the current 7 per cent. Employment shares in the transformative sector began to decline after 1951. However, the raw numbers underlying these shares (not presented here) indicate that until the eighties, this was not because employment in manufacturing, construction, and utilities was declining in any absolute sense but because employment in this sector was not growing as quickly as in services. Only between 1981 and 1986 do we see 'deindustrialization' in the sense of a real absolute decline in manufacturing employment. In distributive services, the share of employment grew at the beginning of the period and subsequently levelled off (Table 1, column 6).

Over this same period, the share of employment in services (producer through retail services) rose from 31 per cent in 1941 to 58 per cent by 1986. Growth was most pronounced in producer and social services. The share of employment in consumer services initially declined between 1941 and 1951, mainly reflecting the decline in female domestic workers, and then remained relatively stable until 1981. During the 1980s, however, the consumer service sector has been the single most important source of new jobs, accounting for 211,590 out of the 770,790 jobs added to the economy. Retail service has also been an important source of employment growth, adding nearly 130,000 new jobs to the economy between 1981 and 1986.

These general parameters of the 'postindustrial transition' in Canada are documented elsewhere, and they hold few surprises (Magun, 1982; McInnis, 1971; Meltz, 1965; 1969; Picot, 1986; Smith, 1978). However, the sex-specific features of these changes have not been documented in a continuous series for the post-war period. As we show in Table 1, postindustrial trends differ in important ways for men and women.

The stereotypical 'worker' who appears in the pages of the history of industrial capitalism has been the male, blue collar worker employed in goods production (resource extraction, manufacturing, utilities, and construction) and in distribution (railways, trucking, and communications). The results in Table 1 show that this stereotype is far from dead. Despite the dramatic decline in the percentage of men in the extractive industries (a result of declining employment in agriculture), the majority of men (56%) were still employed in goods production (extractive and transformative industries) and distributive services in 1986. In contrast, only one-quarter of women were employed in these traditional 'industrial' sectors of the economy. By 1986, women represented about a quarter of total employment in goods and dis-
tribution but between 40 and 70 per cent of employment in the other service industries (Table 1, panel 4).

Over the whole period the percentage of men in the transformative sector changed only modestly, rising after the war and then declining slightly in the eighties. The main change in employment shares until the eighties took the form of declining employment in the extractive sector (especially in agriculture) and increasing employment in services. Conversely, for women, employment shares in the extractive sector were negligible from the beginning. 4 Instead, the female experience of the transition is one of declining employment in the transformative sector – from 25 per cent in 1951 to 14 per cent in 1986. The share of female employment increased substantially in producers services (largely, finance and insurance industries) and in social service industries. 5

The change in the industrial mix of employment for men and women tells only part of the story of ‘postindustrialism,’ however. For women, the more dramatic shift in work patterns over this period was the movement from unpaid domestic labour to paid employment. Between 1941 and 1986, the percentage of all women in the paid labour force more than doubled and women’s share of total employment increased from 19 per cent to 43 per cent (Table 1, panel 4, column 2). Female shares of employment grew in all sectors. Over the 45 year period, women moved to a position of numerical dominance in producer, social, and consumer services, to parity with men in retail services and to 40 per cent of employment in public administration.

In sum, for men, postindustrial employment has largely meant a shift from agriculture to services and, until recently, relatively little change in goods production and distribution. For women, it has meant a shift from unpaid domestic labour into paid employment in services. And it is the latter change – the shift from unpaid domestic labour – that has contributed most to the growth in service employment. In other words, if unpaid domestic labour were counted as an ‘industry’ in the usual classifications, we would describe ‘postindustrialism’ in terms of the shift from unpaid to paid service work and put less emphasis on the ‘goods to services’ metaphor.

Despite the fact that service employment has become an increasingly common destiny for both men and women, the structure of postindustrial labour markets is sex segregated. Relative to their share of total employment, women are underrepresented in goods and distribution but outnumber men in producer, social, and consumer services. Although sex segregation across the eight sectors declined over every period, the largest changes occurred between 1941–1951 and 1961–1971 with relatively modest decennial change since then. 6

II GENDER AND POWER IN THE POSTINDUSTRIAL ECONOMY

A large research agenda emerges from the shift of employment to services and from increased rates of female labour force participation. Studies trace the persistence of occupational segregation over time (Armstrong and Armstrong, 1984; Connelly, 1978; Fox and Fox, 1987; Smith, 1978), compare the skill levels of occupations held by women and men (Boyd, 1990b; Myles and
Fawcett, 1990), document the movement of women into the clerical occupations (Lowe, 1980; 1986), examine the role of women as a reserve army (Connelly, 1978; Marchak, 1987), and analyse women’s occupational status and mobility (Boyd, 1982; 1985; Cuneo and Curtis, 1975; Goyder, 1985; Marsden, Harvey and Charner, 1975).

