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8
1. Managing in “the Golden Cage”
An Ethnographic Study of Work, Management and Gender in Parliamentary Administration

Prelude I

One cold and early morning last winter, beginning of February, I walked to work through the cemetery. I do that whenever I feel like I need fresh air and a moment to myself. The Hietaniemi cemetery made me think of my research topic, Parliamentary administration. Both cemeteries and Parliaments are places that are full of traditions and layers of history and culture and more than that, both places demand utter respect. Silently. I often felt like I was interpreted as being disrespectful of the Parliament and its traditions by simply asking my questions, even by just being there. As if my mere presence and questioning position somehow questioned the sacredness of this institution. The generic institution of a Parliament is characterised by a level of inborn self-righteousness. They exist, they rule and it is beyond any mortal, not to mention an outsider, to try to interfere with the established procedures and ways of being and doing things. There is something very safe in that notion. Much in the same way one can feel very safe in a cemetery. The trials and tribulations of everyday societal life don’t extend there. The difference between the two places is that a cemetery is a very peaceful place whereas the Parliament is simultaneously peaceful and harassed, or perhaps harassing. It is an arena of constant power struggles, and thus very non-peaceful (as such even violating, Hearn and Parkin, 2001), and there moreover is an element of untouchability
in it. Almost as if it is not a place for mortals much like a cemetery. The main difference is that most of us end up in the cemetery but most of us never get to set foot inside a Parliament. Death, cemeteries and political institutions, what could they possibly have in common? Why did I think of the Parliament while standing on the empty road that cuts through the cemetery? It was something I felt rather than anything I saw. The presence of a national institution. The empty road reminded me of one very hot summer evening when I was completely alone in the Finnish Parliamentary main building and trying, not immediately successfully, to find my way out. I was then struck by the monumentality of the building, as well as by the vast emptiness of it. I felt the same way as I did on that empty, snowy cemetery road. A cemetery is an institution and so is a Parliament. You do not make fun or question death, and you do not make fun or question the Parliament, at least not Parliament as an institution; the MPs are obviously a very different matter. There is something inexplicable here and that something was present that early winter morning in the cemetery and that late summer afternoon in the Parliamentary house. The history of a nation? A form of nationality\textsuperscript{1}? Would I have felt the way I did if I was not Finnish? I am not sure. Perhaps I am not enough of a Finn to even know? Maybe I felt what I felt due to my own position in this country? Born and partly raised abroad and thus always a bit of a stranger here? One can speculate.

***

Prelude II

Instead of using the name of the organisation in the title of this thesis I use a metaphor “the golden cage”. It is, however, very important to point out that this metaphor is not ‘mine’, not developed by me. It is produced by a group of employees of the Parliament. There is a painting in one of the offices of the Parliamentary administration that has an image of the Parliament portrayed as a golden cage and one of the managers told me the story behind it. The Parliamentary employees had been assigned to paint in groups during a refreshment day and as one assignment they were asked to portray their

\textsuperscript{1} Hietaniemi cemetery has many national heroes.
workplace. One group had produced this picture where the Parliament is portrayed as a golden cage with people inside of it. To me the picture itself, the fact that a group of employees themselves had painted it, that it was still on the wall in the offices of the administration and seen as a suitable and even good way of portraying life and work in the organisation - all these things together mean that this painting offers a perfect metaphor of the dual relationship many people in the Parliament seemed to have with their workplace. The Parliament may sometimes seem a little bit like a cage but it also has a golden quality about it.

***

**Introduction**

This book, this research, is, has been and to extent still is an attempt to understand the institution of a Parliament by looking at it from a different angle. I am trying to tell a slightly different story from the usual ones involving only the politicians, and in so doing I am mainly hoping to increase knowledge of different perspectives on democracy and democratic institutions. Unpacking the nearly mythical institution to smaller, more digestible, graspable realities can, perhaps, in the long run even ‘improve’ the institution. At least it helps to remind the surrounding society that although nations, to a certain extent, do need national institutions they should not become larger than life. Institutions should work on behalf of people and be thus accountable to these same people.

This project has already made many people within the Parliament nervous and even upset for reasons I never quite understood. One of the questions to be answered in future research is definitely why are these institutions so sacred? In this research I have tried to answer a very simple question. What is it like to work in such an elite institution, to work between the Politics and administrative demands? To try to manage and to facilitate legislative procedures that will always take precedence over all other work done? This book is one take on this. It is based on six months of working, participant observing, interviewing in the Finnish Parliament.

---

2 From now on a capital P always refers to party politics and small p to organisational politics.
As a reader, you are reminded that you are not reading “the truth”; rather you are reading one perspective on this ‘house’, people, structures, rules, hierarchies, and so on. I am hoping that everyone I have worked, spoken, had coffee or lunch with feels I am doing justice to them, their workplace and their institution. Whatever the nature of the institution, however highly it is portrayed within the collective minds or in the history of any given nation, anywhere, it is still, at the end of the day just another place where people work, experiencing all the usual problems of any workplace. Much political science has tended to neglect the administrative aspects of Parliaments and other political elite institutions. Some political theorists, for example Rawls (1971), have given weight to the general arrangement of the society’s basic institutions as they form part of society’s basic structure, the location and source of justice. For Rawls these institutions distribute the main benefits and burdens of all social life, who will have which basic rights, who will have opportunities to get what kind of work, who will receive social recognition etc. Thus the structures they contain and how they are managed do matter. This research is based on the idea that increased knowledge of the administration of political institutions, their inner micro-structures, informal and formal structures and the ways they function as workplaces is beneficial in terms of improving the internal governance of these places. In addition, such knowledge also has wider societal implications. The quality of democracy can be improved by first examining and then perhaps further developing the quality and structures of administration of these elite institutions.

This thesis is based on qualitative research, specifically ethnography, involving participant observation, interviews and documentary analysis. It focuses on exploring micro-level structures, mainly management structures, working processes and gendered relations within the Finnish Parliamentary administration. The thesis examines the traditional logic of state governance, and considers the different impacts the logics have on the working environment and workplace atmosphere. When examining a Political institution and the working processes within it, power is both a key issue and a key concept. Gender relations and gendering are thus also central in this research in making different power relations visible. The primary focus is specifically on gendered processes and the differing ways that advantage and disadvantage, exploitation and control, action and emotion, meaning and identity are
distributed within the administrative offices of the Finnish Parliament. In particular the meanings and significance of “liking” and “politicking” within the administration are examined. Together these concepts are additional informal processes and structures within formal organisational structures. These processes and structures do not, however, always follow or coincide with the gendered formal structures.

Parliaments are Political institutions but they are also places where people; the MPs and the people employed there work, albeit in different ways. Here the focus is on those in a Parliament who work there as employees and managers and thereby run the organisation. Accordingly, this involves seeing the Finnish Parliament as a working environment, for MPs and employees, for men and women. The aim is thus also to clarify what effects gender has for working in a Finnish Parliament. This will be done by combining organisational and management studies with political science perspectives, together with a gender-sensitive view.

There are several different implications that arise when looking at a Parliament as a workplace. One of the key concepts is power and the question of how power is divided within any given Parliament. In order to be able to evaluate the power relations within these institutions one needs to look at their different organisational structures. As an organisation, Parliament has (at least) two differing hierarchies, the Political and the organisational; and then there is the (very likely) possibility that these two hierarchies are further mixed with each other rather than forming two separate clean-cut categories. Within any Parliament there are also two main groups of people in terms of status, salary and position within the hierarchy: employees and MPs. Within these two main groups there are again further subgroups. The former group (the employees) are, however, a fairly stable group and very typically they have been working within a Parliament for an extended period, whereas the other group (MPs) are at least partly fluctuating according to the given Political changes and order. The Political group of MPs also includes a subgroup, the MPs assistants whose position has been a source of a lot of debate in the Finnish parliament. The MPs assistants’ contracts are with the administrative office of the Parliament but the assistants are managed separately by each MP and thus they form a distinct group inside the organisation. Thus there is a large group of people in the Political part (further divided into groups i.e.
parties, subcommittees and subgroups) that (potentially) changes every four years, and then another large group of people in the political part of Parliament staying put and providing the supporting structure for the MPs, facilitating their work. Within all of these subgroups and subdivisions there are also the divisions to men and women, as well as a specific type of social hierarchy that exists simultaneously with the main formal hierarchies (see figure 1.). This creates an interesting and complex, in many ways unique, setting for a working environment as well as a very complicated web of power relations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>political hierarchy</th>
<th>Political hierarchy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secretary General</td>
<td>Speaker of the House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Manager</td>
<td>Deputy Speakers(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers of different units</td>
<td>MPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees of different ranks</td>
<td>Men/Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men/Women</td>
<td>Political staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social hierarchy</td>
<td>MPs’ assistants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social hierarchy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 1.*

This book is a story about what happens when one’s work is (and it always is, whether it is Politics or politics), by definition, ‘tainted’ by Politics, politics and personal issues. What kind of workplace, what kind of organisation, would that be? How could it function? What is it like to work in a place that is both highly Politically charged and also has all the trials, tribulations and politics of “normal” organisations? Many parliaments throughout the world probably have many people working there able to answer these questions, perhaps even with some ease.

Moreover, within mainstream organisational studies Parliaments, amongst other Political organisations (Rainey, 2003) are highly understudied as organisations or workplaces. The greater part of the work done on organisational studies focuses on the private rather than the public sector. Furthermore, even though there is a large and growing body of literature on the public sector, dealing with managing the public sector such as New
Public Management (Polsby, 1984; Dunleavy, 1991; Hood and Jackson, 1991; Osborne and Gaebler, 1992; Dunleavy and Hood, 1994; Stokes and Clegg, 2002) that literature does not usually deal with elite institutions such as Parliaments; instead the focus is more on other public sector bureaucracies, administration, and service delivery.

In focusing on a Parliament as a gendered workplace, combining organisational studies with political science, a gendered approach and ethnographic method, I aim at least to a degree, to unpack an elite government institution, and to look beyond the controversies of party Politics by focusing on the different organisational microstructures and internal functions of the administrations of these Parliaments. The specific research questions addressed are discussed later in this chapter.

As an organisation, Parliaments (in any country) are unique in that they produce laws and policies which people are at least expected to obey. Other kinds of organisations produce norms, guidelines and policies, but Parliamentary decisions usually apply to the whole society, at least theoretically\(^3\). Never the less the workings of this unique type of organisation are of particular interest from many angles. Even though there has been a large amount of international (and Finnish) research on gender relations and Politics – in terms of women’s representation and positions within the governing systems, in the Political parties, public sector administration and policy-making in general, (for example: Barry, Dent, O’Neill, 2003; Mazur, 2002; Chappell and Hill, 2006; Chappell, 2004; Annesley, Gains and Rummery 2007; Arhosalo, 1985; Eduskunta, 1996), this research has generally been more focused on the aspects of gender equality and equality more generally in different parts of the political field and policy making. There has also been a good deal of Finnish research dealing with gender and the different aspects of gender mainstreaming or the lack of it in public sector in the communal and state level (Holli, 2003; Kuusipalo, 1989; Holli and Kantola 2007; Holli, Luhtakallio, Raevaara, 2007; Holli and Saari, 2009), but relatively little attention to women and men as gendered actors inside Parliaments, and even less -according to my knowledge, no research where- Parliaments would have been considered as a *gendered, employing* organisation.

\(^3\) It is necessary to point out here that there are still countries where one can find large areas that are in fact ‘ungovernable’, for example, parts of Afghanistan.
The role of party Politics, usually at the forefront of any study on Parliaments, is here given minimal attention. Political institutions like Parliaments are often treated as something above the “normal” workings of organisations. But it is perhaps good to note here that even “… members of Parliament are paid employees in a public-sector organization and, as such, are no less accountable and open to scrutiny than those employed in more accessible public service sites, such as education, the NHS, the Post Office and so on” (Whitehead, 1999, p.19).

This open scrutiny is and has been very much a concern of the media, in many countries also in Finland. However, open scrutiny of the other sides of the Parliament apart from the money spent, the administration and civil service has been, until recent years, been more rare. Intense media attention towards the administration is relatively recent in Finland. This could also be seen as reflecting the ‘opening up’ or at least change, that could be said to have started during the 1980s, in the way the Finnish media has handled the politicians (Virkkunen, 2006; Ervasti, 2004; Aula, 1991; Holmberg, 2004) and political culture generally over the recent years (Aslama and Kivikuru, 2002; Alho, 2004; Heikkilä, M., 1998; Heikkilä, H., 1992).

This research provides the reader with a thick description (Geertz, 1973) of previously relatively unknown parts of a Political institution, the ‘non-Political’ departments of the Finnish Parliament. The aim is to open another black box (Easton, 1965), that is, to venture into, describe and analyse a previously relatively unobserved, yet systemically very important area within the core of the democratic Political system. The research is very much explorative. There will be a degree of potentially generalisable analysis of the management-related problems in these types of institutions, on problems encountered in and by a growing organisation, and on the need of clear strategy even in public sector organisations with little or no profitability requirements. The next step in research, as suggested in the conclusions of this book, is to look deeper into these kinds of elite organisations within the public sector and investigate what is defined as the bridge between ‘Politics’ and ‘non-Politics’. How long or short is this bridge and more importantly, whether the length of it is indeed (as seems likely based on this work) decided upon over and over again every day? How do the structures change or not accordingly?
In the beginning of this research my idea was to do a comparative analysis of the administrative offices of the Finnish and Swedish Parliaments but the more I got to know the institutions the clearer it became that Parliaments and Parliamentary administrations are, despite of their sometimes similar structural arrangements and features, very different, unique institutions and thus a comparison would not really do justice to either of them. Also I was able to get full ethnographic access only to the Finnish Parliament. Despite of the promising start in Sweden, I was only ever able to do a few interviews in there. I had also initially planned to keep the organisations I was doing my research in completely anonymous but then the Finnish press ‘outed’ me (see chapter seven for the whole story), and it became clear that I would not be able to maintain that institutional anonymity doing research in the Finnish Parliamentary administration.

I have thought of many different methodological ways to secure the anonymity of everyone working in these offices I write about. Several different ways have been considered but eventually it seemed that simplicity was the best way forward. I wanted to remain true to ethnography and tell the story the way it unfolded. I have utilised all the methods (see chapter three for more on this) I could to ensure fuller anonymity but there is no disguising of the fact that the main and only case of this research is the Finnish Parliamentary administration.

The general aim
The research explores the micro-level structures, mainly management structures, social structures and strategy documents of the Finnish Parliamentary administration. The general aim is to examine the management of the administrative offices of the Parliament, as well as the impact gender has for working in a Parliament.

The objectives
There are two main objectives for analysis: firstly, the analysis of management and structures of the administration; and, secondly, the analysis of the gendered organisational processes, hierarchies and structures of the administrative offices. The main focus inside the Parliament is on the general administration and managing of the ‘House’.

17
Another objective of this kind of approach to a Political institution is to unpack some of the myths around governmental institutions and to look beyond the controversies of Politics by focusing on the organisational structures and functions of these Parliaments. As the adopted approach is also informed by gendered studies of organisations this includes examining the possible gender equality or inequality of the Finnish Parliament as a place of employment.

The main focus is thus on those in Parliaments who work there as employees and managers and thereby in many senses run the organisation. The MPs and their assistants with their rather different status, is considered in the analysis but only on those occasions when something occurred in the field that brought them into view. The MPs are employed in these institutions too but it is not possible or necessary to here deal with the multiplicity of issues regarding Political representation and ideology. It is sufficient to say that the Political environment is taken into consideration and acknowledged to have a multiple level impact on the organisational functions of Parliaments.

Part of the core arguments in this thesis is that one cannot and should not try to split any organisation in neat parts and pretend that those parts have nothing to do with one another but in this work the Political part and “the bridge” between the two parts is left to minimum attention as a thorough analysis would be beyond the scope and point of this work. It would also be likely to divert attention from my main focus, the employees.

The nature of the relationship of these two parts of Parliaments – the Political and non-Political (or political) is not straightforward. It is a very complex web of hierarchical, political, Political, social and tactical positions. In the context of this type of explorative study it is impossible to evaluate in any substantial manner all the aspects of how this relationship works and thus that is left to future research. Questions such as what kind of power relationship do the administration and the Political parts of these institutions really have need to be answered through further research on these institutions.

The research has a multi-disciplinary approach and thus there is a wide range of relevant concepts and conceptual areas that need to be examined. Thus as well as having all the usual limitations any piece of academic work, it has some additional ones due to the chosen approach. It is beyond the scope of this work to offer a fully satisfying overview of all the relevant conceptual areas (and the following list is not exhaustive there are other areas that could be
added): organizational culture, political culture, governmental culture, power, bureaucracy, New Public Management (NPM), total institutions, gender, work and workplace, governmentality, political institutions and institutionalism, strategy in the public sector, intersectionality, informal and formal relations and structures and the blurred differences between them, and last but not least institutional ethnography. In this situation one can however show awareness of the limitations, point towards future research, and hope that the areas that have been reviewed offer some compensation for the possible weaknesses.

The research questions

The research questions have lived and developed alongside with the thesis and changed many times over the years but the two main research questions are:

1. What is it like to be a “non-Political employee” within a Parliament? From the perspective of people employed within administration; managers; women and men.

2. What are the specific character and characteristics of the organisational formal and informal processes and relations within the employed, non-Political, part of the Parliamentary institution?

The questions are wide and this is partly due to institutional ethnographic nature of the research (Smith, 1987). The questions functioned more as a guideline on my way into the ethnography. What then became the ethnographic data of this thesis is tightly linked with these questions but maybe not in quite the same way as in some more orthodox qualitative research projects where the research mainly starts with very specific questions that might also change along the way because of the way the actual research process goes but where the aim is still to answer some specific questions in the final analysis.

Here it is important to point out that we are not discussing labour processes and that there will be a discussion on informal and formal in chapter two.
I have not, however, aimed to answer specific questions with this work nor do I have any kind of quantifiable macro-level contribution. I will offer the main observations of this explorative research, mainly consisting of micro-level incidents within this specific workplace. This work is very much based, influenced and inspired by approaches used whilst doing Institutional Ethnography and the theories of Dorothy E. Smith and her views on the importance of the everyday incidents (Smith, 1987; Smith, 1989; Smith, 1996; Grahame 1998; Smith, 2002; DeVault and McCoy, 2002). For more on this please see chapters 2 and 3 for the theoretical framings and methodology.

This particular study has been done by doing ethnography, more specifically the kind of non-positivist ethnography that means venturing into the unknown. I have not gone in looking for specific answers, rather the aim was to discuss with the field with wide questions, ideas and an open mind (Rhodes et al., 2007; Van Maanen, 1988). One could, however, say that I started my fieldwork with two very broad questions. Whilst doing the research I realised that I am interested in these two questions particularly in relation to three specific groups. At the end of my fieldwork I left the field with a whole new set of questions, which I discuss in my conclusions in chapter eight.

This book is an attempt to understand and illuminate internal aspects of Parliaments, of political institutions and the things I have been and continue to be interested in are the different minor specificities, micro-level curiosities that go on every day within workplaces. Rhodes starts one of his articles on everyday life in a government ministry (Rhodes, 2005, pp. 3-25) asking a few broad questions: “What do we know about the work of ministers and permanent secretaries? How do we know what we know about ministers and permanent secretaries?” I have used my already mentioned basic questions and then additional ones I was also considering whilst entering the field. See chapter three for the additional questions.

In addition to my own initial broad questions I had, as part of my work for the Parliamentary Administration, additional two sets of questions that I worked with whilst inside the parliament. There were a set of interview questions and survey questions, both conducted for them as a part of my work in the administration. That data is also part of this thesis, see chapter 3. for the details.
Some key concepts

In the following section I offer an introductory discussion of some of the conceptual, ontological and theoretical considerations that will be further discussed in chapter two. This research starts from an ontological position where the collective is seen as the most important Political and political subject. The fact that my case in question is the Finnish Parliament makes this kind of Hegelian-Marxist ontology even more fitting. The process of Finnish nation formation was very much inspired by the Hegelian theory. Snellman, the founding father of the Finnish state, wrote his doctoral thesis on Hegel (Klinge, 1997). One could argue that Finnish state sector bureaucracy is thus based on these very ideas.

This research does not offer new ways of organising or theorising public sector governance. However, the knowledge acquired by doing this research does speak clearly for a more professional and more organised and centralised managing of these types of organisations. Focusing on facilitating law-making has for a long time been the general approach of these institutions but it does not seem to work so well anymore (if it ever did). This may be due to the sheer growth of numbers of employees within them. What works with approximately 25 people does not work so well with nearly 900.

To the eternal question of what is your contribution, both theoretical and/or practical, or, as one often gets to hear it: now that you have done all this, so what? My answer goes along with Dorothy Smith’s views on the significance of the everyday activities and micro level research in that they offer a valuable and important benchmark with which one is perhaps better equipped to investigate or at least review the seeming inevitability of the existing macro-power structures. The societal significance of the micro-level events, however, has been researched and pointed out by many researchers other than Dorothy Smith. There are interesting feminist accounts on the tensions between women’s everyday micro-politics and the macro-political goals (Kumar, 1994) as well as on the impacts and influence of micro-politics when it comes to gender, identity and resistance at work (Thomas et al., 2004). The importance and varying impacts of micro-politics have thus been considered from many different angles and this research goes along with the view put forward by Prasad and Prasad, when they point out that micro-political resistance:
“... shapes and reshapes employee identity, redefines the nature of work and authority relationships, alters the symbolic order of the workplace and restores some measure of dignity into less respected jobs ...” (Prasad and Prasad, 1998, p. 251).

As I have done research in the very core of political and societal power I find that such knowledge on the everyday and resistance within it that sphere is valuable in itself, because it offers a very different perspective to the dominant perspective on democratic structures of society.

Institutional ethnography sees bureaucratic organisations and institutions as places where individual's actions are made accountable in terms of abstract, generalised categories. “The concrete experience of individuals can thus be viewed as a terrain structured by these generalising relations but not wholly swallowed up by them. In this way, the experience of the individual presents itself not merely as “a case”, but rather as an entry point into the actual workings of those institutions which produce the generalised and abstract character of contemporary societies” (quote from Grahame, 1998, p. 353; see also Grahame, 1999; Smith, 1987, pp. 157-158; Smith, 1996; Smith, 1998; De Vault and McCoy, 2002).

This thesis also follows the thinking of Rhodes et al. (2007) in the belief that “combining the analytical perspectives of an interpretive approach with the methods of social anthropology gives new insights into the behaviour of government elites” (p. 4). That is the contribution of this research: to offer a new angle into life inside these elite organisations, Parliaments.

Critical examination of the relations between the social sciences and the ruling institutions of the society is not a new project and it has been advocated and called for by many theorists, for instance, Foucault (Foucault, 1978). Foucault has discussed the way the social sciences and the discourses used have emerged as part of the ruling apparatus and as such can be seen as being simply another dimension of ruling and governance. Smith’s argument draws on these ideas and she takes them one step further and develops a “critique of sociology’s role in processes of ruling through an analysis of how institutions and professional discourses exclude the standpoint of persons living and acting in the everyday world” (Grahame 1998, p. 349; Smith 1987). More on these debates and theories in chapter two.
In addition, the concept of organisation violations (Hearn, 2003; Hearn and Parkin, 2001), particularly harassment, arose from the fieldwork. I never intended to include these themes into my conceptual framing, and was not planning to include them as a focus point either. However, when one is dealing with an organisation where personal relations in one department are inflamed to a degree that it has consequences for the working of the whole department and where difficult issues are not dealt with but rather stored away (see chapters five and six), the concept of organisation violations suddenly becomes increasingly relevant. It has to be taken up and used to frame these events. Harassment, a concept that came from the equality evaluation and became even more important with subsequent press reports, was never planned to be any kind of major theme in my research. However, it became important, not least due to the way this organisation was not dealing with its different organisational problems. This organisational inability or unwillingness to deal with negative situations became a central part of my fieldwork, regardless of all my earlier plans or expectations.

**Finnish Political culture**

To be able to understand the nature of the Parliamentary administration in Finland one has to understand the defining features of the Finnish Political culture that has ‘created’ and ‘shaped’ this particular Parliament and the way it is today. One also has to be familiar with the actual structural arrangements of the Parliament as the whole. Thus in the following sections I will offer an introduction and an overview of the Finnish political culture and the relevant parliamentary structures in order to further assist the reader.

Political culture as a concept has multiple definitions. Much in the way that all culture-related concepts in social sciences tend to be, Political culture too is a debated concept and there is little consensus on what it should or should not entail. However, for the purposes of this work it is sufficient to note those debates and then choose a definition that fits. A definition may be based on Almond and Verba’s (1963) classic definition of civic culture. For Almond and Verba Political culture is understood as a combination of Political orientations, attitudes towards the Political system and the role of
the self in the system, shared values and attitudes. They see Political culture as the connecting link between micro- and macropolitics (Almond and Verba, 1963, pp.8-33, capital Ps added by the author).

This definition would otherwise be sufficient as it is but its subjectivist starting point is not compatible with the ontology of this work where the collective is placed before the subjective5. Thus instead of viewing Political culture solely through subjective experiences, I follow theories that have come since Almond and Verba’s original definition and added to it, where Political culture is seen as a collective system of meanings, forms of structures in their own right and also more as a process, continuously reproducing itself.

This definition of Political culture also includes the idea that “Political symbols and rituals were not metaphors of power, they were the means and ends of power itself” (Hunt, 1984, p.54). Thus to interpret the details of any Political culture and to understand how different features of Political culture are generated and how they work, collectively and subjectively, offers important knowledge on how power is distributed in that given Political culture.

However in defining Finnish Political culture one can say that Finland is a combination of Scandinavian social democratic welfare model and Germanic corporatism. Corporatism is rather typical for the Scandinavian Political culture and has featured strongly in Finnish Political culture too (Almond and Verba, 1989, p. 7). Despite the similarities in the Nordic region one should still be careful and differentiate clearly between countries as there are grave differences too. The Finnish Political culture and system, much like any Political culture and system, should be treated as a unique case. Here, I return to the argument regarding the corresponding uniqueness of Parliaments. Even if political institutions like Parliaments in the western world tend to share many features they are always products of their own specific national culture, Political systems and Political cultures. One should not assume otherwise. “Societal institutions borrow their cultural identity from society and each of them has a specific cultural identity based on their function and role in (that) society” (Virtanen, 1987, p.28).

5 A subjectivist view of the Political culture is not enough as “Culture is public because meaning is” (Geertz, 1973, p.12).
It is also important to remember that despite the claims towards neutrality and impartiality within the Finnish civil service, “Governmental policy is, on the one hand, part of Politics; therefore it is marked by Political symbols and values, distinct from other kinds of policy” (Frissen in Virtanen, 1987, p.28 capital Ps added by the author). On the other hand, governmental policy is characterised by the institutional context in which it is established, namely bureaucracy. Thus the symbolism of governmental policy is “determined by the organisational culture of bureaucracy” (Ibid., p. 28).

Finnish Political culture was for a long time characterised by inward looking foreign policy, corporatist Politically controlled economy, centralised, bureaucratic and planned public sector with almost no power given to the municipalities and a strong role given to the president particularly during Paasikivi (1946-1956) and Kekkonen (1956-1982) reigns. All of these features can be said to be at least partly due to Finland’s historical and geopolitical relationship with Soviet Union, later the Russian Federation (Saukkonen et al., 1999).

The most important changes in the Finnish Political structures during the 1980’s and 1990’s were joining the EU as well as the partial changes to the constitution and finally the whole new constitution that took effect in Spring 2000. At the heart of these changes there was an idea of strengthening the Finnish Parliamentary system by enforcing the role of the Parliament and the Government (that has to answer to the Parliament in Finland) in relation to the President (Ibid.).

The EU membership meant many things but one of the more significant ones is the anti-discrimination legislation that was introduced. This then resulted in growing acceptance and openness and a shift towards a more heterogeneous society. Basic economic and social rights were 1995 expanded to all people within the Finnish justice system. During the same year the Saami people were granted their place as an indigenous people and the Romas together with other groups were given rights to maintain and develop their own language and cultures. There has been a significant change in the immigration policies and Politics and continuous opening is and has been an ongoing trend within Finnish Politics over the last years. The amount of people of foreign origin in Finland has grown steadily and significantly even if it still is, in comparison with other European countries, one of the lowest in Europe (Ibid.).
The developments in Finnish Political culture over the last years are marked by growing media criticism towards Politics and Politicians, including the way they behave themselves in private (see beginning of this chapter), as well as a widespread disbelief in citizen’s ability to influence how Politics is done. The recent deep seated and widespread scandals over the electoral funding parties received from different companies and foundations have further contributed towards this and strengthened peoples views that politicians and politics cannot and should not be trusted. Fluctuating trust and general disillusionment towards Politicians is, however, by no means a new phenomenon. Voting activity declined and varied largely already between the 1987 and 1999 elections (Martikainen and Wass, 2001). One can see clearly from polling figures how the general confidence towards the Parliament and the civil servants crashed between 1981 and 1996 (EVA, 2001). Another EVA poll done later in 2001 showed that 73% of respondents felt there was a strong discrepancy between politicians and the people. The parties in general were seen as alienated from everyday life and normal people’s problems. Roughly half of the respondents were longing for some type of strong leader but still only a minority saw any kind of nationalistic of right wing movements as positive (EVA, 2001). However, the last Parliamentary election saw the Perussuomalaiset party (Basic Finns, author’s translation) gaining more votes than ever before with their radical, non-committed, reactive and populist Politics.

The role of the state and public sector in general in Finland has been undergoing steady change. The different kinds of coalition governments since the mid 1980’s have varied in their composition but still they have all maintained the same trend. The role of the Finnish state has shifted from being the main and sole corporatist coordinator and governor of the social and economic development of the whole country into a co-operative actor maintaining and facilitating the economic and societal structures together with the markets and civil society. This has meant a different set of values

---

6 EVA is a policy and pro-market think-tank financed by the Finnish business community. It is a discussion forum and networking arena for decision-makers both in business and society. EVA publishes reports, organizes debates and publishes policy proposals. For more information see http://www.eva.fi/eng/index.php?m=1aaddid=581

7 It is necessary to point out here that the overall principles and practices of neo-liberalism include markets, competition, uncertainty, risk, individualism, and that they are indeed a worldwide phenomenon (Harvey, 2005). However, the way they are visible in the Finnish context differs from the, for example, UK or US context greatly; the result is perhaps in some
being introduced within the internal functions of the state, as well as a new set of logics and functional roles in relation to its tasks. Instead of one unified way of approaching the tasks of the state there is now a set of governance values and logics for the core tasks of the state, economic values and logics for tasks related to markets, as well as service values for the tasks related to state delivery of services (Saukkonen et al., 1999).

The Finnish state has been restructured and continues to be restructured in a similar way to other EU states, shifting its role and seeking for new ways of governing in the growingly global world (Ikenberry, 2003), there is a shift in terminology followed by shift in roles. The Finnish state is moving away from welfare state towards welfare society, instead of taking care of individuals the state seeks to facilitate an active individual who would have more possibilities for improving the quality of their own life. Much in the same way that municipalities are encouraged to develop themselves and their own strengths, the geographic areas with more potential are given preference rather than giving out equal financial support to all municipalities. This also follows the general trends in the Western world.

The strong Presidential tradition that is mainly due to historical events left its mark in the Finnish constitution that still has dualistic features, both Parliamentary and Presidential. Especially during the strong leadership of Presidents Paasikivi and Kekkonen Finland was typically classified together with France as a partly Presidential country. Another special feature of the Finnish political system is a combination of strong state and legalistic governing culture. This is again partly due to the historical reasons and the common governance system with Russia (pre-1917), but it is also partly due to the strong party system and the ideologies that go with that. Again for geopolitical reasons, particularly in the early days of independence a strong state was seen as a necessity by all parties (although there was some disagreement on the form it should take). After the Second World War the resulting strong state was visible in the different areas of policy and the state had its fingers in every pie (Saukkonen et al., 1999).

The Finnish party system was born from many historical intersections of issues and contradictions reflecting the special type of nationalism in Finland. Despite the fractured, historically loaded, layered and contradictory ways a more corporatist version of the neo-liberal market economy.
nature of the system it has proven to be very stable. One can argue that the Finnish political elite and Finnish citizens have mostly been very aware of the necessity of maintaining national goals and stability. Due to the complex historical and geopolitical reasons a central part of Finnish political culture has thus always been the idea of common Finnish interest before other interests. Simultaneously, in a country where multi-party coalition governments are almost inevitable during ‘normal’ times, one could only further one’s own cause in a government by agreeing to other parties’ demands. From the 1930’s to the 1980’s (apart from a few very short periods) this co-operative culture was maintained and kept working by the Social Democrats and the (then called) Maalaisliitto (nowadays Keskusta, i.e. the Centre Party). This tradition of co-operation is significant in many ways for this research but particularly as still to this day, the administration of the Finnish Parliament is divided between these two parties. The Secretary General, Seppo Tiitinen represents the Centre Party and the Director of Administration Kari T. Ahonen the Social Democratic party. The Speaker of the house, Sauli Niinistö, is now from the Kokoomus (National Coalition Party or Conservative Party).

Risto Alapuro (1999, p. 103) has pointed out that the geopolitical threat Finland has faced over the years of developing as a nation has had a double effect. On the one hand, it has led to a strong culture of consensus, with a necessity to agree, as disagreements could have led to instability. On the other hand, it has also forced the actors within the Finnish system to tolerate differences in opinion in a peaceful manner as again too tense a situation in internal politics could be destabilising for the system as a whole.

The Finnish political elite has for a long time worked to balance out differences aiming for compromises and consensus, shying away from radicalism. Continuity within the Finnish political system is evident and striking in comparison with other European countries and this shows also in the administration of the state. The civil servants have mostly remained in their posts despite of any possible changes in ideology or governing party, and this is visible also in the Parliamentary administration where most civil servants have been in the house for their entire working career (Pesonen and Riihinen, 2002).
The Parliament: the legislative and administrative structures

When discussing parliamentary democracies, a parliament could be seen as the quintessential Political institution. This is due to the nature and intrinsic logic of the democratic systems whereby regardless of the Political culture or the particular organisational form of any given parliament, a parliament always consists of elected members of parliament representing the given people and thus holding the highest level of power in parliamentary democracies. The origins of the word democracy literally mean, rule by the people, stemming from the Greek words demos (people) and kratos (rule). This theoretical possibility, however, is rarely the case in practice. There is a growing number of critics pointing towards the growing global heterogeneity of cultures, the Political power of the global capitalism and the powerful yet unclear position possessed by the multi-national companies (Gray, 1998; Ikenberry, 2003; Waters, 2001; Huntington, 1996).

A parliament is a legislature and usually operates within a parliamentary system of government. A parliamentary system of government can be broadly defined as a system where constitutional laws make the executive (the cabinet) directly answerable to the parliament. There is, however, no universally agreed definition of what a parliamentary system is or is not, as in reality there are many different versions of the system. Lijphart (1999) employs a criterion that I will apply for the purposes of this thesis. According to Lijphart, parliamentary systems can be defined by three factors. First, as mentioned above the cabinet is responsible to the parliament. The parliament is able to remove the cabinet through a vote of ‘no-confidence’ or through insisting on an election which then gives the cabinet a chance to win and remain in office. Second, the head of the cabinet, usually the Prime Minister, is not elected directly by the people, as in presidential systems, but is selected by the legislature. Third, parliamentary cabinets are collective or collegial in nature thus forming a contrast with the one-person executive that one finds in presidential systems (Lijphart, 1999, pp. 117-118). Parliaments usually come in a bicameral (for example Westminster) or unicameral (for example Finnish Parliament) form.
Under the Finnish constitution, sovereign power belongs to the people, who are represented by Parliament. Finland has a unicameral Parliament with 200 seats and the minimum age for voting and standing for election currently 18. When the unicameral Parliament was established in 1906, Finland was an autonomous Grand Duchy under the Russian Czar, who ruled as grand duke rather than absolute monarch. Finland declared its independence on the 6th of December 1917 and after that during the winter of 1918 endured a civil war. After that the whites (right wing, and loyal to the upper class) and the reds (socialist, generally working class) struggled over the country's form of government. In the end the white republicans won and Finland became a republic, with extensive powers reserved for the President.

As already noted, the Finnish Parliament’s organisational structure can be understood comprising two parts, the Political and non-political. The Political part of the parliamentary organisation consists of the elected MPs their assistants and administrative staff employed by the parties, as well as the highest government officials working in the administration, as in Finland the top offices in the civil service are openly political appointments. The Political part of the organisation is then further divided into seven sub-groups according the tasks they are given within the legislative process: the Speakers’ Council, Speakers, The Office Commission, The Committees, The Grand Committee, The Specialty Committees, Parliamentary Groups (www.eduskunta.fi).

The Speaker’s Council consists of the Speaker of Parliament, deputy speakers and committee chairpersons and amongst its duties are planning and approving the agenda for each plenary session, as well as giving general directions on the committee work and functioning as an advisory body for the Speaker should he or she so wish. The Speaker is elected by the Parliament as a whole from amongst its members during the first plenary session each year. The Speaker is always chosen for one year at the time. As well as preparing work for the plenary sessions the Speaker plays a key role in the Parliament’s international cooperation.

The Parliamentary Committees play a key role in the parliamentary decision-making process and most matters that are later decided upon in the plenary sessions are prepared by one of the committees. There are 15 committees in Finnish Parliament: The Grand Committee (with 25 members
and 13 alternate members chosen at the beginning of each four year electoral period) and 14 permanent specialty committees (with 17 members each and 9 alternate members); each committee deals with matters that are the responsibility of a corresponding ministry.