As important as these dimensions of gender inequality are, they do not go to the heart of the matter of most concern to feminist scholarship – namely, the underlying relations of effective power that produce these unequal outcomes, the social as opposed to the material division of labour. Social relations of production are relations of ‘effective power over persons and productive forces’ (Cohen, 1978: 63) including the instruments and materials used in production and the capacities and skills of those who use them. Together, the social relations of production constitute what Marx called an economic structure, i.e. ‘a framework of power in which producing occurs’ (Cohen, 1978: 79). Relations of production are the building blocks of classes – the positions that are constituted by the intersection of these relations (Cohen, 1978: 85–86).

Feminist theory sharply questions the gender neutrality of conventional class analysis. The historical gendering of class relations during the transition to industrial capitalism has been well-documented (e.g., Hartmann, 1976; 1981; Sokoloff, 1980; 1988; Ursel, 1986). With the decline of the household economy, hierarchically defined gender relations were brought inside the factory gate to become part of a capitalist and, theoretically, universalistic labour market. The subordination of women in the household was reproduced in the relations of power and authority of the capitalist firm. In short, the economic structure of industrial capitalism acquired a social form derived not merely from a logic based on the imperatives of capital accumulation – the logic of the market. It also incorporated social forms derived from the patriarchal household. From this perspective, gender subordination in the market is integral to analyses of the economic structure, producing outcomes which are gender asymmetrical, or ‘gendered’ (Acker, 1988; 1989b).

There are at least four reasons to expect significant change in the way social relations are gendered in postindustrial economies. The first has to do with numbers. The growth in female employment can only be absorbed in one of two ways: by a decline in the number of sex-segregated work environments or by an increase in the number of work environments that are predominantly or exclusively female. If the former occurs, then Kanter’s law of ‘relative proportions’ should begin to operate. Drawing on Simmel, Kanter (1977: 206 ff.) points out that ‘numbers’ are key elements shaping the corporate environment. Stereotyping, tokenism and isolation characterize environments where women are a minority producing performance pressure and differential patterns of evaluation. Accordingly, she concludes that as the ratio of women to men in organizations begins to rise, we should expect patterns of social relations between men and women to shift as well (Kanter, 1977: 209).
Alternatively, if the increase in the number of women takes the form of an increase in the number of exclusively female work environments, then the number of work sites where women have access to positions of power and authority over other women should also increase. This distinction should also make clear that it is possible for the distribution of men and women within classes to become more alike without changing social relations between men and women. An economy completely segregated by sex, where men regulate men and women regulate women, can also produce class distributions undifferentiated by sex. A distinguishing feature of our empirical analysis is our ability to examine relations of authority between men and women, not just sex differences in the distribution of power and authority.

There are three additional reasons to think that gender differences in relations of power and authority might abate in postindustrial labour markets. The first is the very ‘modernity’ of the service industries. The growth of personal, business and social services is a contemporary phenomenon, and, as Stinchcombe (1965) has shown, the organization of labour within firms industries and occupations tends to bear the imprint of the historical period of their foundation and growth. Baron and Newman (1990), for example, show that wage differentials between men and women are greater in ‘old’ than in ‘new’ job categories.

As well, state employment is more prevalent in the service sector and studies of earnings differentials between women and men have shown the gender gap in earnings has narrowed in the public sector (Boyd and Humphreys, 1979; Denton and Hunter, 1982). Finally, postindustrial labour markets – and especially social and business services – tend not only to be ‘knowledge intensive’ but also ‘credential intensive’. High levels of formal education tend to be required for entry and job-relevant skills are acquired through the educational system rather than through on-the-job training and apprenticeship programs. In principle, this should benefit women who are typically excluded from on-the-job training programs but who tend to have slightly higher levels of formal education than men (Myles and Fawcett, 1990).

Despite these reasons for anticipating some degendering of power relations in the service sector, the limited empirical work that directly addresses issues of gender differences in power and authority in the labour market offers less ground for optimism. Most notable is Cuneo’s examination of census data where he concludes (1985: 486) that ‘women have been increasingly excluded from gaining access to such positions as managers, officials, supervisors and forepeople in a ratio equal to their representation in the labour force’. Cuneo does not examine gender differences by economic sector. But in view of the correlation among the underlying time trends, the implication is that the growth of the service sector and women’s numerical dominance in the service industries have not appreciably altered their relative position in the power structure of the workplace. The empirical question we address in the remainder of this paper is the extent to which the gendered organization of production relations persists within what are decidedly ‘modern’ sectors of a postindustrial economy.
Research Design and Data

Our analysis is based on a family of measures related to decision-making, hierarchical location, authority and autonomy described in Appendix A. These are the same measures that have been used in the construction of several class typologies (Wright et al., 1982; Clement, 1990) used to describe the gendered distribution of classes. Class typologies of the sort constructed by Wright (1978), Clement (1990) and others represent an effort to reduce the complexity of production relations – to identify positions in the economic structure – in ways that are theoretically and historically meaningful, on the one hand, and empirically feasible on the other.