The Parliamentary Groups are where the MPs work together with people from their own party. The Parliamentary groups have influence over the composition of different parliamentary bodies, how the legislative work is organised, as well as participation in the Government and the election of ministers. Each Parliamentary Group has an office in the Parliament House and they select their own staff for this office; all of this is, however, funded from the state budget.

For this research the most important organ in the Political part of the Parliament is the Office Commission. It is in charge of the entire Parliamentary administration, the Parliamentary Offices. It is responsible for monitoring and developing of the administration as well as over seeing the entire financial management of the Finnish Parliament.
**The Office Commissions tasks are set in the law, they are to:**

“1. manage, supervise and develop the administration and finances of the Parliament, and consider pertinent plans and development proposals;

2. make proposals on the administration and finances of the Parliament;

3. decide, in so far as specifically so provided, on the appointments to a position or a temporary position in the Parliamentary Office, as well as on the dismissal of officials or the termination of their position;

4. decide, in so far as specifically so provided, on leave of absence for officials in the Parliamentary Office and their temporary replacements;

5. after having heard the Committees in question, appoint the secretaries of the Committees;

6. decide the other matters pertaining to the administration and finances of the Parliament, where these have not been assigned to the Speaker or an official in the Parliamentary Office;

7. put forward initiatives for the adoption of the Parliament's Finance Rules;

8. decide on the Archive Rules of the Parliament; and

9. decide on the other matters that are assigned to it by an Act, these Rules of Procedure, other instructions, or other rules of procedure” (Section 73 in http://web.eduskunta.fi/dman/Document.phx?documentId=mu05908162726142andcmd=download).

The Office Commission makes the appointments of the highest (and thus Politically appointed) staff in the Parliamentary Offices apart from the Secretary General whom is elected by the Parliament. The Office Commission meets every other week usually on Thursdays and consists of the Speaker, two deputy speakers and four other MPs or their alternate members. The members of the Commission are elected in the beginning of each electoral period by the MPs themselves. The Commission is able to make binding decisions when five of its members are present (or four but only if they are unanimous). If there is a tied vote the Speaker has a casting vote. If the Commission is talking about appointments the discussion is lead by the Secretary General. Otherwise matters can be presented to the Office Commission by the Secretary General Director of Administration or some other designated government official
from the Parliamentary Office. Both the Director of Administration and the Secretary General are thus also part of the general administration but with different areas of responsibility.

The Parliamentary Office i.e. the entire administrative and facilitating part of the organisation is further divided into three separate parts that each take care of separate tasks. The three parts are the Committee Secretariat, Central Office and Administrative Department. The head of Committee Secretariat (consisting of the secretaries to all the Parliamentary Committees) is the deputy Secretary General of the Parliament, head of the Central Office (consisting of other government officials linked to the legislative work i.e. minutes, preparations and publishing of the Parliamentary sessions, translations and other related documentary work) is the Director of Legislative issues and the head of Administrative Department (consisting of the concrete administration of the house) is the Director of Administration. On top of these units the Parliamentary Office also includes an International Department (taking care of the international relations of the Parliament), Security Department (in charge of security issues of the Parliament) and Information and Communications Department (consisting of the Library, Research Services and the Information Office of the Parliament), these departments are directly under the Speaker and the Secretary General and thus slightly separate from the other three departments (see figure 2.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OFFICE COMMISSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentary Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 special Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU-Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 2.*
Thus within the Parliamentary Office “the non-Political” part of the Parliament that this thesis is examining is mainly the Administrative Office within the Administrative Department. However, whilst interviewing and working with the different managers of the Parliamentary administration I have worked cross offices too, the managers represent different parts of the Parliamentary Offices. The managers of different offices are all government officials and at least in theory they are non-Political (apart from the Director of Administration and the Secretary General that are both Political offices). What differs between the managers is their distance from the actual legislative work and the frequency of contact with the Political parts of the organisation.

The Finnish Parliament, just like any government institution, receives its funding directly from the Finnish Government Budget, but, unlike any other parts of the Finnish administration, the Parliament is in charge of deciding and controlling its own budgeting. There is no outside controlling agency but the Parliament elects amongst itself the Parliamentary Auditors and their personal alternates⁸ whom are in charge of going through and auditing the annual spending of the Parliament. The three auditors themselves then elect the fourth member and their alternate. The auditors have an annual duty to go over the accounts and administration of the Parliament and they produce an annual auditing report for the Parliament.

The Parliament as an organisation does not have to compete with the other public sector organisations in order to receive its funding. For the Parliament to fulfil its duties and meet its organisational goals it needs to maintain a working legislature and facilitate the work of the MPs. The results expected (by the nation, by the government, the President) from the organisation are thus more in the form of “higher goals” (Simon, 1964; Thompson and McEwen, 1958; Mohr, 1973; Etzioni, 1960), such as the general well-being of society and the actualisation of democracy through an effective and well managed legislature. The fact is that if the Parliamentary organisation runs out of money it is very likely to get more. The main legislature of a democratic country will not and cannot be shut down.

Thus the Parliamentary expenditure is, for a good reason, seriously questioned (by the media) every now and then. The questioning is mainly in relation to MPs’ wages and expenditures, as well as Parliamentary leisure

⁸ in Finnish: Eduskunnan tilintarkastajat.
activities. The most recent scandals related to money in the Parliament were incidents where the Parliamentary Sports club lost tens of thousands of euros over the years stolen by the club’s own auditor and the Parliament’s 100 year old party budget where the intended festivity budget was hugely exceeded. Both of these cases caused public uproar and a lot of debate on the Parliamentary spending and whether or not it is controlled by anyone (For example a.) Helsingin Sanomat⁹ (from now on HS) 7.10.2009, b.) HS 6.5.2009¹⁰).

Framings of ideas
and framing around access

As well as having to have a basic understanding of the Finnish Political culture and the structures of the Parliamentary system, the reader also needs to know something about the origins of this work to better understand the logic of it. Thus the following section offers some background information to how and why this research came to be.

This book has its origins in my undergraduate studies in Political Science in the University of Glasgow. I was a second year Politics student (my first degree is joint honours in sociology and Politics) when I became intrigued by Political institutions and the fact that whatever goes on in the administrative sector of them, amongst the people that are employed to work there and are not Politically aligned, does not receive that much attention. I have since discovered that there is a whole branch of research and literature on bureaucracies and government officials in general but I still think that the elite of the government officials, for example, the senior managers working in the Parliaments and Presidential offices around the world, have not been looked at thoroughly enough. Why is this so? Are they looked upon as somehow above the rest of the administrative machinery? Or are they like many other members of elite? Invisible and out of reach for researchers, sheltered within the governing machinery? What does that mean in terms of those working communities and their power within them?

⁹ The leading national broadsheet in Finland.
¹⁰ a.) Eduskunnan kerhossa mahti kavallus aivan kansanedustajien silmien alla (A massive fraud in a Parliamentary club right under the eyes of the MPs) b.) Hallintoremontti sai alkunsaa, kun satavuotisjuhlinta lähti lapasesta (The restructuring of the administrative structure started with the escalated costs of the 100 year celebrations).
There is an interesting degree of silence about this institution and what happens within it, and that in itself speaks volumes. In this respect the thesis follows the Foucauldian idea that it is very significant “... which type of discourse is authorized, or which form of discretion is required in either case. There is not one but many silences, and they are an integral part of the strategies that underlie and permeate discourses.” (Foucault, 1979, p.27).

Partly the silences exist because of the difficulty in gaining access to these institutions but what those silences indicate is power. Political elites are not very thoroughly researched and in any society power is often to be found protected and surrounded by a particular ‘silence’. The road that crosses the Hietaniemi cemetery has some element of that silence and some of that silence is also part of the organisational culture of the Finnish Parliament. Somehow, these institutions have an element of sacredness and to get to the bottom of them, to understand them, and to do research on and in them is a laborious project. One doctor’s thesis is not even close enough but it is a beginning.

The way this research has developed the form and content of the data has, as so often is the case with ethnography, depended entirely on the events in the field. Sweden was initially supposed to be the other case in this research and before Sweden, in the early days of planning Estonian Parliament, The Czech Parliament and Westminster were all considered as potential cases for comparison. Sweden was the latest candidate but in the end with the unfolding of the events there was more than enough data of interest for analysis. My six months in the field in Finland were taxing; the exit process was taking its toll and in the end my research design had to be changed and became different from what was initially planned. The way the exit process went in Finland, as the Finnish press “outed” me, made it obvious that I would not be able to just refer to an anonymous public sector elite organisation. Thus I had to come up with a new way of offering protection to the people in the organisations and to, a degree, to me.

This is when the concept of factionality was considered as one option. For a considerable length of time I contemplated on using this method to better conceal the organisation in question and to be able to use the Swedish data to the maximum but I was never fully happy with it. It is a debatable method and even if I felt I could have defended it in this case it was still initially forced upon me via the difficulties of the access process together with the actions of
the field and then the media. It should be relatively obvious already from this that the methodological choices of this thesis have all, apart from the initial decision to do an ethnography, been somewhat accidental, field-dependent.

The way the exit process proceeded changed things further and the focus and central point of my research shifted. The end started taking even more space amongst the data and it seemed to be increasingly significant, maybe even more significant than anything else within the fieldwork. In a way one could say it claimed its own space and started to live the life of its own with the assistance of the media and the reactions from the Parliamentary sources. Whilst writing this I am still in a manner exiting, as I am waiting to go to court as a witness. My witnessing has to do with a newspaper article ‘Sexual harassment’ (HS 27.1.2008\textsuperscript{11}) that was written after the equality evaluation “became” public. The parliamentary management anticipated that the equality evaluation report was going to cause a fuss and yet it appears that they chose to do very little about handling the potential publicity at the time. Information manager Timonen later gave an interview on the topic (HS 4.7.2008\textsuperscript{12}). In the interview she says that there was general unwillingness to publicise the evaluation results before the actual equality plan was ready and points out that she personally disagreed with this view. Perhaps here one can see how one of the features often linked to bureaucracy is at play, that is, the culture of secrecy (silence) until something is “completely ready”. The relationship between the media and the Parliamentary administration is, however, a very complex one to say the least. More discussion on this is included in chapter 7.

\textsuperscript{11} Seksuaalista häirintää (Sexual harassment).
\textsuperscript{12} Häirintäkohu oli meille hyvä oppitunti avoimuuden merkityksestä (The harassment scandal taught us a good lesson on the importance of openness).
The ethnography: many roles and many things to consider

Another key aspect of this work that should thus be introduced here is its ethnographic nature. There will be a more extensive discussion in the methods chapter, chapter three, but I will here offer some key aspects and considerations of the ethnographic method and the level of reflexivity it requires. As my colleague, office-mate and fellow ethnographer Teemu Tallberg has pointed out many times in our conversations the wonders of the “real life”, “the empirical world” when doing ethnography, often leave the researcher humbled and sometimes even stripped of any plans.

I was directly employed by my field and that meant that I had to adopt certain roles and could not decide freely what I was doing there. I was in a way wearing several hats everyday and that did not make my ethical position simple. It was in fact a source of a lot of confusion at the time. Whilst attending events like the opening of the Parliamentary season opera or the official opening of the Parliamentary season coffee at the House of Parliament (see chapter 5 for the story) I realised perhaps more clearly than during regular days in the office that my role there was one of a person sitting on several different chairs at once and as a consequence I was not sitting comfortably on any of them.

The general idea of being both in and out of the norm within a society fits this research in many ways. Firstly, as an ethnographer doing participant observation I was by default both an observer and a participant (in changing measures) and thus ended up in a situation where I had to continuously seek internal balance in how I was viewing the people around me. Did I see them as informants or as colleagues or as both and if both then, when and how did the shift in my attitude occur? Then, secondly, through examining this given society, its different aspects, organisations and development via the lens that is coloured by dialectics I was again simultaneously an insider and outsider, as I too am part of the constant socialisation process, i.e. constantly having to balance my own will in opposition with the ‘general will’. Individual understanding of the character of the general will only comes via obstacles and gradual growth of knowledge of the world and how it works. Thirdly, as a feminist researcher I am both an insider and an outsider to start with, trying to make sense of something I am also part of myself and trying to be reflexive.
and to see and analyse my position and the world around me. Then there is a fourth dimension that comes from my personal background. I was born outside Finland and have lived abroad for a long time, as a child and as a student. I have always felt that I am neither here nor there, always in a way in transit. This then puts me in a position where I am not really an insider in Finland but not really a proper outsider either. All this will have had an effect on this work and will keep on affecting the way I view the world. Thus my position in relation to this research could be seen as a four-fold insider and outsider (Wolf, 1996). However, as pointed out before, these matters will be further considered in chapter three.

Writing of this thesis, towards the end has been an act of regaining control. The confusion caused by the exit process and the scandals that went with it have passed. The shape this research has taken seems correct and right and in the end it is just as it should be. My role as an ethnographer was and is, amongst other things, to describe and analyse what I experienced during my time “in the field”. When going into the field I really (despite of the pre-warnings and my previous experience of working as a researcher) expected to be able to observe and tell a controlled, neat story and then analyse it. This did not happen. The story, the research, the data is at times boring, normal, dramatic, controlled even, and then at other times it is everything but. The only way to do justice to it, however, is to attempt to share this experience of “uncontrollable webs” of media, Politics, administration and evaluations and to conceptualise and analyse it all in a manner that would offer the reader an idea of the way the informal and formal processes and structures and strategies are indeed visible in what at first appears to be nothing but a “mess” of events.

The next chapter starts the sense making, and the organizing of the “uncontrollable webs” by illuminating the theoretical conceptualizations and conceptual frameworks used. Chapter two thus offers the theoretical and conceptual skeleton of this thesis to which the latter data chapters, four, five, six and seven, then add the ethnographic flesh.
2. Theoretical and Conceptual Frameworks

Introduction

This chapter sets the foundation for the story that unfolds in the chapters that follow. The chapter consists of building a conceptual framework that acts as a support and frame for the succeeding story and illuminates the theoretical key points and the most important areas of literature that I have drawn from. The conceptual areas are presented and discussed in order that the reasoning behind the many choices made before, during and after conducting the work becomes as transparent as possible. This is also done to position this research amongst existing work, to set the theoretical and conceptual scene, and to give context and background in terms of giving an overview of the relevant fields.

The structure of the chapter is as follows. The first half of the chapter contains discussions about what is known about ‘political management’ organisations in the different relevant literatures (political, organisational, management, and gender). In this way a theoretical vocabulary (on institutions, organisations, NPM and gender) is constructed whilst at the same time the existence of a gap in these literatures is demonstrated, when it comes to looking at parliamentary administration and the concepts that are needed to examine it (power, shifting structures, informal/formal organisation). The second half of the chapter offers discussion of the gendered nature of the research approach and my own stance in relation to method and the field. Ethnography is discussed here to a degree to illuminate how it as a method can
allow power, shifting structures and other conceptualisations to be identified but also then requires the researcher to acknowledge the theoretical basis of their interpretations, thus requiring theoretical and conceptual discussions on for example, Foucault, Hegel, Butler and de Beauvoir I start by defining the concepts of an institution and an organisation. I then move on to a metanarrative, a story of my own theoretical and philosophical background and thinking and the consequent ontology of this work.¹ Political institutions and institutionalism are discussed to further set the foundation and I then move on to discuss organisational cultures, bureaucracy and ideal types, total institutions, ‘the Prince’ and New Public Management (from now on: NPM). These are some of the central conceptual areas where I have been able to draw from. Then comes a section on Parliament as a workplace including some reflections on shifting structures, power, informal and formal relations and structures and the blurred difference between them. The chapter concludes with considerations of gender, feminism and gendering, intersectionality and institutional ethnography.

**Institutions and organisations**

A Parliament is and can be seen as both an institution and as an organisation. It is thus important to make the definitional distinction here. A Parliament is firstly and fore mostly an institution as it is an entity fulfilling a very particular societal function (a school, a Parliament, law are examples of institutions). A Parliament is also an organisation but as the term organisation here is wider and looser it is not directly and automatically linked with some form of societal function. The term organisation can be used of almost infinite variety of different collectivities whereas an institution, although it can be many things from material to immaterial, is always defined by its societal function.

¹ A reminder: in this chapter, just like in the earlier chapter and in the rest of this book, whenever word politics is discussed it refers to party Politics when the P is capital and to administration, bureaucracy and office politics when the p is small.
The place of theory

This thesis has its beginnings in the everyday life of the political elite institutions but also in the many questions related to the preferred ways to organise governance as well as the nature and qualities of elite Political institutions set by Political philosophy. In the heart of the initial research problem and research questions (for the list of research questions, see chapter 1 and 3) lies a rather broad, theoretical question: what does a good Political institution consist of, what does the everyday working life inside of it consist of and furthermore is it possible to talk about the quality of any democracy without seriously considering the employment provided by its core institutions?

The weight given to the elected, i.e. Political, parts of these elite institutions is understandable and also widely covered within Political Science but the employed workplace parts of these institutions are still relatively unexplored. This is the case despite the fact that everything that goes on in the employment parts of these elite institutions is in turn influencing everything else that goes on within these institutions, including the end result: the quality and nature of the given democracy (Gawthorp, 1974; Rawls, 1971; Rhodes, 2005; Chappell, 2006; Annesley and Gains, 2008).

The philosophers and theorists that have been most influential in this research on Political institutions have been and are Aristotle, Machiavelli, Hegel, Max Weber, Erving Goffman, Simone de Beauvoir, Dorothy E. Smith, Judith Butler and towards the end of this research process, especially when dealing with the field and the related power questions, Foucault. The parts of their ideas that have been central to the theoretical framing of this work are outlined in this chapter. As well as offering the conceptual frames for analysis their thoughts and work have also offered me invaluable mental shelter during the time spent in the field collecting data. When the ‘real’ world became too much to handle it was reassuring to return to the theory and the world of ideas that seemed to, at times at least, to be able to explain some of the things that went on in this organisation. I will always remember that

---

2 The word, good, is used here in Aristotelian sense: “Since we see that every city-state is a sort of community and that every community is established for the sake of some good (for everyone does everything for the sake of what they believe to be good), it is clear that every community aims at some good, and the community which has the most authority of all and includes all the others aims highest, that is, at the good with the most authority. This is what is called the city-state or political community. [1.1.1252a1-7]” Miller, F. (2010): Aristotle’s Political Theory. The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Spring 2010 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2010/entries/aristotle-politics/.
sense of relief with gratitude, and to me that, in a way, is part of the essence of theory and theories of human societies and the organizations in them. Theory can offer relief through potential explanations, a kind of buffer zone. Whilst I conducted the fieldwork, theories, for me, functioned almost as art or shopping were seen to function during the early 20th century, the thoughts and ideas of these theorists offered islands of hope, graspable, understandable moments in time when the “reality” of the organisation was too fleeting, too much to handle (Frisby, 1992).

A metanarrative: Hegel

“The Hegelian dialectic can...be presented as a plausible but contestable enterprise dedicated to establishing coherent internal relations between principles and practices in a society” (Browning, 1999. p. 150).

This work has a metanarrative, the rationale of Hegelian dialectics. More particularly, this work is influenced by the way Hegel saw human development from mere individuals into functioning societies via stages of development starting with the realisation of belonging to the immediate family. The dialectic, as a process in its all encompassing nature, where conflict, ‘good’ and ‘bad’ are all just parts of the same cycle and means of development, is a key part of the theoretical approach of this work. It is part of my understanding of the world, part of the way I see and conceptualise human development and societies. I do not agree with the whole Hegelian argument nor do I fully understand it, but it has been influential in my thinking and thus it features here as a type of metanarrative. This is not, however, a Hegelian thesis and not an attempt to further analyse Hegel; it is simply influenced by the logic of human societal development, as set out especially in his Elements of the Philosophy of Right (Hegel, 1998, edited by Allen W. Wood).

In the Elements of the Philosophy of Right an individual will is always seen as subordinate to the general will manifested by the surrounding society in what Hegel saw as its highest form, as Political and thus organised. However, this situation only arises and is possible after the individual will (a person) goes through a complex step by step process that is both cyclical and historical, and thus starts the continuously progressive individual journey of realisation that it is always better to belong to something (for example a family) than
being on your own. One learns that by belonging to a general will (again at this first stage illustrated by the immediate family), the individual both gains and becomes more at one with the original purpose of the will. Part and parcel of this journey is conflict and the growth potential it offers. Conflict is always implicitly and explicitly part of greater good, and thus conflict should not be seen as something to be avoided. Through a series of collisions there arrives an improved end result, an improved individual will, an elevated form of society. For Hegel this whole process is elementary for human development and simultaneously part of natural development for human society. The process, however, can and should be assisted and improved with the right type of societal institutions, for example, through punishment (Hegel, 1998).

Despite choosing the collective over individual as my focus in line with Hegelian thinking, the possibility for development that exists in the meeting of the two forces, the individual and the collective, is acknowledged and appreciated as the potential way forward. The collective and the individual as concepts are always part and parcel of the Political and political processes and through that, part of the core of the Political institutions. Hegel's ideas can be and have been utilised in many different ways but the arguments chosen for the purposes of this work link together institutions, processes and practices within them as important parts of development of both individual freedom, social responsibility and the resultant presumed improved societal condition.

When looking at one of the very core institutions for any democracy where democratic principles are put in action and the sense of the collective good versus individuals’ own advantage is always very much present, at least in principle, this simplified version of the Hegelian dialectics offers a metanarrative that is utilised when moving towards understanding all the complex processes, structures and dynamics of the Parliamentary administration that is, the administrative offices of the civil servant part of Parliament.

The fact that the research is done inside the Finnish Parliament makes this Hegelian influence even more fitting. The process of Finnish nation-formation was very much inspired by the Hegelian theory. J.V. Snellman, one of the key founding fathers of the Finnish state, wrote his doctoral thesis on Hegel: “Dissertatio academica absolutismum systematis Hegeliani defensura” (An academic thesis to Defend Hegelian absolutism) and continued later on to follow the dialectical view whilst writing about the potential progress of
Finnish society and development of the Finnish civil society (Klinge, 1997). One could thus argue that the Finnish state sector bureaucracy has been formed from and within a tradition based on these very same ideas.

**Institutionalism and neo-institutionalism**

Political institutions do not emerge from thin air and are not shaped the way they are by accident. To understand them, their organisational culture, as well as all the related debates and disagreements in defining them, one needs to be aware of the past, the historical development of the human societies and the parallel development of social sciences. One also needs to look at the structures of the given institutions, the society and institutions around them as well as the people working in them.

The main traditions for examining Political institutions are: modernist-empiricist, formal-legal, idealist, and socialist. The approach to Political institutions adopted in this research can be defined as modernist-empiricist, neo-institutionalist with an emphasis on the importance of the historical processes. This in effect means seeing Political institutions as consisting of formal rules, compliance procedures, and standard operating practices that then in turn structure relationships between individuals in various units of the polity and the economy (Chappell, 2004; March and Olsen, 1989; Rhodes, Table 6.1 in *Oxford Handbook of Political Institutions* from now on OHPI, 2006, p.92).

Political Science has always fluctuated in terms of the importance given to the state and the state institutions. Institutionalism itself does not have one single meaning and there are nearly as many different takes on institutionalism as there are theorists. Institutionalism is also not new; it has, however, changed drastically during the last 50 years. The status of any researcher following an institutionalist path has also moved from the rebellious even stigmatised position of the early years into a very mainstream, widely adopted and accepted position. According to some commentators, institutionalism has become an overtly accepted view within the social sciences (Pierson and Skocpol, 2002, p. 706; Siaroff, 2003; Rhodes, OHPI, 2006).

There are drastic differences between different strands of institutionalism and what is now often called the ‘old’ institutionalism or just institutionalism
was still largely based on formal-legal institutional terms. This form of institutionalist approach was later criticised by various neo-institutionalists for many things such as not giving enough room for considering the “non-political determinants of Political behaviour and hence to the non-political bases of governmental institutions” (Macridis 1963, p. 47, cited in March and Olsen, 2006, p.5). Neo-institutionalism, a later and wider version of institutionalism aims to “describe and explain how Politics “really works” (Eulau and March 1969, p. 16, cited in March and Olsen, 2006, p.6) instead of focusing solely on the formal-legal terms neo-institutionalism adds more components to the analysis and wants to examine both individuals and structures and how the two interact and effect one another as well as work with one another. The meaning and impact of structures on individuals’ behaviour and values was, however, not always seen as that important (Peters, 2000, p.6).

After the old institutionalism and before the new institutionalism there was a brief period during which the state was seen as very insignificant and behaviouralism was the trend in Political science. However, neo-institutionalism, or new-institutionalism as it is also called, has since sought ways to bring ‘the state back in’ into Political Science. Thus states and state structures are seen to really matter again but whether state or any Political institutions can ever fully accommodate marginal groups of a society, have room for “other” voices is a source of on going debates. Some more radical feminist thinkers, for example, have argued that the structures of the state are simply part of the wider patriarchal structures and such that the feminist agenda will never be accepted within them and thus the only way is to abolish the existing structures (for example, Acker, 1989) whereas other more liberal feminists have had more optimistic views on the possibilities of working with the existing (including state) structures (Watson 1990; Waylen 1998). Adopted dialectical view on conflicts sees change within the state structures as possible and even probable.

Theda Skocpol (1985, p. 21) has pointed out that “states matter not simply because of the goal-orientated activities of state officials. They matter because their organisational configurations, along with their over-all pattern of activity, affect political culture, encourage some kinds of group formation and collective political actions (but not others) and make possible the raising of certain political issues (but not others)” (Chappell, 2002, p. 8). Thus one could also argue that
examining any state institution and what they encourage and make possible and what not can be a very illuminating exercise and a useful one when one wishes to locate the powerless groups of any given society.

Different theories such as structural-functionalism, systems analysis, group theory (whether pluralist or elitist) and, later, more critical approaches such as neo-marxism and radical feminist theory, have all had a tendency to give formal Political institutions a less important role. These different approaches have reduced the explanation of Political processes to social, economic or cultural variables down playing or dismissing the institutional and organisational forms of political life as making little or no difference to outcomes (Ferree et al., 2002, March and Olsen, 1989).

Over the last 50 years the study of Political institutions has, however, again become a more central part of Political Science. Many contemporary Political theorists, for example Rawls (1971), have stressed the content, meaning and importance of the quality of the institutions. Most of that research is, however, focusing on the impact the state structures might have on Political processes instead of the organisational processes going on in the workplace parts of these institutions. The crux of the argument is none the less that structures matter in Political contexts and as these organisations are very much operating within a Political context, state structures matter and have major impact on them too. On the other hand, the workplace parts of the institutions are themselves part and parcel of the state structures and thus can have impact on what goes on in the Political parts. The nature of the relationship of these different parts is not straightforward, but rather involves complex interactions and reciprocities.

Whilst examining Parliamentary administration it soon becomes obvious that structures matter but they matter in different ways depending on the individual. As Jessop says, “A given structure may privilege some actors, some identities, some strategies some actions over others,” and “the ways in which actors take account of this differential privileging through ‘strategic-context analysis’” (Jessop, 2001, p. 122). In other words, individuals intending to realise certain objectives and outcomes make a strategic assessment of the context in which they find themselves. However, that context is not neutral. It too is strategically selective in the sense that it privileges certain strategies over others. Individuals learn from their actions and adjust their strategies.
The context is then in turn changed by their actions and so the individuals have to again adjust to a different context. Institutions or functions no longer alone define the state. A state is thus also a site of strategic selectivity: a “dialectic of structures and strategies” (Jessop, 1990, p.100).

**Organisational culture:**

**Bureaucracy, total institutions and the Prince meet NPM**

“The definitions of the concept of organisation culture do not contain the intension of organisation. Very often they are mere lists of the phenomenological and anthropological vocabulary” (Virtanen, 1987, pp. 53-55).

“Organisational culture embeds/contextualises its own leadership possibilities” (A. Mills, 2009).

**Organisational culture**

An important part of the argument on organisational culture in this thesis comes from the classics of sociology of work. The works of Elton Mayo and colleagues dating back to the 1920s are highly relevant here. Mayo’s work on the informal groups in the organisations (in his case industrial organisations) and their relevance to everything that takes place in the organisation together with his views on the necessity of what might be called an anthropological approach are incorporated in the conceptual make up of this research. The importance of informal relations and culture is visible in this work too. These early works on organisational culture tended to use rather narrow definitions of culture but then one could say that their contribution is the acknowledgement of culture’s existence and importance (Mayo, 1933; Van Maanen and Barley 1985, p. 39; Virtanen, 1987).

The definition of organisational culture used in this work is close to the symbolic and structural views on organisations. Organisations in general are seen as gendered combinations of symbolic social interaction, formal and informal structures that need interpretation (for example Harlow and
Hearn, 1995; Hearn and Parkin, 1987; Morgan, 1986; Martin, 1992; Mills, 1988; Smircich, 1983). In describing organisational culture inside a political organisation, a Parliament, one is immediately struck by the duality of the culture inside the organisation and the blurred nature of the boundary between “the two cultures” within, the party Political culture and the administrative, bureaucratic, political culture.

Another useful conceptual framework discussing public administration and bureaucracy is provided by Virtanen (1987). He has written what he himself calls a sketch for a conceptual perspective on Finnish public servants, political, organisational and governmental culture and attitudes. Although the paper is over 20 years old it still acts as a relevant benchmark for a conceptual framework for analysing the Finnish Parliamentary administration. In his sketch Virtanen points out that the concepts of political culture and organisational culture are both either too broad (political culture) or lacking the intent of the organisation and focused on the private sector (organisational culture) thus lacking the context of the state and “the necessary elements of the concept of governmental culture are politics and policies, administration, and representation of the people’s will vs. public interest. Moreover, these elements should be seen in internal relation to each other” (Virtanen 1987, p. 54).

The dichotomy between administration and Politics has been to an extent further analysed in what is known as the implementation studies where the focus is on examining how the public policies are carried out. However, Virtanen and others have criticised implementation studies for not being able to clarify or pin point the concept of implementation. Thus he suggests that “organisation theory with its new orientations to interorganisational phenomena and public organisations is considered a better solution for overcoming the problems of the Politics-administration dichotomy than the narrow implementation theory” (Virtanen, 1994, p. 240 capital p by me) In terms of this work Virtanen’s approach is vital and important as the focus here is not at all on policies but on the other parts of the Politics-administration dichotomy and thus the implementation studies are not relevant here.

When discussing governmental culture Virtanen is referring to the culture of the Finnish public sector organisations more generally, municipal and state sector, where Political and administrative people work together. The resulting culture is a “realisation of political and administrative values penetrated by
the content of ‘public values’ (operationalisations of justice, equality, security, national existence etc. manifested by the rights and obligations of citizens)” (Virtanen 1987, p. 54).

The organisational culture of the Finnish Parliamentary administration, much as Virtanen describes it when he discusses what he calls a governmental culture, is a combination of Political and administrative/bureaucratic/political values (what Virtanen calls the public interest) and structures that are in turn influenced by the general existing values of the Finnish civil society (what Virtanen calls the people’s will) and further flavoured by the different personal relationships at the workplace.

“Both Political and administrative relations are social relations and they penetrate into all social action whatever its quality and whether it is institutionalised or not. There is nothing inherently ‘governmental’ or ‘state-like’ in them. We cannot understand the social reality if we talk of the members of a ‘collection of human bodies’ in a building, for example, a Parliament or Ministry, to be only politicians or only administrators. They can be both when they stay in the same building or when they are labelled as only politicians or as only administrators in the mass media regardless of their being in the same building. Everything depends on their intersubjective relations that may make A a politician in an episode T but an administrator in an episode T + 1” (Virtanen 1987, p.33 capital P’s added by me).

This lengthy quote is necessary as Virtanen illustrates the dilemma that is not so often discussed but that still lies in the heart of these types of organisations and thus this research. It is not realistic to assume that one could have two completely different and separate organisational cultures within one building, one organisation. Rather it is very likely that the two cultures become enmeshed with each other, with both parts adopting elements from the other’s culture. This is one of the main reasons why the workplace parts of these organisations should be more thoroughly investigated. The workplace part of the organisation is bound to have some level of input in the elected part and thus it matters what its like.

As an organisation and institution, the Finnish Parliament in many ways fits the definitions of an ideal-type bureaucracy (Weber, 1914). In some admittedly metaphorical ways it also fulfils the definitions of the total institution (Goffman, 1961), and at times it could be seen to function in a
manner that is rather close to the calculative logics of the Machiavellian Prince (Machiavelli, 1981). Elements of NPM are less visible inside the organisation but could also be argued to feature. None of these theoretical constructions is a perfect fit. However, they do offer different routes into understanding and reflecting on this organisation.

**Bureaucracy as an ideal-type**

The Finnish Parliament’s administrative offices fit the basic characteristics of an ideal-type bureaucracy as originally described by Weber and then later developed by many others. A bureaucracy as an ideal-type is characterised by:

“a mission defined by top officials. Fixed jurisdictions within the organisation, with the scope of work defined by rules. Authority graded from top to bottom, with higher-level officials having more authority than those at the bottom. Management by written documents which create an institutional record of work. Management by career experts, who embody the organisation’s capacity to do work. Management by rules, which govern the discretion exercised by administrators” (Kettl, 2006, p.371).

Public bureaucracies all over the world share a basic problem of how to be powerful enough to do the work but not to step on the toes of the sovereign elected officials as the democratic ideal is that the power lies with those elected to do their jobs. This explains the classic Politics-administration dichotomy. However, this should never be seen as something that is simple or straightforward, and it seems that the power balance between the bureaucrats in the Parliamentary administration and the elected office holders is characterized by ongoing negotiation.

This is: “certainly not a new problem, of course. Medieval serfs put up with overbearing nobles because they protected them when marauders raided, and the Roman Emperor Caligula was killed by his own Praetorian guard because they did not like where he was taking the empire. As government has grown larger and more complex, keeping powerful bureaucracy at heel has become even more important – and difficult” (Ibid., pp.374-375).

The importance of the bureaucratic job itself, making it possible for the legislature to function, is central to the bureaucratic organisation of the Parliamentary administration. Managing the administration, i.e. the
people facilitating the law making, is seen as a necessary and to a degree a tedious task to be done on the side, but not equally important. This type of tension is, however, also rather typical for the public administration all over the world thus the dual nature of the Parliamentary administration, like all public administration, unavoidably is “a combination of two competing practices, law and management: the effective delivery of the ‘product’, and the interpretation and application of legal rules” (Beetham, 1987, pp.36-37). Effectivity and ability to deliver ‘immediately and well’ (heti ja hyvin in Finnish, translation by the author), a phrase used by one of the managers to describe their service principle, are described as central for the administration of the Finnish Parliament too.

Weber originally developed the concept of an ideal-type to solve the scientific dilemma of selection and abstraction of reality and yet to maintain the ability to compare by using the conceptual frame provided by the ideal-types. It is important to point out immediately that when talking about an ideal-type one does not refer to anything morally or ethically superior. “Nor did Weber mean to refer to statistical averages. Average Protestants in a given region or at a given time may be quite different from ideal-typical Protestants. The ideal type involves an accentuation of typical courses of conduct” (Coser, 1977, pp.223-224) or a logical extension of a form, in this case a form of authority. Also an ideal-type does not describe any concrete reality but rather consists of parts of reality forming “a logically precise and coherent whole, which can never be found as such in that reality” (Ibid.).

Although the employees of Parliamentary administrations are not that well researched, bureaucrats and public sector employees more generally are. There is plenty of research done on bureaucrats and more generally on different professionals in public services organisations. Ferlie and Geraghty (2005) point out that “... the terrain is vast and complex ...” (Ibid., p.423) and then go on to define three main approaches when examining and analysing professionals in public services. Firstly, looking at different professionals defined by their location and roles, for example ranging from local government to central government or from elite professions to para-professions, secondly analysing the relations between the public servants and their “customers” i.e. the citizens and the third approach has focused on looking at the ‘evolution’ of different public services for example “... the central civil service (at least in the
UK) appears to be moving from a long tradition of “gentleman amateurs” to a new notion of the civil servant as a professional” (Ibid., 423). Health care and education are often the two central areas that are looked upon when evaluating the possibly changing roles and attitudes of the public sector employees in relation to the most topical and contemporary discussions, the public service reforms and the varying and debated impacts of NPM (Whittington, McNulty and Whipp, 1994; Morgan and Murgatroyd, 1997; Kaboolian, 2000; McNulty and Ferlie, 2001) and the public sector managerialisation (Clarke and Newman, 1997; Broadbent and Laughlin, 2001).

**Total institutions**

In drawing on earlier research on total institutions I do not wish to imply that the Finnish Parliamentary administration “culturally” is like a mental institution; it is important to be very clear on that. However, I do claim that the Parliamentary and some similar elite organisations do seem to have some of the elements of total institutions. They, for instance, tend to create a type of metaphorical or social vacuum, and sometimes a physical vacuum around them (Thedvall, 2007; Annesley and Gains 2009; Rhodes et al., 2007) and thus people working in them could be seen to display some of the similar behavioural models as people living in total institutions described by Goffman (1961).

Goffman defines total institutions as follows: “A total institution may be defined as a place of residence and work where a large number of like-situated individuals, cut off from the wider society for an appreciable period of time, together lead an enclosed, formally administered round of life” (Goffman, 1961, p.11). Parliamentary administration does not have anyone permanently living there (anymore, previously some staff members did live on the premises), the people working in the administration are not cut off from the wider society for any specific period of time (even if one could argue that as members of the staff they are immediately rather distant/above the wider society) but they do share a rather enclosed and formally administered life inside the workplace.