Such typologies are useful when they are intended to isolate particular production relations (or a combination of them) that are theoretically pertinent for the explanation of some other social process such as class conflict, the formation and distribution of ideologies and beliefs or even income inequality. But they are decidedly less useful when the purpose is to study production relations themselves. While typologies have the advantage of reducing complexity, they also obscure the underlying components that go into their construction. The reason is that all such typologies are based on theoretical choices to privilege some production relations over others or on the particular way in which a subset of production relations intersect. Employees who supervise the labour of other but also have decision-making powers over the allocation of capital are typically classified as managers or executives and the fact that they also do supervisory work is lost in the process. Those responsible for the allocation of capital and labour to different uses may or may not be responsible for directing and disciplining labour. Similarly, some supervisors are closely regulated in their work while others have significant autonomy. Some have powers to discipline their subordinates while others only co-ordinate the work of others. The result is that any such typology can potentially conceal as much as it reveals about the gendered structure of production relations.

Our strategy is to study production relations directly, to ‘unpack’ the conventional class typologies into their constituent elements. We also extend the analysis to consider production relations not usually included in such typologies. Concrete positions in an economic structure are constructed out of production relations. However, individuals always exist in a matrix of production relations that are unlikely to be exhausted by any class typology or the subset of production relations used in its construction.

The data are from the Canadian Class Structure Survey (CCSS) collected by means of a multi-stage probability sample in Canada’s ten provinces during the winter of 1982–83. Completed interviews were obtained in 76 per cent of total eligible households. Results presented here are weighted to reflect both sample design and post facto adjustments for age and sex composition by region and employment status (Black and Myles, 1986: 7–8). Our analysis focuses on a subsample consisting of respondents who were currently employed or unemployed for a year or less. This corresponds to the ‘experienced labour force’ concept used in recent Canadian censuses. The CCSS was conducted in the depths of the greatest recession experienced by
Canadian workers since the thirties when unemployment was especially high. The use of the ‘experienced labour force’ universe helps us to correct for distortions introduced by this cyclical effect on the composition of our sample.

For both substantive and methodological reasons we exclude employers and the self-employed from our analysis. Sex differences in ownership of capital have been documented elsewhere (Carroll, 1987; Cuneo, 1985) and the specific contribution of our analysis lies in the examination of the distribution and relations of control and authority among employees. Moreover, because it was presumed that employers and the self-employed held powers of decision-making and authority by definition, many of the questions used in this analysis were not asked of this segment of the labour force. It should be kept in mind, however, that by focussing exclusively on employees, our analysis generates conservative estimates of sex differences in subordination-domination in the labour force.

The subsample is made up of 1761 respondents (787 women and 974 men). Because of this sample size, we could not use the detailed eight-sector industrial classification employed in the analysis of census data in Table 1. Instead, we used a three sector industry classification based on three important divisions for women: 1/ the goods producing and distributive sectors which are predominantly male industries (this corresponds to a combined extractive-transformative-distributive sector); 2/ commercial services including producer, consumer and retail services; and 3/ public services including the social services (health, education and welfare) and public administration. Previous research indicates that the commercial-public service
division is important in that it is the public sector that provides the majority of high wage, high skill jobs for women (Boyd, 1990a; Boyd and Humphreys, 1979; Denton and Hunter, 1982; Myles and Fawcett, 1990).

The distributions by sex, within and between sectors, are shown in Table II and confirm the basic observations made previously concerning the sexual division of labour by industry. In the employed labour force, men (59%) are much more concentrated in the goods sector than women (22%). Women are a minority (24%) of all those employed in goods production but a majority of those employed in both commercial services (61%) and public services (60%).

In analysing these data, we make use of conditional probabilities (percentages) and differences in conditional probabilities (percentage differences between men and women). A main concern is to test hypotheses about the difference of differences (interaction effects) between sectors. We want to know whether gender differences are smaller or larger in the ‘modern,’ postindustrial sectors of the labour market. We report a large number of such interactions in our tables, all of which lead to similar conclusions but which in general are not statistically significant. This means the observed interactions may be an artifact of sampling error or of sample size (there are few women in goods and distributive services and fewer still with significant powers).

However, the pattern of interactions between gender and sector is consistent across a large number of measures, and in the concluding section we turn to census data to help us overcome the problems of sample size. Because the census includes all jobs in the economy, we are not faced with the problem that results may be due to sampling error. Moreover, the large number of cases allows us to do a more detailed industry analysis than is possible with the cciss. With the census data we are also able to measure changes over two time periods – 1971–81 and 1981–86. The weakness of the census is that we are compelled to measure ‘production relations’ with conventional occupational categories. Our classification of census occupations is based on that of Pineo, Porter and McRoberts (1977). But the fact that we are able to reproduce similar results with different data bases and using alternative measures gives us considerable confidence that there is more than sampling or measurement error to support our conclusions.

**Distributional Differences in Power**

1/ Autonomy

One form of power exercised by employees is the capacity to exercise control over their own work. Here we consider two broad aspects of such control – conceptual autonomy and task autonomy. Conceptual autonomy refers to the requirement in a job to conceptualize or design important aspects of a product or service. Task autonomy refers to the conditions under which the task is actually accomplished (control or the pace of work, how and when one does one’s work etc.)