Much of what has been written on asylums has been from the doctor’s point of view; likewise, almost everything written about Parliaments is from the point of view of Politics, Politicians or at least focused on them. Much like Goffman, entering into a mental institution in order to study it, I went into
the Parliament with an urge to understand more about these institutions, to gain a new angle to them. In my case I wanted to understand the way these institutions work, their internal functioning; I was not primarily interested in individual subjective experiences. I naturally wanted to know how individuals feel about working in such a place, what kind of workplace this creates but from the beginning my interest has been more on the collective level.

The Finnish Parliamentary administration, however, does not fit Goffman's definition of a total institution. It carries some of the features of these types of institutions but it really is more like a metaphorical total institution. It is the Parliamentary administration's all encompassing and highly immersing nature as an institution and a workplace that seems to bring it close to a total institution. Then again, as Goffman writes this is not such a rare feature as: “every institution has encompassing tendencies. When we review the different institutions in our Western society, we find some that are encompassing to a degree discontinuously greater than the ones next in line. Their encompassing or total character is symbolized by the barrier to social intercourse with the outside and to departure that is often built right into the physical plant, such as locked doors, high walls, barbed wire, cliffs, water, forests, or moors” (Goffman, 1961, pp.15-16).

There are five rough groupings of types of total institutions and out of these one is a clear closest fit with the organisational reality of the Finnish Parliamentary administration: “there are institutions purportedly established the better to pursue some work like task and justifying themselves only on these instrumental grounds: army barracks, ships, boarding schools, work camps, colonial compounds, and large mansions from the point of view of those of live in the servants quarters.” (Ibid. pp.16)

The Parliamentary administration does partly fit the total institutions definition in the sense as it is seen (by both the staff and the management and their customers, the MPs) as instrumental in facilitating the law making. The rather closed and to a degree round the clock nature of the organisation is justified with security and efficiency reasons. The general inter-organisational ethos of being separate from the rest of the society comes across in all my data and one member of the highest management described it best by defining the administration to me first as ‘a camp’ and then as ‘a round-the-world solo sailing with the exception that one is not sailing alone but with a number of people’.
The Prince

Machiavelli’s instructions to ‘the Prince’ (Machiavelli, 1981) stressed that whilst seeking to command authority, being loved and feared in the right proportion by one’s people is one of the key factors. As a ruler one thus needs to understand that there is a level of necessary violence required to maintain status quo. Machiavelli’s text is pre-modern but the world of power he describes is not so different from the world inside the Parliamentary administration and thus relevant here. The likeness of these two rather different worlds seems mainly to be due to the weight given to social status both in the Prince’s kingdom and inside the Parliamentary administration. Themes such as the importance of social likeability together with the underlying element of threat of social and/or general disposition seem to feature in both places. This can be explained, at least partly, as a simple continuation of organisational culture spilled over from the Political part of the organisation where favours and different social networks feature as a major part of the ruling games.

The Prince and the way Machiavelli views power is conceptually again a fairly close fit for this work. In The Prince Machiavelli offers a relatively thick description of power as well as describes the many different strategies that are used to gain and maintain power. Furthermore, the Machiavellian stance includes no moral take on the way the power is used or maintained; he is simply interested in what works: “Power is simply the effectiveness of strategies for achieving for oneself a greater scope for action than for others implicated by one’s strategies.” (Clegg, 1989, pp.32)

Clegg has contrasted pre-modern organisations with modern bureaucracies and provides a description that suggests that bureaucracy in practice is more than just simple rule following and this describes the Finnish Parliamentary administration too. “In bureaucracy, authority is expected to dominate, so that power, as a creative force, will be channelled by rules into proper democratic expression. Not that this will always be the case; power often becomes embedded in a command of the interpretation of rules, precedents and eccentricities (Clegg, 1995) thus becoming premised on discursive domination rather than authority, per se” (Ibid. pp.230-231).
Thus Finnish Parliamentary administration, an organisation that can at first glance seem relatively straightforward and clear in terms of chains of command fits the above description rather well as it turned out to be, in reality, a complex web of power relations and power games where a skilled Prince would no doubt excel.

**New Public Management (NPM)**

From roughly 1980’s onwards markets were seen as a suitable and possible model for the public sector reform and the emerging philosophy was given a name: New Public Management (NPM). The argument was that a similar kind of ethos of efficiency and productivity that existed in the private sector could also be introduced to the state sector (Boston et al., 1996).

The spread of the NPM ideology and the neo-liberal values that often go hand in hand with it have, for example, made it more likely that the management tactics have been copied from the private sector and trends such as evaluation of management and managers by both themselves and by their employees has become popular and spread across the public sector. The more positive approaches embrace NPM as a welcome attempt to introduce more flexible management with a dialogue based leadership to the public sector, a more organic style of leadership instead of the old-school, classic bureaucratic top-down approaches (for example Karlsen and Villadsen, 2009). However, this can and has been criticised in many different ways, for example, as a mere shift and alteration of power structures rather than any real democratisation of them.

Further more criticising the idea of public sector NPM is relatively easy to understand in the light of the problems experienced for instance in the UK with the privatising of their public services. It is necessary to point out that public service in the form of for example train services or policy administration is very different from the public service provided by the Parliamentary administration and thus again the Parliamentary administration would have to examined separately. None the less the critics of NPM have pointed towards several different features that can be questioned. Hood has listed the four most used criticisms of the NPM (Hood, 1991, pp.8-10). Firstly at least in the early days of the NPM very little had changed, NPM was mostly rhetoric without any
real actions, secondly the costs have generally speaking not lessened but the management sector has become larger than before, thirdly the NPM does not seem to promote the public good as is often claimed but rather the interests of a variety of new groups such as management consultants, business schools and the top managers and officials of central government departments and fourthly the NPM philosophy entails an ambitious idea of universalism of principles which does not seem very feasible. Different administrative cultures react differently to the doctrines and designs of NPM and thus the claim of a universal system of NPM seems rather ludicrous. There are several other types of criticisms one can point towards such as all the contradicting and paradoxical features that are intrinsic to the NPM doctrine (Pollitt and Bouckaert, 2004, p.164) and one of the most interesting ones in terms of this research is the contradiction between the stress on the managerial values and the simultaneous demand for more powerful Politicians. NPM philosophy is in essence a combination of managerial and economic theories and yet these two often seem to contradict each other. To put it simply the economic theories generally suggest that the power of Politicians should be strengthened whereas the managerial theories have a tendency to push for a more managerial bureaucracy (Christensen and Laegreid 2003a, p.20).

Stokes and Clegg (2002) write about NPM, governmentality and the types of organic qualities of an organisation that NPM entails: free thinking, enterprising and empowered individuals, and animosity towards rule by rules. They argue that this way of thinking has almost completely by-passed the Weberian concept of bureaucratic power, something that is an important dimension in his original thinking. Stokes and Clegg go on to argue: “Weber’s view of public sector management in his ideal type of bureaucracy was not only moral but also deeply political and deeply realist. It was tied up with a view of organisations as essentially practices of power” (Stokes and Clegg, 2002, p. 229).

Theorists of NPM that believe in the positive possibilities of the more effective public sector yearn for organisations where rules have been removed. This desire can, however, create a situation where power is used in a rather reckless and imbalanced manner. That situation for Stokes and Clegg is not all that far away in those Western societies that initially gave birth to the Weberian bureaucracy, a desire to have societal order and rule by rule.
When it comes to managing the Finnish Parliamentary offices there are or at least were at the time of this research very few signs of any kind of dialogue-based management. Some of the individual departments had managers with clearly more dialogue-based styles and this was communicated by the managers themselves as well as by their staff. The survey I conducted during spring 2007 (Niemi, 2007a, see appendix A for the whole report), and the numerous surveys done before that for that matter, have so far not resulted in any kind of fundamental changes in the management styles cultivated in the Parliamentary administration. Thus one could say that the management of the Finnish Parliamentary offices is still mainly, apart from those already mentioned exceptions, closer to the conventional, bureaucratic top-down management. However, this does not mean that the organisational power structures are also straightforward, top-down.

Parliament as a workplace: power, shifting structures, informal and formal

There are several different implications that arise when looking at a Parliament as a workplace. One of the key concepts is power and the question of how power is divided and distributed within any given Parliament. In order to be able to evaluate the power relations within this institution one needs to look at the different organisational structures. I am using the relational view to examine the power relations within the Finnish Parliament and thus power is seen as a continuously shifting process, fluctuating in the structures of the Parliamentary administration (Clegg, 1996, 2000).

Power

This view of power is similar to Foucault’s ideas on power (1975, 1983). The complex web of power relations and discourses that people grow up with reorganises over and over again through us and the actions we make. The concept of control, different ways of controlling people are central to this view. Also a study of an organisation, in this case Parliament, and power within it requires an acknowledgement that when looking from outside into
these organisations one has already established a kind of power relation and further more a “theory of power does not, and cannot, exist other than as an act of power in itself – in attempting to rule out other understandings of the phenomena in favour of universalistic explanation such a theory of power is unreflexive: it cannot account for itself, and any theory of power that cannot account for its own power cannot account for very much at all” (Hardy and Clegg, 1996, p.636).

According to Foucault, one can use history as a useful tool for intervention when examining power. Looking back, searching for key narratives, concepts and theories as well as problematising the divisions of inside and outside, including meddling with the boundaries of a certain scientific fields these actions reveal again and again the artificialness of the existing categories and power relations. This approach to power is for Foucault an imminent critique. It does not judge true/false, it moves away from that and wants to talk about how networks of practices make certain kind of knowledge possible and another kind not. Foucault is thus most interested in problematising effectively and not that interested in ‘truth’ as that does not really exist. However, he stresses that one must however stay within the domains of scientificity, not write a novel. History is useful as a resource as it is not how the past really was, nor is it a celebration of human progress, giving us identities, but using history tactically, we intervene in a domain that is already ridden of normativity.

**Shifting Structures**

Organisational and historical changes, processes and power relations are also taking place in the Finnish national context and when looking at any Parliament as a place of employment one needs to carefully differentiate between national political cultures resulting in a variety of differences within their given Parliaments. It also needs to be stressed that any Parliament as a place of employment, regardless of the fact that it is here looked at from organisational point of view is still a very unique kind of workplace with unusual and different features and pressures coming from within and outside. As such, it should and cannot be over-simplified.

Examining Parliament as a gendered workplace goes back to the earlier part of this chapter, the concepts of gender and gendering and how viewing
the world through the feminist lens changes the way it looks. It is also by
default tightly related to the concept of power. The way the concept of power
is seen in this research and within these organisations is no longer a single
act or a structural construction but rather “diffuse, as a network in which we
are all enmeshed as both subjects and bearers of power relations” (Halford
and Leonard, 2001, p.33). This definition of power and gender relations in
organisations includes room for varying power relations; women are not
automatically oppressed by powerful men but rather the power relations are
seen as complex and ever changing nets, and identifying any clear categories
of oppressed or dominant people becomes less straightforward. This fits the
purposes of this research as the power relations within the employed parts of
Parliament are shifting and fluctuating, far from straightforwardly, and to a
degree volatile. As it has already been pointed out, the organisation culture
of the Political part of the organisation effects and shows in the culture of the
workplace part of the organisation. Karvonen and Selle (1995) amongst many
others, have noted “by and large, politics is still a strongly male dominated
field” and being a woman in politics is still somehow seen as “special”, for
example, in mainstream discussions there is still talk about female politicians
rather than just politicians.

**Formal and informal**

Formal organisation refers to the actual, concrete organising of work and
working processes. The specific structures and hierarchies that serve as the
frame for the organisational functions, “… structural expression of rational
action …” (Selznick, 1948, p.25).

Informal organisation then refers to all the rest, the social, the informal,
all that goes on and structures the work and relationships in the workplaces.
All the relationships between people based on personal attitudes, emotion,
presjudices, likes and dislikes. Everything that is not and cannot be controlled
by the formal organisational structures. Informal organisation can at its best
offer new dimensions of development to the employees and the management.
When it is toxic it can be the source of organisational disputes and thus it
can have both positive and negative aspects for both the employees and the
management. Informal organisation at its best offers, friendship, sense of
belonging, general support from one’s peers, it can be a source or the hot bed for innovative new ways of working, alternative channels of communication, source of social control and at the best case scenario a balancing check to the managerial authority. From the management perspective a successful informal organisation means a more content and more self-organising, self-regulating employees. It can also at its best act as a managerial tool as less supervision is needed.

The disadvantages of informal organisation are a potential strong resistance to all change when the “own customs and traditions” of the organisation become too important and set in stone. There can be social conflicts causing wider role conflicts and power cliques that can mean that the employees become more loyal to their own groups than the organisation on the whole (Selznick, 1948).

I now move to the second half of this chapter and discuss the gendered nature of the chosen research approach as well as my own stance in relation to both the method and the field.

**Gender, feminism and gendering**

Parliaments are part and partial of the core of the state structures and as the concept of the state is mostly considered non-gendered in most social science debates it is not a great surprise that the Parliaments are also generally seen like this. However, as has been pointed out before in this thesis the core Political structures of the Western Political systems are constructed through a male dominated process and these processes are at the bottom of the State theory and social contract theory, as developed by Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau and others (Pateman, 1979, 1988).

Gendering the state structures, however, reveals that it is not any type of man but a very particular kind of Political man that state rules and structures are designed for, and that the founding texts that lie behind many modern states are deeply creative of a dichotomy between men and women (Carver, 2004, p.199). Thus the gendered nature of the state cannot be reduced only to the structuring of ‘men’ and ‘women’; rather the gendering of the state and particularly its elite core unavoidably intersects with other social divisions (Pettman, 1998).
Researching the different aspects of public sector governing and governance and how structures and institutions influence employees thinking in various ways has been done before from many different perspectives, including ethnographic methods. There is non-gendered research on minister’s private offices (Rhodes, 2007), different types of government elites in the UK, the Netherlands, Sweden and the EU in general (Rhodes et al., 2007), research on the institutions and processes of policy-making inside government departments (Smith, Marsh and Richards, 1993, 2001). There is also gendered research on different cabinet committees as well as research on the relationships between departments and executive agencies (Gains, 2004; Annesley and Gains, 2009, pp.7–8). This thesis contributes to this broad genre by exploring another elite, people employed in the administration of a Parliament. Here it is also important to distinguish between these governing elites. The above mentioned research is generally on ministries and civil service, Ministers and cabinet officers whereas this research is on the administration of the administration, the Parliamentary administration.

There is thus much literature on public sector organising and bureaucracy but apart from few exceptions, for example, Rhodes et al. (2007) and Annesley and Gains (2008), there is little research that addresses those in elite administrative and allied functions in the employed parts of the elite institutions. Gender and gendering for their part bring added flavour as if the employment side of these organisations has not been that well researched it has most definitely not been looked at through a gendered lens. However, there is a whole area of literature on gender and bureaucracy addressing the different gendered implications of bureaucratic organising and organisations (see for example Due Billing, 2007; Ferguson, 1985; Morgan, D., 1996; Hollway, 1984; Savage and Witz, 1992).

To examine a Parliamentary administrative office as a gendered workplace and how gender affects the experience of working there one needs to gender the Parliament in general as well as the organisational theories used and to re-examine and re-visit concepts that are often taken-for-granted. Seeing the world through “feminist glasses” and thus being and continuously becoming more aware of the societal gender structures is an enriching, if sometimes hard, position to take. Yet it always provides a more “complex” picture of the world. Using gender as a lens shows multiple sides of reality and is particularly useful when analysing power.
Cynthia Enloe writes “As one learns to look at this world through feminist eyes, one learns to ask whether anything that passes as inevitable, inherent, ‘traditional’ or biological has in fact been made” (Enloe, 2000, p.3). In the case of the Finnish Parliamentary administration one does not need to seek for long to find the immediate and obvious questions as majority of the managers are middle-aged men and the top management are all men. Previously there have, however, been two women Speakers of the house, Riitta Uosukainen and Anneli Jäätteenmäki.

Gender and gendering are, as pointed out rather absent from this type of research and as Annesley and Gains point out “except for a very small literature on the gendered aspects of the civil service both internationally (Chappell, 2004) and in the UK (Watson, 1994) there is no scholarship that looks at the gendered dimensions of the core executive, although the need for such a perspective has been recognised (Marsh, Smith and Richards, 2001; Annesley and Gains, 2009, pp.7–8) There is also a need to look closer at the gendered dimensions of the Parliamentary civil servants, and their different ranks.

Bureaucracies and political institutions are creations of tradition and history and thus much is taken-for-granted, seen as a ‘given’ as things have always been done this or that way. Asking basic feminist questions about political institutions, who decided this is to be organised like this? What if it was done in another way? What if all the roles were reversed – these questions are easily seen as radical as they often threaten the very core ideologies of these institutions. The core beliefs, the rationale at the base of Western political institutions, can be traced back to Aristotle and his views on how a society is best organized for the good life to be possible. A woman’s place in that order, in a society is well outside the political sphere of the polis, at home taking care of the domestic arrangements (Aristotle, 2009 edition).

Thus contesting the existing order by questioning the organising of the very core structures of democratic societies is a necessary task and one that is being done and has been done on many different fronts by feminist theorists (for example Enloe 2004; Cockburn 1991; Acker, 1989; Waylen 1998; Cohn, 1987). Democratic ideals are and remain commendable but that does not mean that they should not be re-examined or altered to make room for increased equality. The gendering process is multi-layered and in order to analyse this a degree of reflexivity is necessary for the researcher. This means turning the
examining gaze back to oneself and asking the same why questions again but this time the critique goes to the core of oneself. Why do I know this and not that? Why do I think that this person is right and the other one wrong? Where do my beliefs come from and why are they shaped and formed the way they are? Do I know the answers to these questions and if I do how am I going to make sure that my own gendered blind spots do not become the blind spots of my research? Questioning one’s own knowledge and they way it has become what it has is a challenging yet necessary task for anyone doing research, not just for a feminist researchers (Acker, 1989; Gouldner, 1970).

This thus means adopting a generally reflexive stance, doing one’s best to bend back and forth and examine one’s own biases and knowledge formation as a researcher. The research findings are seen as something that are and were intrinsically affected by the researcher’s own values. According to this kind of epistemology, a researcher can never be fully objective but is always part and partial of their research. (Guba and Lincoln 1994, p. 109, cited in Metsämuuronen 2003, p.166) This is all the more so when one has been doing ethnography and spent time in the field, thus in effect being part of the data in even more substantial ways. This research portrays a socially constructed reality derived from a time-and context-bound, specific institutional frame and reported through the lens of my particular view of the world.