In the cciss, measuring conceptual autonomy was a matter of considerable importance because of the analytical significance of the category of ‘semi-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Goods and Distribution</th>
<th></th>
<th>Commercial Services</th>
<th></th>
<th>Public Services</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female (1)</td>
<td>Male (2)</td>
<td>Difference (3)</td>
<td>Female (4)</td>
<td>Male (5)</td>
<td>Difference (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual autonomy</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Task autonomy, % Yes**

- **Can decide working hours**
  - Female (19)
  - Male (24)
  - Difference (-5)

- **Can take time off without accounting**
  - Female (29)
  - Male (26)
  - Difference (3)

- **Can slow down pace of work**
  - Female (48)
  - Male (42)
  - Difference (6)

- **Can introduce own new task**
  - Female (36)
  - Male (41)
  - Difference (-5)

- **Can decide to do own job**
  - Female (66)
  - Male (70)
  - Difference (-4)

---

*a The percentage indicating 'no' may be calculated by subtracting the figures for 'yes' from 100. For example, of all female employees in the goods sector, 19% can decide working hours; 81% of female employees in the goods sector cannot (100 - 19 = 81).
### TABLE IV
DECISION-MAKING BY SEX AND INDUSTRIAL SECTOR, CANADA 1982

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision role</th>
<th>Goods and Distribution</th>
<th></th>
<th>Commercial Services</th>
<th></th>
<th>Public Services</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female (1)</td>
<td>Male (2)</td>
<td>Difference (3)</td>
<td>Female (4)</td>
<td>Male (5)</td>
<td>Difference (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-maker</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-decision-maker</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE V
MANAGERIAL SELF-PLACEMENT BY SEX AND INDUSTRIAL LOCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Managerial self-placement</th>
<th>Goods and Distribution</th>
<th></th>
<th>Commercial Services</th>
<th></th>
<th>Public Services</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female (1)</td>
<td>Male (2)</td>
<td>Difference (3)</td>
<td>Female (4)</td>
<td>Male (5)</td>
<td>Difference (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial self-placement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top, upper</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-managerial</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
autonomous workers' in Wright's (1978) original class schema. All respondents were asked:

... is yours a job in which you are required to design important aspects of your own work and to put your ideas into practice? Or is yours a job in which you are not required to design important aspects of your own work or to put your ideas into practice, except perhaps in minor details.

Respondents who indicated they were required to design important aspects of their work were then asked in an open-ended question to provide an example of how they designed their own work and put their ideas into practice. The examples were then coded according to a rating scale of high, medium, low and no autonomy according to a protocol initially designed for the American version of the survey and which the two principal investigators of the Canadian survey were able to replicate with an acceptably high level of reliability. The main purpose of this was to eliminate exaggerated claims to autonomy. As Clement and Myles (forthcoming) show, the resulting classification of autonomous employees is a valid measure of self-direction and job complexity ('skill').

Task autonomy is measured with a simple 'yes' – 'no' response to five questions asking respondents whether they can regulate their own working hours, take time off without loss of pay, control the pace of their work, introduce new tasks on the job, and determine how they do their work.

The results (Table III) show there are more jobs with significant conceptual and task autonomy in the service industries than in the goods and distribution sector, but men have clearly appropriated such jobs disproportionately to their numbers. At high levels of conceptual autonomy the gender gap is only 6 percentage points in goods and distribution but rises to 15 and 21 percentage points in commercial and public services respectively.

The patterns for task autonomy are even more surprising. If anything, women tend to have a small advantage over men in the goods and distribution sector. This is reversed in the service sector, where men have a decided advantage in both commercial and public services on most items.

2/ Decision-Making
A distinguishing feature of the history of all industrial capitalist economies is the 'decomposition of the functions of capital'. With the rise of the large corporation, traditional powers associated with legal ownership – effective control over the allocation of capital, labour and the means of production – are delegated to a new middle class of managers and professionals. To measure the distribution of decision-making powers among employees, respondents were asked seven questions concerning their participation in policy decisions related to budget-setting, investment and workplace organization as well as the form of their participation in each decision. For presentational purposes, we use a summary measure indicating whether the
### Table VI

**Authority Measures by Sex and Industrial Sector, Canada 1982**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Goods and Distribution</th>
<th>Commercial Services</th>
<th>Public Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female (1) Male (2)</td>
<td>Female (4) Male (5)</td>
<td>Female (7) Male (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of total who supervise others</td>
<td>24 37 -13</td>
<td>28 41 -13</td>
<td>19 35 -16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanctioning</td>
<td>100 100 0</td>
<td>100 100 0</td>
<td>100 100 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>17 27 -10</td>
<td>14 28 -14</td>
<td>16 25 -9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal supervisor</td>
<td>4 5 -1</td>
<td>7 6 1</td>
<td>6 6 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-supervisory</td>
<td>75 63 12</td>
<td>72 59 13</td>
<td>73 64 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
respondent claims to be a decision-maker on any of the seven items or takes part in the decision-making process in an advisory capacity. The distribution of decision-makers, advisors and non-decision-makers by sex for the total labour force and by sector is presented in Table IV. A second indicator of relative power position – the respondent’s self-placement in the managerial hierarchy – is presented in Table V.

Both measures tell a remarkably consistent story. As indicated by the pattern of percentage differences, rather than narrowing the ‘gender gap,’ differences in the distribution of power are larger in both commercial and public services than in the ‘industrial’ sector of the economy. In the goods and distribution sector, there is a gender difference of 7 percentage points, which rises to 14 percentage points in public services and 15 percentage points in commercial services. There is a two point difference in the percentages of men and women who claim top or middle management positions in goods and distribution, a difference of 8 percentage points in commercial services and 11 per cent in public services.

3/ Authority

It is within the supervisor-subordinate relation that the majority of people have their most immediate experience of the exercise of power. Experientially, senior executives and the powers they wield may be quite remote from the day-to-day life of most workers whereas the exercise of authority by one’s immediate superior is a recurring and ongoing reality at all levels of the firm.

In Table VI, we show the percentages of men and women by sector who supervise others (line 1) and the type of authority they exercise over subordinates. Among those with authority, we distinguish between those who have sanctioning authority (the capacity to impose positive or negative sanctions on others) and task authority (those whose power is limited to co-ordinating the labour of others). Finally, there is a small residual category of ‘nominal supervisors,’ those with neither sanctioning or task authority.

The magnitude of the gender gap in supervisory authority (the proportion of men and women with subordinates, line 1, Table VI) is the same in goods/distribution and in commercial services and it is only slightly larger in state services. If we consider types of authority, however, the difference between the percentage of men and women who not only supervise but also can discipline their subordinates (sanctioning authority) is substantially larger in commercial services than in the goods sector. In contrast, sex differences in public services are somewhat smaller than in the goods sector.

Thus far, the pattern we have identified across a wide variety of measures of power, authority and autonomy all lead to a similar conclusion. Rather than eroding the traditional sexual division of power, Canada’s post-industrial labour market appears to be the site of some consolidation and even its growth. Neither ‘modernity’ nor the numerical dominance of women in the service industries have reduced the unequal access of women to positions of power and authority or even to jobs with high levels of self-direction. Cross-sectional differences, of course, tell us nothing about trends over
time, a point to which we return shortly. They do point to a remarkable feature of postindustrial labour markets, however. In the traditional sectors of an industrial economy where most employees are male, the exercise of power takes the form of men ruling other men. Only in the modern, female, service industries do men begin to rule over women in large numbers. In the following section we document the extent and consequences of this development.

4/ Authority Relations Between Women and Men
There are many possible reasons to account for the unequal access of men and women to positions of power and authority in the contemporary workplace. For example, female employees typically tend to be younger and are more likely to have experienced labour force interruptions than male employees. The implications for relations between men and women, however, are startling. In the goods and distribution sector, the majority of employees are men. As a result, men who rule tend to rule other men. In the service industries, in contrast, the majority of employees are women and those subject to male authority are mainly women. This is shown in Table VII.

The CCS asked all respondents who claimed to have subordinates for information on the sex composition of those they supervised. In Table VII we summarize this information by classifying sex of subordinates into three categories—'male only,' 'female only' and 'mixed'. In goods and distribution, 67 per cent of men with subordinates supervise men only and only 33 per cent have female subordinates. In commercial services, the numbers are reversed: 69 per cent of men with subordinates have female subordinates and 31 per cent supervise only other men. In public services the corresponding figures are 74 and 26 per cent respectively. In contrast, women with subordinates in all three sectors typically have authority only over other women—60 per cent in the goods sector, 64 per cent in commercial services and 64 per cent in public services. Between 36 and 40 per cent of all women with authority have some or exclusively male subordinates in the three sectors.
TABLE VIII
SEX OF SUPERVISOR BY INDUSTRIAL SECTOR, CANADA 1982

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Goods and Distribution</th>
<th>Commercial Services</th>
<th>Public Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female supervisor</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male supervisor</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female supervisor</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male supervisor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two broad conclusions follow from these results. First, the direct exercise of authority by men over women becomes widespread only in the service industries. Secondly, women are put in positions of authority mainly in female job ghettos, irrespective of sector. There are more women with authority in the service industries simply because there are more of these ghettos not because women are more likely to be given authority over men.

The latter conclusion is confirmed dramatically in Table VIII where we show the distribution of responses to a question that asked respondents the sex of their immediate superior. The question structure allowed for the possibility that a respondent might be supervised or be required to report to more than one person. Hence there is a small residual category ('mixed') of respondents who report to or are supervised by both a man and a woman. 11 Only rarely do men have a female superior (Table VIII, Panel 2). In goods and distribution, 3 per cent of all men have a female superior, in public services the figure is 10 per cent and in commercial services 15 per cent. Most women in goods and distribution have male superiors but these women represent a small fraction of all employed women. In commercial services 56 per cent of women have male superiors and in public services the figure is 47 per cent.