Whether a feminist or not a researcher is always initially and inevitably part of the given academic community, part of a particular way of knowing and thus their consciousness are influenced and to an extent organised by the established relations and ways of knowing within that community (Habermas 1984, 1986; Foucault, 1978). Dorothy E. Smith has argued that women particularly are affected by these structures of knowing as they often relate to these structures in a different, perhaps more complex, way than men. According to Smith, a ‘bifurcated consciousness’ is created by a situation of being simultaneously both in and out of the knowledge structures and knowledge communities. Women (like most members of society) are often socially conditioned to see themselves through the societal structures and formations created mostly by men and thus to view themselves as ‘others’ in relation to the structures in a patriarchal society as the societal constructions could be said to be mostly male. This creates a complex situation where women are in a manner existing both inside and outside of the societal
structures, being simultaneously themselves and the other and continuously having to seek ways to unite one's own identity with the identity offered or recommended by the existing patriarchal order (Smith, 1987).

A feminist researcher is inevitably in a difficult situation as by becoming a social scientist one has learned to think and analyse within the relations of ruling and as a feminist researcher one has to learn to criticise and question everything, including one's own patterns of behaviour and thinking. Once one starts viewing social relations such as class as gendered processes that have been working in a particular, decisive way for a long time one starts to see that many seemingly 'neutral' processes are not neutral at all but rather 'sites of gender production' and that “organisational processes of different kinds may carry within them patterns of gender difference and subordination” (Acker, 1989, p. 249).

Trying to position oneself in the field of feminism, amongst the variety of feminist theories, has not been an easy task for me. I have at times wondered whether I even qualify as a feminist as many of the definitions and categories and ways of being and seeing as a feminist have seemed further limiting rather than liberating. For the purposes of this work I have, however, chosen a label for my way of approaching feminism. Of the existing categories on offer the liberal queer feminist is the closest fit. It is immediately necessary to further define the chosen label as the word queer easily brings wrong connotations that I do not seek. The definition of queer here is not referring to sexuality or sexual preferences but rather to “… whatever is at odds with the normal, the legitimate, the dominant. There is nothing in particular to which it necessarily refers. It is an identity without an essence” (Halperin, 1995, p. 62 original emphasis; also see Butler, 1990).

For a heterosexual feminist researcher, queer theories have previously often seemed slightly hostile and by default not relevant. The definition of feminist thinking used in this research is inspired by the early writings of Butler, mainly because her early views entail maximum amount of freedom for one to make one's own choices and remain undefined in the way that they want to. The performative aspect of Butler's thinking further fits my way of seeing the individuals behaving and being, performing themselves and their gender; the aspects of the act just tend to change according to the audience (Butler, 1990).

The feminist position of this work is also very much affected by Simone
de Beauvoir. Like Butler, de Beauvoir stresses the importance, the necessity, of the ability to choose what kind of woman one wants to become rather than being confined into some kind of ‘natural’ role or position by simply having been born with the sex of a woman. De Beauvoir also holds an optimistic dialectical reading on the outcomes of conflicts; however, for her the conflict is between the two sexes and this is then in direct conflict with Butler’s views as she would find it hard to define what exactly the two sexes are (Butler, 1990; de Beauvoir, 1984, 1986).

However, for the purposes of defining the feminist perspective adopted in this research it is sufficient to point out that there are grave differences of opinion between Butler and de Beauvoir and I simply select from their views in a way that fits this work. For de Beauvoir the crucial conflict is between the sexes but it is a necessary part of a socialisation process that leads women to see their position in a different light and then want to change it; this is what will make women’s liberation materialise. For in order for women’s liberation to materialise women have to become socialised in order to recognise each other as free and as other. Here again de Beauvoir’s dialectical thinking fits the metanarrative of this work.

De Beauvoir uses the heterosexual erotic encounter as an example of a situation where this kind of mutual recognition between human beings can (sometimes) already exist. “The dimension of the relation of the other still exists; but the fact is that alterity has no longer a hostile implication” (de Beauvoir, 1984, p. 448). My adopted critical feminist epistemology includes and holds both transactional and subjectivist stances. In other words, everything is seen as intrinsically gendered, and gender together with the other sectionalities forms a web of intersectionalities that then play a role in the making and maintaining of any reality.
**Intersectionality and gendered intersectionality**

A strong gendered intersectional approach is part and partial of the theoretical frame of this work. Thus it is not enough to examine gender, class or ethnicity alone, as that would not give a full picture of these organisational realities. To cover all the necessary fields and to be true to the theoretical framing I have sought to produce an intersectional (Haslanger, 2000), gender-sensitive and context specific analysis of the organisation in question. While doing research in bureaucratic, elite, administrative offices one has to examine the intersectionalities of gender, class, age, ethnicity, possible Political affiliations and how they, or some of them, affect a person’s position and possibilities in that particular office. In the case of this specific organisation one also has to add into the cocktail of intersectionalities a strictly hierarchical organisational system and a strong culture of social capital whereby one’s position within the hierarchy together with one’s likeability in turn influences one’s position and possibilities within the organisation.

An intersectional approach is a necessary part of the chosen theoretical framework but also due to the growingly global and globalising world it is not enough to examine gender, class or ethnicity on their own but rather there should be a more context specific analysis where the different intersections, social divisions and their often very organisation specific consequences are reflected upon. The need and importance for more intersectional approaches and specifically gendered intersectionality has been pointed out in a variety of research in critical studies on men, critical race studies, Black studies, postcolonial studies (Hearn 2004b; Hearn and Kimmel 2006; hooks, 1984; Ouzgane and Coleman, 1998; Morrell, 2001).

**Institutional ethnography and the gendered parliament**

The method and approach of institutional ethnography is what has made it possible to discover and look closely at the different intersectionalities found in the everyday life of the Finnish Parliamentary administration. The way institutional ethnography is used and understood in this thesis can be
described as: “… driven by the search to discover “how it happens,” with the underlying assumptions that a) a social “happening” consists in the concerted activities of people and b) in contemporary society, local practices and experiences are tied into extended social relations or chains of action, many of which are mediated by documentary forms of knowledge” (De Vault and McCoy, 2002, p.754).

In other words the everyday life at the administration and my ability to participate in it was the starting point of this work. Going in and finding out “how it happens” how things are done and what people think was what defines the approach of this work, what I wanted to do and what I also have done. Many things then changed along the way but this basic principle has remained intact. In this sense I have followed Dorothy E. Smith’s proposal of how to do institutional ethnography very closely. The everyday life of this organisation was the point of departure for the entire thesis and the different conceptualisations and analysis have then been developed from it, based on what has emerged from the field, from different events, tasks and from my own reactions to it all. The aim has been to “… develop a conceptualisation which clarifies the properties of that world” (Grahame, 1998, p.350).

Doing institutional ethnography, even doing it “partially” or “selectively” as I have done i.e. not adopting every detail of the approach, still means adopting both theory and method. Thus discussing institutional ethnography and the particular way it has been adopted in this thesis continues in the following chapter on methods.
Summary

This chapter is an overview of theories and conceptual frames that have in one or another way been relevant for the planning, doing and analysis of this research. It also serves partly as a literature review, covering some of the areas seen as most important for conceptually making sense of the field and the ethnographic data, and thus for the execution of this work.

A central tension within the thesis, both theoretically and conceptually, and later in terms of the concrete themes arising from the data, is that between the notions of the individual and the collective, and at times the different forms of the two logics. This tension persists in several ways, for example, between theoretical assumptions about the nature of key democratic institutions and the messy everyday life experiences studied and described ethnographically in this work. Another way in which this tension appears is where the details of the everyday life with their persistent significance, as stressed by inter alia Dorothy Smith, meet the Hegelian general will, and more so the dialectical development of the general will and the consequent Political institutions, state and what might be seen as the “higher” level of general will. The individual and the collective do, if only fleetingly, meet but the meeting is uneasy and perhaps best described as an ongoing, tense, unresolved process. However, this tension provides the key dynamic behind this work that can be seen through the data chapters and in the themes that arise from them. I will return to these dialectics in the final chapter.

The Parliamentary administration and more specifically working in the Parliamentary administration is examined through and with the assistance of these theories, concepts as well as reflected on the relevant areas of the existing literature. Thus the Parliamentary administration is examined as a gendered bureaucracy containing elements of NPM, including formal and informal power structures and webs that are similar than the one’s met by the machiavellian Prince. It is also seen and analysed as an organisation with a strong and unique organisational culture consisting of multiple, particular and tangled relationships between the political and Political parts of the House. All this together then forms a web of intersectional structures and processes both informal and formal as well as defines the Parliamentary administration as a workplace and the experience of working there.
3. Methodology

Introduction

“The ethnographic approach admits of surprises, of moments of epiphany, which can open new research agendas. It accepts serendipity and happenstance. It is fruitful, progressive and open” (Rhodes et al., 2007, p.209).

This thesis can be described as multi-method (see figure 3.) and in some respects this arose by accident and out of necessity. I chose to do ethnography, participant observation and interviews, and they are the core of my methodological approach. However, my field, the Parliamentary administration, also employed me as a researcher and commissioned me to conduct two evaluation surveys as well as write two reports on them. This, however, does not in itself mean that the thesis can be characterised as multi-method as the surveys were workplace evaluative surveys not meant for producing comprehensive statistical evidence. The reports were planned as a tool for the Parliamentary administrative offices so that they could then develop their internal planning in terms of the personnel strategy and equality plan (Niemi 2007a, 2007b). The two reports offer thematic evaluative information on the chosen themes of workplace (gender) equality and human resource strategy within the organisation.

In the end the organisation was thus approached from multiple angles and using multiple techniques. What was reassuring from the beginning was that the same themes recurred from all these different methods as well as being already visible in all the earlier research reports, dating back to early 1990s (for example, Moilanen, 2002; Setälä and Järvinen, 1993).
The ethnography I have done consists mainly of observations of people, in interview situations, walking in corridors, being at lunch, having coffee, talking to colleagues: formal and informal meetings: doing all the usual things one does at work. Institutional ethnography (IE) (Smith, 1989, 1996, 2002; Grahame, 1998; De Vault and McCoy, 2002) is and was the main source of inspiration, even if I have not followed this method strictly. In tune with the ethos of IE, in the back of my mind through all of this has been a wish, at times vague, to somehow contribute towards improved democracy and to benefit the people working in the organisation by exploring and reporting on their place of employment.

The Parliamentary administration is a rather unique setting and one needs to physically be there to really be able to see what the working reality looks like. One of the managers summed this particularity up when they commented to me (right in the beginning of our cooperation) that: “if you really want to do research on this place you really do have to come and work with us. Otherwise you see nothing.” (anonymous manager, excerpt from research diary 3.10.06, translation by the author)

**Original plans and exit**

As so often is the case with ethnographic research, the way this process turned out to be in the end was mostly shaped by demands and experiences of the field (Rhodes et al., 2007; Kondo, 1990; Goffman, 1989). After my initial choices the thematic make up of this data was dictated by the events of the field. The research snowballed and took a particular form of its own, and I followed and tried to ‘keep up’ to the best of my capacities. My initial plans do not, however, have a lot in common with what I am writing about now. However, issues that have remained intact through the process are my initial interest in what the “other” part of an elite Political institution looks like and the willingness to see whether it would be possible to locate a particular logic of management and/or governance inside the administration. What is it like to work in such a place? What are the specific characters and characteristics of it and what are the logics of this institution? These questions have stayed with me through all the trials and tribulations of the research process.
Initially, there was a plan to do a comparative analysis of two equal sized cases, Finland with Sweden or Czech Republic or Estonia. Also for a long time it was planned that the identity of the elite organisation I was writing about would not be revealed. This seemed to be a necessary precaution in order to protect the anonymity of my informants and the data in general. All these plans, however, turned out to be impossible. This was for three main reasons, firstly, the uniqueness of these institutions does not really suit comparative studies. Secondly, access was not available on a comparable and equal level. Thirdly, the Finnish fieldwork was followed by an exit process that turned into a media event. Thus it was no longer possible to disguise that it was Finnish Parliamentary administration I was researching.

Therefore, this research was carefully designed and planned, the events that occurred especially around January 2008 changed the balance and the focus of it. Instead of fighting that and proceeding with the initial plan, I followed the path of events that unfolded. Thus the chapters six and seven became central for this book instead of being just the end of the project. This all meant that there were conceptual additions as well as methodological ones, as, for example, organisation violations and harassment in particular were not planned to feature as a theme in this research but became important due to the field.

The exit process from the field thus redefined the focus, and the central point of my research shifted accordingly. The exit process started taking more and more space in the data generation and it seemed to become almost more significant than anything else. I am currently waiting to go to court as a witness for a case that has its beginning in my equality research report. The court case stems from a journalist reading the equality evaluation report I wrote for the Parliament (Niemi, 2007b). She then interviewed anonymous MPs assistants asking them to name the worst sexual harassers in the Parliament, wrote a story based on that, and one of the named MPs filed a case against her and the newspaper HS\(^1\). I have been summoned to go and tell the court whether the names came from my evaluation. This will be an easy task. There are no names in my data. However, when discussing the methods of this research one has to stress that in terms of the final research design and the shape and form of this work, the exit process has in many ways been extremely important, as well as very public.

---

1 The leading national broadsheet in Finland.
Varieties of ethnography

“As observers we were part spy, part voyeur, part fan and part member” (Van Maanen, 1978, p. 346).

Ethnography has been used, described and defined in many different ways. It has been ridiculed and it has been praised. It is important to clarify that the kind of ethnography done for and in this research is not some softened version of positivism. The aims and criteria for gaining knowledge are completely different. This is not to say that ethnography cannot be positivist; there are ethnographies, particularly in the older tradition of anthropology and later too, that have adopted a positivist approach and thus the method of ethnography does not automatically exclude positivism and even when rather positivistic in essence there is still a demand for further interpretation (see, for example, Lévi-Strauss, 1962; Malinowski, 1961).

“The integration of all the details observed, the achievement of a sociological synthesis of all the various, relevant symptoms, is the task of the Ethnographer... the Ethnographer has to construct the picture of the big institution, very much as the physicist constructs his theory from the experimental data, which always have been within reach of everybody, but needed a consistent interpretation” (Malinowski, 1961, pp. 83–84).

Assessing ethnography, assessing this particular ethnography should be done by reading the story and the reflections around and on it. I tell a story and make an analysis based on it, offer some conceptualisations for approaching this part of the Parliamentary institution and show how the administrative part of the Finnish Parliament in many ways follows the conceptual framings found from bureaucracies and public administration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 4</th>
<th>Chapter 5</th>
<th>Chapter 6</th>
<th>Chapter 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Me</td>
<td>Me</td>
<td>Me</td>
<td>Me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acces</td>
<td>Being</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Exit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation</td>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>Recording</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Context/Media</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.
Institutional ethnography and organisational ethnography

The methodological choice of this research is a combination of qualitative and semi-quantitative methods – an ethnography done with semi-structured interviews, participant observation, together with a survey. Institutional ethnography has been used as a main guideline for the participant observation (Smith, 1987, 1989, 1996, Smith 2002; DeVault and McCoy, 2002) and on a very modest scale one could argue that my presence in the Finnish Parliament could be said to have improved the situation for the people employed in there. I received a few thank you emails after the media harassment scandal was over and in those emails, mainly from women, the writers thanked me for improving their working conditions. The way they generally framed their thank you’s was: after what happened the unpleasant looking and jokes have disappeared. However, I never aimed at writing the equality evaluation for them nor did I expect it to result in the kind of events it did, and as such it could be seen as an accidentally successful case of IE.

Whilst doing ethnography one should, amongst all the other things, be careful with the level of one’s engagement with the organisation as the work can easily start looking like consultancy work due to the required level of sensitivity towards the organisation and the problems they have and through heightened sensitivity one easily adopts. It is a difficult balancing task of being both an insider and an outsider on one go. It is also a task of being present, describing as much as one can, enduring boredom, suspicion and weird situations, trying to take into consideration the historical context of the organisation and trying to understand all that one sees and understand it ‘right’, seeing the processuality of the whole project (Bate, 1997). To put it short it is task that requires continuous self-examination and questioning of one’s reactions.

Combining organisational theories with ethnography is something that has been done a great deal over the recent years and yet the anthropological concept of culture does not always sit all that comfortably with the concept of organisational culture as used in organisational theory. The whole concept of culture and the multiple definitions of it is at the core of this dilemma but it is then followed by very different goals. An ethnography should bring up details about organisations that would otherwise remain unrevealed but it is not meant to be the “true tale” of what goes on. Organisational culture studies
often aim to be able to describe “the culture”, ethnography aims to tell a story of some of the features of the given culture and to thus offer an entry point into the reality of that organisation (Bate, 1997).

Institutional ethnography has been chosen as it combines feminist point of views and Marxist thinking, both of which are part of what could be called critical school of sociology and/or management. IE researchers in general have a tendency to have a critical or liberatory goal, the ontology entails that the research would reveal ideological and social processes (DeVault and McCoy, 2000). When it comes to an organisation and institution such as the Parliament it becomes highly important to remain on the critical stance and unpack everything one observes. National institutions and particularly institutions such as the Parliament have a very particular stance in our collective consciousness and as such they, more than perhaps many other organisations, need to be critically evaluated. Dorothy Smith has described IE as “alternative sociology” and thus it offers the suitable conceptual framework for this work as it has inbuilt a dynamic that is intended for revealing the relations of ruling by which Smith refers to:

“…those forms that we know as bureaucracy, administration, management, professional organization, and the media. They include also the complex of discourses, scientific, technical, and cultural, that intersect, interpenetrate, and coordinate the multiple sites of ruling” (Smith 1990, p. 6). Thus to use the conceptual framework of IE is to question the existing formations and structures of power and to question the existing arrangements by asking why is this organised like this? Is it the best way or is there another reason for it?

IE also entails the idea that the researcher’s role is not to attempt to completely map out institutions but to “… explore particular corners or strands within a specific institutional complex in ways that make visible their points of connection with other sites and courses of action” (DeVault and McCoy, 2000, p.753). Thus the task set by the IE is feasible and doable and contains no positivistic claim to be able to see everything. This is in line with my general view of what one can and cannot see and measure within the realms of social science.

IE also fits this research as it sees bureaucratic organisations and institutions as places where individual actions are made accountable in terms of abstract, generalised categories. “The concrete experience of individuals
can thus be viewed as a terrain structured by these generalising relations but not wholly swallowed up by them. In this way, the experience of the individual presents itself not merely as “a case”, but rather as an entry point into the actual workings of those institutions which produce the generalised and abstract character of contemporary societies” (Grahame, 1998, p. 353).

**Ethnography on public elites**

Ethnographic social science research is not abundant. Even if there is much research on elites in general, top business people, technology experts, millionaires, top politicians, top civil servants (see for example Stephens, 2007; Undheim, 2006; Kezar, 2003; Odendahl, and Shaw 2002; Hambrick and Mason, 1984; Hertz and Imber (eds.), 1995; Rhodes et al, 2007; Hearn, Jyrkinen and Piekkari, 2009) ethnographies on elites is not a vast area of research. This is naturally partly down to the simple fact that access is harder to gain, but, as Susan Ostrander (1995) has also pointed out, it is often the case that the difficulties related to access are given too much weight. An equally, if not more, problematic part of elite research is protecting the data, protecting the sanity of the researcher and being all the time ready to take any opportunity as it arrives. However, the difficulties also result into a situation where social scientists often do not “study up”.