Gathering these results together suggests the following. The majority of women with authority exercise that authority over other women. About one-third of women with subordinates have at least one male subordinate but these are unusual men, accounting for only 7 per cent of the male labour force. The implication is that unequal access to positions of authority and power is mainly a result of 'anti-matriarchy'. Men are not, or will not be, ruled by women. Under these conditions, women achieve positions of authority almost exclusively within female job ghettos. In a curious way, then, numbers do matter: women gain access to positions of authority but only when it is unlikely that men will be subject to that authority. These results confirm England's (1979) observation that resistance to sex equality is greatest when it involves face to face relations of power in the workplace. Our data do not allow us to explain this apparent resistance of men to the exercise of power by women. We do, however, conclude, that this fact must
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Extractive (1)</th>
<th>Transformativ (2)</th>
<th>Distributive (3)</th>
<th>Producer (4)</th>
<th>Social Services (5)</th>
<th>Public Administration (6)</th>
<th>Consumer Services (7)</th>
<th>Retail (8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Females</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All others</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>87.9</td>
<td>84.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Males</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All others</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>74.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difference (Female-Male)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
<td>-2.9</td>
<td>-6.7</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
<td>-4.2</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>-3.7</td>
<td>-6.6</td>
<td>-5.2</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-8.8</td>
<td>-10.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE X
DIFFERENCES IN PERCENTAGE OF WOMEN AND MEN IN MANAGERIAL AND SUPERVISORY OCCUPATIONS BY INDUSTRY, CANADA, 1971, 1981, 1986

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Extractive (1)</th>
<th>Transformative (2)</th>
<th>Distributive (3)</th>
<th>Producer (4)</th>
<th>Social Services (5)</th>
<th>Public Administration (6)</th>
<th>Consumer Services (7)</th>
<th>Retail (8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Management occupations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>-3.1</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>-4.2</td>
<td>-3.0</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Supervisory occupations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>-3.5</td>
<td>-9.3</td>
<td>-9.3</td>
<td>-7.6</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>-11.1</td>
<td>-17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>-4.2</td>
<td>-7.3</td>
<td>-6.4</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-10.9</td>
<td>-12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>-3.7</td>
<td>-6.6</td>
<td>-5.2</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-8.8</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE XI
DIFFERENCES IN PERCENTAGE OF WOMEN AND MEN IN HIGH AND MIDDLE LEVEL MANAGEMENT OCCUPATIONS BY INDUSTRY, CANADA, 1971, 1981, 1986

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Extractive (1)</th>
<th>Transformative (2)</th>
<th>Distributive (3)</th>
<th>Producer (4)</th>
<th>Social Services (5)</th>
<th>Public Administration (6)</th>
<th>Consumer Services (7)</th>
<th>Retail (8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. High level management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>-4.1</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>-2.9</td>
<td>-6.6</td>
<td>-5.0</td>
<td>-3.3</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>-2.9</td>
<td>-5.6</td>
<td>-4.8</td>
<td>-3.0</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Middle management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>-3.4</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>-6.5</td>
<td>-6.3</td>
<td>-6.5</td>
<td>-3.5</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>-3.5</td>
<td>-3.4</td>
<td>-8.9</td>
<td>-5.8</td>
<td>-6.0</td>
<td>-3.4</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
<td>-2.9</td>
<td>-6.7</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
<td>-4.2</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
be the starting point of any effort to explain the position of women in the economic structure of modern capitalism.

5/ Evidence from the Census
Our survey results suggested that gender differences in workplace power and authority are more pronounced in services than in traditional industrial sectors of the economy. As we indicated, however, tests for interaction effects across the three industrial sectors generally fell below conventional standards of statistical significance, especially when we corrected for the design effect (1.5) of the CCSS sample. From this, we might conclude that there are no differences across industry sectors. Alternatively, it may be that our sample size is simply too small to detect these differences. Our analysis of census data support the latter interpretation.

As another way of examining gender differences in power and authority, we turn to unpublished industry by occupation distributions from the Canadian censuses of 1971, 1981 and 1986. We examine the percentages of the female and male labour in managerial and supervisory occupations following the Pinoe, Porter and McRoberts (1977) classification. Census occupations provide inferior measures of power and authority since unlike the CCSS there is no detailed probing of actual duties, responsibilities and powers of managers and supervisors. The advantages of the census are the large number of observations and the ability to track changes in time. We are also able to return to the more detailed industry classification used in the introduction.

Percentage distributions and differences (Females-Males) between men and women in managerial and supervisory occupations for 1986 are shown in Table IX. The results support our survey findings concerning sector differences in the gendering of class relations but the pattern of differences varies for managerial versus supervisory categories and by detailed industry. In producer services, social services and public administration, the gender gap in management positions is typically twice as large or more than that found in other industries. These are the high wage, high skill sectors of the service economy and here the gender gap is most accentuated at the top of the labour market. In contrast, at the supervisory level the gender gap is largest in the low wage, low skill consumer and retail services.