Studying up entails many things that are to a degree unexpected but none the less problematic for the researcher. Some of the members of the organisation were, for example, angry as my results were not entirely positive. This has all, however, been part of the research process and with time, analysis and necessary distance from the organisation I have been able to see the interviews stripped from (most) of these emotions and reactions that they evoked in me. The reflexivity adopted in the research has been partly a necessity due to these issues rising from the power relations between me and my field, a field that contains some of the most powerful people in Finland.

It is necessary to point out that despite of their elite status and the issues that rose from that it was not only a negative relationship I had with my interviewees. The interviews were in many ways relatively typical research interviews, including very pleasant interviews, more stiff interviews, interviews where not much was said, interviews where so much was said
that the researcher could barely keep up. The general feeling was, however, warm, as all the interviewees had themselves signed up for the interview and were willing to discuss the matters in hand.

Access is often a result of lengthy negotiations but there are other issues that are linked to the elite nature of the organization. One can gain access to the organisation as a whole but then denied access to particular meetings due to one or another reason. Also after publishing one’s results the reception can be chilly, that was exactly the case after filing in my reports for the Parliament. Thus Rhodes describes my feelings during this process too as he writes: “... there is that sinking feeling when elites turn on you after you submit a draft of your findings. They are embarrassed by how close you have come to capturing on paper what they do and why they do it, including the mundane nature and hypocrisy of life at the top” (Rhodes et al., 2007, p. 211).

Ethnographic fieldwork amongst elites also contains many possible pitfalls that should not and cannot be ignored. An inadvertent bias can creep into one’s analysis. During this research I have, however, attempted to be alert to my reactions towards the field and watch my step: “one must remain systematic and objective even after leaving behind positivistic, natural law-based and universalistic research approaches” (Rhodes et al, 2007, p.8).

In addition, I would say that there were two researchers on the field: the researcher employed by the Parliament, and the researcher writing her thesis at Hanken. The ultimate test of roles and researcher integrity came when I was met by the power of the media coupled together with the power of the Parliament and my work was questioned in a way that I never thought possible. Even if I knew that this was something to be expected when doing research with the elites, even so it was a hard lesson.

Multiple roles, reflexivity, emotions and openness

“When all is said and done anthropology might, after all, be seen as a frame of mind” (Czarniawska-Joerges, 1992, p.195).

I was directly employed by my field and that meant that I had to adopt several roles and could not decide freely what I was doing there. I was wearing several hats everyday and that did not make my ethical position simple.
During the research process I held the roles of, amongst others, a researcher, an employee, former employee, and each of these roles and positions gave me a new angle towards my field.

This was also a source of confusion at the time and still whilst writing this I remember vividly that feeling. Whist attending events like the opening of the Parliamentary season opera or the official opening of the Parliamentary season coffee at the house of Parliament I realised perhaps more clearly than during regular days that my role there was indeed one of a person sitting on several different chairs at once and as a consequence I was not sitting comfortably on any of them. It was also a question of maintaining a certain distance from the field, avoiding going too ‘native’ and blurring the role boundaries. This is a difficult task again when one is employed and present in the organisation all the time. For this reason both my authorship and my involvement were shifting, and in the midst of this I was attempting to be aware of the developments and to do everything as well as I could.

The fieldwork was also a humbling experience and it evoked a great deal of emotions – far more than I had ever anticipated. I have tried to evaluate the impact these emotions have had on my work and my analysis. Their impact seems to be rather various. I have tried to be as reflexive as possible and to take them into consideration, bend over backwards and analyse my own reactions to different incidents. For example, when writing my research diary and writing about someone I have met during the day I tried to evaluate my own reactions to them by looking at my reaction from three different angles: as my own reaction, as an event, and as a specific detail in the organisational life. Everything has, however, been filtered through me and as a consequence I am different and the data is different. I am one of the research tools used in this work and thus in this sense I am part of the methodology (Gouldner, 1970).

As part of the methodological process, I have thus had to think about emotions in research, how to cope with them and accommodate for them in one’s work (Dunn 1991; Gray 2008; Lee 1993; Ostrander 1995; Rager 2005; Sampson, Bloor and Fincam, 2008). An additional reason for having to deal with emotions in relation to research rose with the media. It was not just the emotions that came as a response to the field; it was also the emotions arising from how my research was dealt with by the media and how the Parliamentary administration then in turn reacted or as was the case did not really react at
all apart from a few unpleasant conversations over the phone. How does one control and arrange one’s reactions in relation to all these mixed emotions and let them come in so that they feed and even filter the data but do so in a controlled manner? I have tried to evaluate the meaning and significance of my own emotional reactions and their impact on the analysis but I cannot say I feel that this process has been totally systematic.

I have sought to solve the ethical question related to how open an observant researcher should be by choosing extreme openness. I advertised openly who I am and what I am there for. I emailed the whole organization first to introduce myself and then to introduce the evaluation research and finally to remind them to answer the survey. In every email I told them about myself, and my research, and about the evaluation work I was going to be conducting (see appendices C and D for my emails to the organization). I received feedback from some of the employees (10 people) thanking me for being so open about what I was doing. All the people thanking me pointed out that this type of openness was rarely the case in this organization. One of my main regrets in terms of my fieldwork is that I never got to hold a debriefing session for the staff regarding the survey results. I should have probably pushed for it but in the midst of the media attention it seemed too difficult (Punch 1986; Mitchell, 1993).

The phases of fieldwork

My fieldwork can be divided into relatively neat phases, with each containing different elements and different forms of work. Through out all the phases I have been writing the research diary, and this forms the backbone of the research.

Phase one: pre-fieldwork and access

The first phase is the pre-fieldwork phase consisted of me making contact with the organisation for the first time, engaging in lengthy access negotiations, and finally ending up receiving what they call a ‘researcher’s place’ (tutkijan paikka in Finnish, translation by the author) i.e. a desk in a room in the Parliamentary Library. This phase could be described a period of endurance, and this phase is documented in a mini-ethnography in chapter four. A lot of time was spent on
the telephone, reading documents and sending many emails, and all the while I had to be as diplomatic as possible. I kept documenting my encounters with the Parliament, held on to all documents given by them, and paid attention to the different procedures and practices of communication within the organisation – who I was told to telephone and for what reason, and who seemed more accessible than others, and why this appeared to be so. It felt very much like peering in from the outside, a bit like if a window is frozen and you make a little hole for peering in it by pressing your finger against it and then trying to see what is happening inside. I did not ‘see’ much, but I was able to see some kind of shape starting to emerge out of the previously faceless mass of people and departments. In hindsight I am amazed that I endured the lengthy access negotiations. I started the access negotiations on 12th May, 2006, got access to the library 27th November, 2006, and finally access to the administrative offices on 2nd March, 2007, nearly 10 months later.

**Phase two: fieldwork as an employee**

The Office Commission of the Finnish Parliament decided on the 15th February, 2007 to continue with the existing human resource management strategy during the strategy period 2007-2009. Simultaneously, the Office Commission decided that the effectivity of the human resource management strategy during the strategy period 2002-2006 should be evaluated by an outsider rather than an internal employee. Shortly after this, I started working in the Parliament conducting the above evaluation. The Equality Working Group of the Parliamentary Administration decided that the equality situation of the Parliamentary Administration should also be re-evaluated, and I was asked if I could also conduct that evaluation research at the same time with the human resource management strategy evaluation. I agreed and both evaluations were thus conducted in the Parliamentary administration during Spring 2007.

**Interviews were conducted in order to:**

- firstly, map the key areas of working in the public sector;
- secondly, to map the key areas of working within the Parliamentary administration; and
- thirdly, to map the key areas within the managing of the Parliamentary administration and to further support the survey results.
All together 32 interviews\(^2\) were conducted both before gaining the access and then during and after working on the field i.e. during the spring, summer and autumn of 2007. Out of these interviews five pre-access pilot interviews were conducted within the Finnish public sector more generally, 10 informal pilot interviews were conducted within the Parliament (before the survey was put together) with a variety of staff from different departments and levels of hierarchy, and 17 semi-structured research interviews were conducted during or after the survey with the Parliamentary managers (see appendix J for the questions for the manager interviews).

The 10 informal pilot interviews in the Parliament were conducted in order to inform the choice of themes for the questionnaire and make them as relevant and topical as possible. The method of selection for the people interviewed for the pilots was snowballing. I always asked the person I was talking to recommend someone else, preferably from another department entirely. The pilots were semi-structured, and I simply asked the interviewees to reflect on the different themes and issues related to personnel management in the organisation. I also had some prompts I had gleaned from the existing strategy document and from the previous research reports (Moilanen, 2002). I also asked the pilot interviewees what they would like me to ask in the survey, and what would be an important question to ask. Already then it was clear that certain issues had remained very much the same for over 10 years.

Whilst conducting these 10 pilot interviews I managed to speak to people at different levels of organisational hierarchy ranging from management to secretaries, both men and women, and people from different departments. The information I received from those discussions contained clear themes that in turn corresponded with the themes that previous research had highlighted. Thus it seemed that these themes would be good to incorporate into the survey. Before interviewing people in these pilot interviews I explained that those interviews would not be used for anything else, that they were merely conducted to get “a feel” of the organisation, and to pick the most relevant personnel-related themes for the survey questionnaire.

After I had selected the most recurring themes I negotiated these themes with two of the anonymised managers that I shall call Muinonen and Makkonen. It was only after this negotiation process that I put together the

\(^2\) Plus an additional four in the Swedish Parliamentary administration.
final version of the survey taking into consideration their views on what
would be most important and less important but maintaining my right to
veto any suggestions as an external evaluator. The themes were thus chosen
together based on the pilot interviews and the previous reports and the actual
questions selected for the survey were all directly drawn from the question
bank\textsuperscript{3} provided by the Finnish State Treasury. Using that particular question
database also made it possible to compare the results of this survey with
other government departments as well as with the previous survey results
(Moilanen, 2002) collected from the Parliament. The strategy document that
was being evaluated had been written based on that previous survey, and this
thus seemed like a natural continuation of this process.

The equality evaluation part of the questionnaire was put together as a
team effort with the Equality Working Group of the Parliament, and it too
was based on a ready made questionnaire offered by the state-sponsored
website where one can find tools for equality work\textsuperscript{4}. Before drafting the survey
questionnaire I had attended the Parliamentary Administration’s Equality
Working Groups meetings, attended an equality consultant’s lecture on
making equality plans, and together with one of the Parliamentary managers
held a three hour long meeting with two of the equality consultants hired to
help to draft a new equality plan for the Parliamentary administration. Whilst
constructing the survey questionnaires and preparing them to be sent to the
employees I kept attending the Equality Working Group’s meetings, keeping
my research diary and documenting everyday life in the organisation, reading
their old reports, and observing the people and the workplace around me.

All this preliminary work was done to make sure that the equality evaluation
questionnaire would fit the organisation’s needs. I selected questions from
the ready made questionnaires and drafted a version which I presented for
the Parliamentary Administration’s Equality Working Group meeting where
we then discussed and negotiated the draft and together decided which parts
should be included and which questions seemed most relevant.

The combining of the two surveys in one document was resolved so that
at the end of the first survey questionnaire there was an additional set of
questions. This additional section was targeted at evaluating the equality

\textsuperscript{3} The State Treasury maintains this question bank for the use of the entire Finnish public
sector.

\textsuperscript{4} https://www.tasa-arvokysely.fi
situation of the Parliamentary administration. What were initially two separate questionnaires were thus put together in order to avoid sending out too many questionnaires. The two anonymised managers, Muinonen and Mikkonen, that I was working with, recommended this instead of two separate surveys. According to them, the staff was rather tired of filling in surveys, and I later discovered this was very much the case. In the letter attached to the survey questionnaire the personnel was clearly told that they would be answering two separate surveys at once. It was also stressed that the confidentiality of the answers and the respondent anonymity would be of central concern throughout the research.

The two parts of the survey are thus constructed in a different manner. Whilst drafting the human resource management strategy evaluation survey questionnaire, I maintained a right to veto when it came to the questions and themes as my task was to be a neutral external evaluator. Whilst drafting the equality evaluation survey questionnaire, the work was very much done in the Equality Working Group and based on what the group thought would be needed and suitable. It is an important part of successful equality work that it is done in co-operation with the organisation and on their terms thus it was important that the questionnaire was put together as a group (Mustakallio, Sevelius and Tanhua, 2007).

The two different parts of the survey were also to be answered by different people due to way in which MPs assistants were employed in the Parliament. The human resource management strategy part of the survey was to be answered by the people working in the Parliamentary administration but not by the MPs assistants. Although the MPs’ assistants contracts are made via the Parliamentary Administration, the assistants are not (were not at the time) part of the human resource management schema of the Parliamentary Administration as each has one direct boss, the given MP. However, the equality evaluation part was to be answered both by the people working for the Parliamentary administration and by the MPs’ assistants. This meant that in the end the human resource management strategy survey was sent to about 490 people, of whom 229 people answered; thus nearly 50% of the people who work in the Parliamentary administration answered that part of the survey. The equality evaluation survey was sent to 680 people, out of whom 320 people answered; thus again nearly 50% of the people responded. The
survey questionnaire was made available both online and as a paper version, and it was possible to answer the questions both in Finnish and Swedish (see attachment F for the survey questionnaire and the attached letter).

My initial contract of employment with Parliamentary administration was for three months and I was paid hourly with the idea that my time with the organisation can be extended if there were to be a need. From the start it was clear that more time would be needed but for strategic reasons the contract was made for shorter period at the time – in the end I was employed in the Parliament for six months.

**Phases three and four: fieldwork through exiting**

Phase three starts after my officially employed time was over at the end of August 2007. At the end of my stay with the Parliamentary offices I was asked to hold a management training day in the beginning of September 2007, together with my senior colleague who specialises in well-being at work. The details of this day are documented in chapter six but the day is mentioned here in this chapter as it offered yet another method of data gathering.

Based on the survey response we, my senior colleague and I, had made questions for the managers whom were asked to form groups. They were each given number and then group accordingly. They then worked independently in groups, each group answering two random questions arising from the survey response. We then went over all the questions and the answers and tried to encourage debate. Whilst the groups gave their answers I wrote everything down so that the projector was on and the groups could see what I wrote and correct my writing if they thought that something was not quite the way they had said it or meant it in their answer. Thus this material (see chapter six) together with the interviews with the management and the survey responses regarding the managing should give a fair picture of the views and attitudes of the Parliamentary management.

After the training day there was an interim period of silence for about five months and I did not expect to hear from them again. Phase four, however, started unexpectedly as the media discovered of the equality evaluation report (it was and is a public document), and a scandal broke in the press over the results of the survey. The main speculation was on whether there
is a significant organisational problem related to sexual harassment in the Finnish Parliament. Here it is sufficient to say that naturally even one case of harassment is always too much in any organisation and thus the media attention is understandable. Some journalists dealt with the matter in a very professional manner, but simultaneously others did not and the report was taken out of its context. Individual people were drawn in and accused and the whole thing exploded out of proportion. For a detailed description of these events see chapter seven.

The Parliamentary administration reacted to the scandal slowly but eventually they started demanding more work, reports, from me. Firstly, they asked me to produce a report on the numbers of the equality evaluation, despite my repeated efforts to explain that those numbers mean nothing out of context but have to be looked at in the context of harassment research numbers. In the end I produced the report for them and got paid extra for it. Secondly, much later in March 2008, I was asked to appear as an expert in the Parliamentary Committee for Worklife and Equality (consisting of MPs in charge of amongst other things the workplace safety of the Parliamentary administration) and produced a written report for them too. Both of these reports can be found as appendices E and F. This phase in a manner still continues as I was asked to be a witness in a court case that is linked with the media scandal. I am still waiting to go to court.

I will now further explicate some of the additional qualitative methods and interview methods used in this research in order to further clarify the methodological variety.

**Pilots outside the Parliament**

Pilot interviews were conducted during autumn 2006 in order to find out more about the specific working processes and hierarchies that can be found to exist in organisations within the public sector. These interviews were conducted with professionals who had been or are working within the public sector for a minimum of three years. These five pilot interviews brought up some useful similarities in the experiences of work within the public sector. Firstly, hierarchies are regarded as highly significant and very strict within these organisations and thus when it comes to working practices and decision
making within these organisations they play a large part. Hierarchies also seemed to be an important part of the actual experience of work and workplace within these organisations. The interview material was analysed in order to create the interview structure for the research interviews.

**Main interviews**

I have conducted 10 informal non-taped interviews and 17 semi-structured and taped formal research interviews. As well as this I have interviewed the highest management of the Swedish Parliamentary offices and conducted four identical interviews to the Finnish formal ones there. The Finnish interviews were done with the management of the Parliamentary offices and everyone who agreed to was interviewed. Some of the questions (using SWOT analysis) were sent to the interviewees before the interview to give them a chance to familiarise themselves with them beforehand in writing. Some did answer the questions before the interview giving me their answers in writing and others preferred to go through the questions together. In both cases their answers were discussed during the interview situation and I made additional notes to further clarify their answers. The report itself is attached as an appendix and extracts from the interviews, as well as the results of the SWOT analysis conducted by the management of the Parliamentary offices are further used in chapter 5.

There are a multiple problems concerning the interview situations. When interviewing elites from a feminist perspective one is in a difficult position of having to interview up. Such a power relation needs to be accounted for whilst conducting the interviews and perhaps even more whilst analysing the interviews (Puwar, 1997).

I am very aware of having been afraid of some of my interviewees, having wanted to please them, having been impressed by their power to the extent that I felt unable to question any of their views, and having been genuinely upset about even the possibility that they would not be pleased with my work. Ostrander (1995) has listed some of the more typical problems that can feature during elite interviews and these are all present in my experiences with some

---
5 A basic tool for organisational analysis SWOT analysis means analysis of the organisational Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats. The respondents are asked to analyse their own organisation using these themes.
of the interviewees. For example, the elite tendency to talk freely and at great length but not necessarily giving much or even any required substance was rather common in my interviews with the management. Gaining a clear answer was often a challenge as the interviewee trailed off somewhere down the memory lane.

The members of the elites are used to giving their opinion and used to knowing that the opinion matters and this has a clear impact on the interview situation. I repeatedly found myself in a situation where the interviewee’s opinion giving was dominant in the interview. This also resulted in me, without realising it until later, wanting to give as positive a picture of everything as possible in order to please the interviewees. Usually only after having returned to my own office I kind of ‘woke up’ and realised how the power balance had impacted both the interview situation and my behaviour during it. The uneven power relationship simply tipped me into a position where I repeatedly found myself wanting to somehow ‘please’ the managers. This was not only due to fear of being thrown out from the Parliament and my employment if I behaved otherwise but in hindsight it was also a reaction to their power; I felt inferior and wanted to please without being able to explain why even to myself. It felt odd (Ostrander, 1995).