Census data can also tell us about trends over time. In management occupations, gender differences declined in the extractive industries, social services, public administration and consumer services after 1971. They rose or were stable in other parts of the economy (Table X). There was a more consistent downward trend in sex differences in supervisory occupations across all industries except for the extractive industries.

It is instructive, however, to further disaggregate the managerial occupations to see where in the hierarchy women have been making gains or losses. As Boyd (1990b: footnote 11) observes, women have tended to gain most in lower level managerial and administrative support functions. This conclusion is confirmed when we divide managers into 'high' and 'middle' level managers following the Pinoe-Porter-McRoberts classification. As we show
in Table XI, the gender gap in high level management increased since 1971 in all industries except social services. Conversely, the gender gap has fallen among middle managers in all industries except retail trade. In short, there have been two offsetting trends in the labour market: women have been improving their position relative to men in lower level management and supervisory jobs but losing ground relative to men in upper level executive positions.

CONCLUSION

The shift of employment from goods to services and the massive incorporation of women into the paid labour force are defining and inseparable features of postindustrial labour markets. How we interpret the significance of this historical transformation depends critically on the precise nature of the question being asked. Significance for whom? And for what? The service economy is not cut from a single cloth. Relative to historical and emergent patterns in goods production, it provides a complex mix of high wage, high skill employment (the ‘information economy’ and the ‘welfare state’ industries) and low wage, low skill employment (the ‘servant industries’). The one constant of the service industries, however, is the numerical dominance of women. The service economy is where most women work.

However, women have not converted their numerical strength in the service industries into power. Our findings on the differential location of men and women in hierarchies of power and authority show that women are less likely than men to occupy positions of power. Our examination of the relations of authority between men and women indicate that women rarely are supervisors or managers of men although men rule over both men and women. Census data indicate that the inroads of women into management are primarily at the lower rungs. Both census and survey results also show that gender differences in access to management and supervisory positions are largest in those service industries where women are in a majority. Together these results indicate that the service economy not only represents the continuation of female subordination, but also represents its consolidation.

Our results also underscore the observation of Bielby and Baron (1986) among others who have pointed out the importance of firm level analyses for understanding the dynamics of gender inequality. Even when there is convergence in the male and female distributions of power and authority this tells us little about the extent relations of power and authority between men and women are changing. It is quite possible to produce identical class or occupational distributions for men and women even when perfect segregation exists at the level of the firm or work setting. Our analysis of the sex composition of supervisors – supervisees indicates that despite an increase in female supervisors and lower level managers, few men are subject to female authority and women mainly get access to authority in female job ghettos.

As well, our results have some bearing for feminist theorizing about gender inequality in the workplace. Recently Acker (1988; 1989a; 1989b) has
argued that gender is so fundamental to hierarchical structure that alteration of the gender order tends to threaten the hierarchy itself (Acker, 1988: 482). Our research does not explore the processes that produce these gendered social relations. But our results on the relations of power and authority between men and women do indicate the embeddedness of gender in hierarchical relations. Our results in fact invert the traditional problematic of why men rule over women. Our findings on the near absence of men being supervised by women suggest a very powerful ‘iron law of anti-matriarchy’ – men will not be governed by women. This suggests recasting the traditional question of why women are subordinate to men to asking why are men seldom, if ever, subordinate to women. This latter question creates different theoretical and empirical questions, and sensitizes us to the gender hierarchies in analyses of class relations.

NOTES

1 In its original incarnation, the concept of postindustrialism was deployed by mainstream practitioners of what Giddens (1976) calls ‘industrialization’ theory to make sense of emergent trends and patterns that were inconsistent with the conventional concepts and categories of this perspective (see Myles, 1990). If emergent patterns could not be adequately understood with a theory derived from ‘the logic of industrialism’ (Kerr et al., 1964), then presumably a theory based on ‘the logic of postindustrialism’ was necessary (Bell, 1973). Our use of the term is less ambitious. As Block (1987: 27) observes, the concept of postindustrialism (like post-Keynesianism or post-Fordism) is a negative one. It does not designate the kind of economy or society we are moving towards but only the kind of economy and society we are leaving behind. It means simply that societies have moved beyond ‘industrialism’ – an historical not a logical category. But our use of the term also differs from Block’s for whom postindustrialism represents ‘...the development of new productive forces that come into conflict with capitalist social relations’ (Block, 1987: 107). It is not capitalist social relations that are threatened by postindustrialism but a particular historical form of those relations. The Fordism labour process based on mass production technology in which semi-skilled labour is combined with product-specific machinery to produce a large volume of standardized goods for homogeneous markets is now breaking down (Piore and Sabel, 1984). However, the empirical terrain subsumed by the Fordism/post-Fordism metaphor is too narrow. As Mahon (1987) observes, analyses of postwar labour markets that derive from this perspective have been constructed largely around blue collar work in manufacturing. However, the distinctive feature of advanced capitalist labour markets is that most employment is now in services.

2 Fluctuations from 8% in 1961 to 7% in 1971 (Table 1, panel 1, column 9) should not be over-interpreted given rounding procedures. Carried to the first decimal place, the percentages are actually 7.6 and 7.4 for 1961 and 1971 respectively.

3 Although Armstrong (1984) and Smith (1978) assemble industry data by sex, they use the major groups of the census industrial classification (sic).

4 The slight increase in 1961 and 1971 in the percentages of females in extractive industries reflects an increase in the percentages of women in mining, and quarrying as well as in agriculture.

5 The decline in the percent of women employed in the transformative sector was not because their share of jobs in this sector declined but because their share of employment in this sector grew less quickly than in services.

6 Indices of dissimilarity for the female and male labour force distributed across the eight
categories in Table 1 are: 48.5, 40, 40, 35.5, 34 and 31.5 for 1941, 1951, 1961, 1971, 1981, and 1986, respectively.

But this also means that there is no single typology that can provide an all-purpose tool for class analysis.

A more extensive ‘unpacking’ within a comparative framework is presented in Clement and Myles (forthcoming).

For this reason we do not use log-linear models which tend to be insensitive to interactions in the probabilities for the good reason that such models are multiplicative in form and only additive in their logs.

Tests of significance for interactions (difference of differences) were made with Jim Davis’ CHIP program designed for the analysis of contingency tables.

It should be emphasized that these results refer only to the respondent’s immediate superior. Many respondents will be at the end of a longer chain of command with a different sex composition than indicated here.

The census distinguishes between ‘foremen’ and ‘supervisors’ which we aggregate into a single supervisory category.
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APPENDIX A

Construction of Variables on Decision Making, Authority, Managerial Self-Placement and Autonomy, Canadian Class Structure Project.

A. The DECISION MAKING VARIABLE is constructed from responses to the following questions:

1. Are you personally involved even just to provide advice on:
   
a. Decisions to increase or decrease the total number of people employed in the place where you work?

   b. Policy decisions to significantly change the products, programs or services delivered by the organization for which you work?

   c. Decisions to change the policy concerning the routine pace of work or the amount of work performed in your workplace as a whole or some major part of it?

   d. Policy decisions to significantly change the basic methods or procedures of work used in a major part of your workplace?

   e. Decisions concerning the budget at the place where you work?

   f. Deciding the overall size of the budget?

   g. General policy decisions about the distribution of funds within the overall budget of the place where you work?

2. How do you usually participate in this decision? Do you make the decision yourself; make the decision as a voting member of a group; make the decision subject to approval; or only provide advice?

   Asked following each of 1a. through 1g.

CONSTRUCTION: Respondents who indicated they; make the decision themselves, make the decision as a voting member of a group, or, make the decision subject to approval for any ONE of 1a. through 1g. are coded as Decision Makers. Of the residual those who indicated they provide advice for any ONE of questions 1a. through 1g. were coded as Advisor Managers.
B The AUTHORITY VARIABLE is constructed from responses to the following questions:

Sanctioning Authority:

1. Do you have any influence on:
   a. Granting a pay raise or a promotion to a person you supervise?
   b. Preventing a person you supervise from getting a pay raise or promotion because of poor work or misbehaviour?
   c. Firing or temporarily suspending a person you supervise?
   d. Issuing a formal warning to a person you supervise?

Respondents answering Yes to any ONE of a. through d. were coded as having Sanctioning Authority.

Task Authority:

2. As part of your job, are you directly responsible for:
   a. Deciding the specific tasks or jobs to be done by the people you supervise?
   b. Deciding what procedures, tools or materials they use in doing their work?
   c. Deciding how fast they work, how long they work, or, how much work they have to get done?

Respondents who answered Yes to any ONE of a. through c. were coded as having Task Authority.

Nominal Authority

3. As an official part of your main job, do you supervise the work of other employees or tell other employees what work to do?

Respondents who answered Yes to this question but no to questions 1a. through 1d., and, 2a. through 2c. were coded as having Nominal Authority.

C. The MANAGERIAL SELF-PLACEMENT VARIABLE was constructed from responses to the following question:

Which of the following best describes the position which you hold
within your business or organization?

Top Managerial
Upper Managerial
Middle Managerial
Lower Managerial
Supervisory
Non-Management Position

D. The AUTONOMY VARIABLE was constructed from responses to the following questions:

1. First, is yours a job in which you are required to design important aspects of your own work and to put your ideas into practice? Or is yours a job in which you are not required to design important aspects of your own work or to put your ideas into practice, except perhaps in minor details?

No, not required = no autonomy.
Yes, answer next question.

2. Could you give an example of how you design your work and put your ideas into practice? The specific examples were coded according to the following criteria:

High: indicates an ability to design broad aspects of the job, engage in non-routine problem solving on a regular basis and to put one's ideas into practice in a regular and pervasive way.

Moderate: ability to design limited aspects of the job, engage in relatively routine forms of problem solving, and within fairly well defined limits, put one's ideas into practice.

Low: virtually no significant ability to plan aspects of the job, problem solving a marginal part of the job, and only in unusual circumstances can put one's ideas into practice.