**Analysis of data**

This is very much an abductive piece of work (Coffey and Atkinson, 1996; Mason, 2002), as I have been doing a lot of moving back and forth between the field, the data collected, experiences on and off the field, conceptual frameworks, and theories. The analysis has thus been conducted as a continuous process through out the research process (Coffey and Atkinson, 1996, p.153) as all these aspects and the moving between them has shaped the process of getting familiar with this data and this organisation, as well as highlighting the major themes arising from it.

This type of approach is chosen as it seemed most suitable for the purposes of this work but it is also in line with the dialectical meta-narrative (see chapter two on Hegel) of this work. The abductive approach to data analysis can also be described as a dialectical process where “… theory, data generation and data analysis are developed simultaneously…” (Mason, 2002, p.180).
Moreover, during the process I have faced all the usual problems often encountered in ethnographic fieldwork: I have been looking at different ways they are doing things in the organisation, practices, and interpreting them, trying to understand them. There is always a possibility that I have seen something and interpreted it in inaccurate way, thought that it means something when it, in fact, did not, would not if interpreted again. Thus I cannot claim to know for a fact that what I saw was what I thought it was. The only group of employees I both observed and interviewed are the managers, and there too I mainly asked them about the content of their work, managing in that particular organisation, and what they thought of that thus conducting a form of triangulation. However, the interviews follow a clear pattern that fits very closely with the rest of the ethnographic data.

To try to further secure my analysis of the data from too much subjectivity from my part is that I tried not to make instant interpretations, to remain as reflexive as possible. The parts of the notes that are included in this book have been selected as the most typical, explicit, dramatic and boring representations of the organisational reality, but there too I have tried to question my own judgement several times over. The question posed to me and by me during the analysis and writing was, why do I think this is relevant, and what does it say to the reader?

The data of this research consists of my field observations from the period of six months during which I was working in the Parliamentary administration, my research diary, the survey and the two reports based on it, the interviews, the SWOT and the training day material, together with the two later reports for the Parliament and finally the media reporting. Before writing the two main reports for the Parliament I read and re-read the interviews, did a broad thematic analysis of the interviews to complement the surveys, as well as gathering the SWOT answers and picking out thematic similarities across all the data. I was picking out both their themes and my themes i.e. for example a reoccurring theme brought up by the managers was their ability or inability to control their own time in relation to their own work and the aspects of managerial work they saw as important. An example of ‘my’ themes i.e. a theme that I picked out from the interviews was the particular way they talked about the House and working in there, the special quality of it.
At this stage the interviews were going to be further analysed for the purposes of this thesis but as the events and unexpected turns of the exit process started the interviews lost their centrality amongst the data. I made a conscious decision to put them aside and only use them selectively and sparingly in this work. There was more than enough data from other sources and crucially the central interview themes matched with all the other themes rising from the different forms of data. All through the research process the themes that have arisen from the different forms of data have been consistently the same: the style and quality of management, the centrality of the legislative work and the consequent “natural” hierarchy of different types of work done within the organisation, the level of control, the importance of the formal and informal and the consequent problem regarding the flow of information within the organisation. This has been the most important feature of going through and analysing the many different different types of data as the thematic similarity across the data is both reassuring and has made handling the data easier.

**Factionality**

My six months on the field in Finland were taxing; the exit process was taking its toll, and in the end my research design had to be changed and became different from what had initially been planned. The way the Finnish exit process turned out also meant that I totally lost the ability to conceal which organisation I had studied.

In writing up this research the possibility of using factionality as a method was considered for offering protection, to be able to handle the data more freely and to be better able to use the Swedish data I had. However, I was never very happy with the idea. I wanted some security, a buffer zone between me, the data and the outside world but somehow creating a third factional Parliamentary administration that would have been a mixture of the two Parliamentary administrations, Finland and Sweden, I had data on along with additional fictional characteristics seemed unnerving to me.

Here I quote Gerard (1996) to attempt to define exactly what is meant here by factionality:
"It’s always seemed odd to me that nonfiction (another word for factionality) is defined, not by what it is, but by what it is not. It is not fiction. But then again, it is also not poetry, or technical writing or libretto. It’s like defining classical music as nonjazz. Or sculpture as nonpainting … historically, nonfiction was around long before fiction – at least in the form of the short story and the novel – ever came on the scene. But nobody called it that. Farther back still, nobody seems to have made much distinction between the two. Aristotle divided the literary world into History and Poetry, and, much to everybody’s surprise, Poetry seems to have included literary nonfiction. The Iliad of Homer was long considered to be "only" myth by those who cared about such distinctions, until one reader, Heinrich Schliemann, used it as a nonfictional document to discover the actual remains of Troy. A real place, after all, even if it was fought over by mythical gods and goddesses. Poetry and History together” (Gerard, 1996, p.3).

At times factionality seemed like one way to maintain confidentiality and to explicate different ideal types, and thus for a long while I was planning on using it. I had to come up with alternative solutions for protecting the anonymity of the people in the organisation and factionality seemed to be the best way around this issue. Also it seemed to fit the situation quite nicely: “I think it (factionality) is invariably a response to crisis. Non-fiction flourishes in times of great upheaval” (Howarth in Gerard, 1996, p. 3). It would have indeed been a response to crisis and a solution that was meant to also save me from further crisis.

As I had already earlier realised that I would not be able to have two comparable cases either it was time to consider alternative methods. I found myself wishing I was Canadian doing my thesis in Canada or Ireland, as there it is possible to defend your thesis, become a doctor and publish your thesis five year later. This would have been ideal for me. I was painfully conscious that the offices I have spent time in are small and Finland is a small country. Also the organisation, or some senior members of it, can be very sensitive in terms of anything that is published about it. It is also full of lawyers and thus I had to think about protecting myself as well. I did not wish to start another scandal and thus have been carefully considering how to frame this work, how to write it and publish it, whilst keeping the balance of being true to my informants and protecting them and myself.
Had I used factionality, it would have worked like this. There would have been the Finnish case and another case X, and case X would have been the factional one. This is to say that it would have been based on real existing data from another Parliament, potentially Parliaments. Most of the case would have been completely factual and some of it fictional. I would not have ‘invented’ the data for the research but rather 90% of the data described would have been reported accurately and 10% of it would have been partly fictional. The added pieces of fiction would not have compromised the factual part of the book, as the analytical tools I would have utilised would have been directed to following a logic through rather than extricating individual actions.

To define factionality is hard and that was one of the reasons why I felt I did not want to carry on with it. I add it here none the less as the description of the process of thinking of using factionality perhaps sheds further light on how seriously I was considering my data and the ways I could or could not use it. Another example of the gravity of the thought process is that we (me and my supervisor) were also thinking at some point that I could perhaps just write a ‘fictional’ book based on the data, for example, as a space adventure or some other genre.

Factionality is not easy to describe but it is also not easy to write. "The hardest part of writing creative nonfiction is that you're stuck with what really happened –you can't make it up. You can be as artful as you want in your presentation, draw profound meanings out of your subject matter, but you are still stuck with real people and real events. You're stuck with stories that don’t always turn out the way you wish they had turned out" (Gerard, 1996, p. 6).

This same problem is very much part of writing ethnography but somehow I felt very uneasy with factionality and the idea of using it. I felt that even if I was crystal clear in my head of where the boundaries were, even so I would have a hard time of explaining that to someone else. It did not seem like a defensible position even if I knew it could have been. Thus I was relieved when I made the decision to drop it. However, considering of using factionality was a part of this research process and thus it should be reported here. For a while it was to be one of the main elements of my methodology.
Writing and language

Writing ethnography there are many things to consider before and during writing. There are ethical choices to be made and everything down to the most minute details like the choice of words when describing situations can make all the difference. Several times during writing I discovered that I had unintentionally used words that made the situation seem slightly different than how it had in fact been. Words are powerful and defining and thus when the intention is to describe real life events they become even more so. The process of writing ethnography has been almost as important as the process of fieldwork was.

One significant part of phase four and this research in general is the use of languages whilst conducting the work and being on the field and it is something I have spent quite a long time considering. The use of language in data gathering has been and was considered (Marschan-Piekkari and Welch eds. 2004) in order to make as informed decisions as possible regarding what language to use during the interviews. This was naturally more so the case when it still seemed like the research would entail a clear contrast between two countries.

When Sweden was still featuring as the other case many different options were weighed and the main issue for a long time was whether it would be possible and even wise to use English as the language of the whole research, i.e. do the interviews in English in both countries seeing as the dissertation will be written in English and I was going to have to translate everything. Using English in both countries could have also given a more equal position to the interviewees both in Sweden and Finland as they would all be using the same language, not their native one.

After some consideration I, however, decided that it would be far too complicated. The interviews were thus done in Finnish in Finland (apart from the few Swedish speakers who were all given a chance to be interviewed in Swedish) and in Swedish in Sweden. The aim was and is to give all the interviewees an equal footing by them being able to use their native language.

Moreover, I made an observation during this writing process that I felt that I could not have written this book in Finnish. Finnish as a language has such a heavy inbuilt meanings, and writing about sensitive matters or describing situations in Finnish somehow seemed far too difficult for me. Then again, this most probably has as much to do with me as it is with the language. Language carries a lot of emotion.
Concluding remarks

Ethnography is a method, but by the end of this chapter it is perhaps relevant to consider that it is also a way of approaching research. Thus it has been considered in the conceptual chapter two, as it is very much a certain view of the world as well. Thus the line between ontology and epistemological aspects of ethnography is sometimes unclear; it is a way of doing things but it has a dimension that includes an idea that the world can and should be best observed up close (Rhodes et al., 2007). Thus writing this thesis has at times felt like one long confession and perhaps felt far too personal. This shows, for example, in that in the first draft of this book I attempted to write myself “out” of the thesis by using passive forms of language through out. I simply wanted to avoid the personal aspect. That is no longer so.
4. The access – phase one

Introduction

The chapter begins with a geographical description of the Parliamentary premises and then moves on to describe and analyse the first, access phase of the research process. At the end of the chapter the themes arising from it are discussed and reflected upon in relation to the research questions. From chapter three one can find a table with a timeline where all the phases of the research are marked in the order they took place. All the names referring to the managers and employees and used in the text are pseudonyms.

Whilst reporting ethnographic research one should always be writing a story (Van Maanen, 1978), not a made up story but rather a story that is as close to reality as stories can ever be. This story aims to give a glimpse of life inside an elite institution, examine the governing rationale with which it functions, cast the organisation as an ideal type of a kind, and examine how all these aspects in turn create a very particular type of workplace. As such it thus attempts to give one kind of answer to the question: “what is it like to be a non-Political employee in the Parliament?”

This is, however, also a story of the research process what it is like to do research in an elite organisation. To put it shortly, one spends a long time trying to get in and then an even longer time trying to get out. Both the access and exit processes have been, are, indeed a major part of the fieldwork material and consequently very significant parts of this story. Thus this is not just a story of the organisation, it is also a story of me making my way in, doing research and working in the organisation and then making my way out.
The four phases of my research process can be further classified based on the level of intensity and nature of the work done during the phase. The first initial phase during which I mainly negotiated with the Parliamentary managers and in the end was given a place in the library as a parliamentary researcher is described in this chapter. The phase that started after finally gaining access to the offices, phase two, was very intensive one consisting of many interesting post-election events such as the opening of the new Parliament and the planning and drafting of the two surveys, it will be described and analysed in chapter five. This phase lasted from February until early June 2007. After June, however, most people (including the most important people, the MPs) started their holidays and life inside the organisation slowed down and became a lot quieter. Thus phase three, June-July-August 2007 is a significantly quieter phase, a period of transition. This phase will be described in chapter six. During this time I was writing the two evaluation reports (see chapter three for the table on both reports and their contents) and was also mostly absent from the actual offices, working elsewhere. Finally, there was the sudden and until now, final intensive fourth phase from January 2008 when the exit process continued unexpectedly this phase will be described in chapter seven.1

The geography of the Parliament

To be able to follow the story and the description fully one also needs to be aware of the geography of this institution. This is significant as it reflects the divisions within the organisation and in some ways its hierarchy too. To look at the way the different buildings of the Parliament are located please see the map in Appendix G.

The main building (building G on the map) contains everything that is immediately linked with the legislative work, as well the main Parliamentary Assembly room. Some of the MPs still have their offices in the main building but some have also moved to the new building (building Y on the map) that also mainly contains MPs offices and assembly rooms related to legislative work. The new building also has the Citizens Information Centre in its entry level.

---

1 Please note that all the extracts from my research diary, parts of interviews, emails, reports, group work materials, conversations are in italics and sometimes bolded, and all the translations are done by me. Some of the originals are in Finnish but mostly the research diary is in English as that was the language of this research process.
Both the old and the new building have cafeterias serving lunch and the two buildings are linked together by an underground tunnel. Underground there is also a vast space containing sports facilities, saunas, a parking hall, a bomb shelter and so on. The space underground is so large that it almost seems like another separate world. I never properly learned to navigate there and it always just seemed like a giant labyrinth of corridors and steps and rooms.

Behind the old main building there is another extra building (building C on the map) that has also been built later (between the old Parliamentary building and the new Parliamentary building) and is the main home of the Parliamentary administration, postal services, language offices, estate services, and the library. This is the building where most of the events of this story take place. It is a peculiar slice of a house, shaped like an arch and made of a metallic material that makes it insufferably hot during the summer season (and apparently rather cold during the winter season but this is hearsay as I never worked there during the coldest winter months). All the corridors inside curve slightly as the whole house itself is curved. The curved house hosting the administration is linked to another older house next to it (although one cannot really see it from the outside) and there are some more offices linked with the services in there too (Public Relations and parts of security), as well as some general rooms for meetings or party receptions.

The whole layout of the Parliament might seem to be clear when looking at it on the map but in reality it is a very complex web of corridors and offices both on the surface level and underground. Even people who had worked there for a few years confessed that they still get lost. I got really lost only once during my time in the house but this was only due to being extra careful. I would have got lost many more times had I not always insisted in asking for specific instructions every time I had to venture outside the office where I eventually was located. My first location inside the Parliament, a desk in the library, was on the bottom floor of the curving administrative building where the Parliamentary library is located.

The office that I was eventually assigned to, upstairs of the same curved building, also served both as ‘the gift room’ and a room for another hourly paid employee. It was known as ‘the gift room’, as it housed all the official presents the MPs and the government officials take with them to trips and visit abroad. Amongst the glassware, vases, ties, scarfs, umbrellas, books,
medals, cd’s and variety of little pieces of Finnish mementoes was the place where I sat during my time in the organisation. The culture of gift giving was and is an important part of the Parliamentary visits (MPs and civil servants visits) both abroad and domestically, and it seemed to me at times that the life around the gift room together with all of the stories linked to it could itself have been a topic for one PhD. But then the same could be said about almost all the different parts of the organisation: the house is rich with multiple stories and layers of events.

**Fieldwork pre-access**

We had agreed with my supervisor that since the Parliament had recently started offering a new service to the citizens, the information centre (kansalaisinfo) that would be the most natural place to start the access negotiations.

12.05.06

I walked into the Parliament’s information centre for citizens and asked one of the women behind the counter whom I should talk to when I wanted to ask for permission to do research in the Parliamentary administration. She said that the Parliament is an open organisation and that I should just go to the library where there are several resources and researchers at my service. I explained that I am the one who wants to do research and in order to do ethical research one needs to ask for permission and to negotiate with someone but she did not seem to really understand what I meant. She did not seem to know what to do with me. Finally, after a lot of looking around for papers and playing with the computer, she gave me a piece of paper with contact details of a person whom she thought could help me. My contact person is Sulevi Suikkanen² from the Sugar department and I am going to email them on Monday. My research has thus now officially started.

After some emailing back and forth I set up a meeting with my contact person. Before the meeting I prepared a letter (see appendix H) describing my research project in order for them to better understand what it was that I wanted to do. As I entered the Parliament that morning it really felt like a beginning.

---

² Please note that all the names used in the text are fictional, made up in order to protect the anonymity of the respondents.
I met with my contact person at 9.00 in the Parliament this morning. I was a bit early and had to wait for some 10 minutes. I was sitting in the lobby and listening as the janitors spoke about their holidays. I was fascinated by absolutely everything and listened carefully. Anyhow, after a while Sulevi Suikkanen appeared. He seemed very nice and was also to my slight surprise very casually dressed (jeans and a shirt). Maybe it was visible that I thought he was very casually dressed as he immediately explained that since yesterday was the last Parliamentary sitting it was possible to dress down a bit. I asked whether they generally had a casual Friday policy and he said that not really, that this was just their own decision to dress more casually. We walked to the main cafeteria inside the house of Parliament and he offered to buy me a cup of coffee.

His reactions to me and my research plan were positive and the only reservation he had was regarding my plan of trying to work ‘in’ there as he was doubtful of what they could find for me to do. He then, however, after thinking for a while offered the Parliamentary information centre for citizens or the library as possible places where I could work. He said many times that they are and wish to be a very open organisation and that thus there would be no problem for me to get my interviews done. He said that the organisation generally takes a positive view on research like mine and that the people working there would most probably be very cooperative. He was asking which particular group I was interested in the Parliament and I said I would prefer the administrative offices but that again I was ready to negotiate everything and that my research design is such that I have alternative possibilities and I can group and regroup things based on what is the access and dialogue situation. He then took my paper and my card and promised to get me a contact person from the Apple department. He said that in August I could plan this research further with their help. The meeting ended in a very pleasant tone and I really felt he had taken me seriously and was more than willing to help out.

In the end of our meeting we agreed that since it was nearly midsummer and the Finnish summer holidays were about to start we would continue in the autumn. He promised to keep the matter in mind and continue with it once back from holidays. Thus I did not hear from them until the following autumn.
25.09.06
My email to them:
Hello Sulevi, Hopefully your autumn has started nicely, I am sure you are keeping busy! I am writing to ask whether you have already managed to find a contact person for me? I am sorry to keep bothering you but this is very important for me and I am anxious to start collecting data for my research.

Best Regards, Hertta Niemi

He responded immediately:
Hello,
Your contact person is Antti Aalto from the Apple department. He has promised to be in touch with you and I am a bit surprised that he has not called you yet. Perhaps it is better that you call him directly. You will reach him from this number. He has your letter/memo.

Kind regards, Sulevi Suikkanen

I am a bit concerned as he was meant to ring me (apparently a while back) and has done nothing about it. I am (for no apparent reason) anticipating hostility and thus am a bit nervous about contacting him. It feels awkward to have to follow him around if he was meant to ring me.

26.09.06
I just rang Antti Aalto at 15.21. He was busy. I rang him again. Relief. He was very pleasant, cooperative and generally positive. And this is what has happened: he has talked to one person a while ago and says that in order for me to do this research the Mint department needs to say it is ok. According to him the person he spoke to is very positive towards this and he then passes me the contact details for that person, manager Minna Makkonen. He pointed out that she might be on leave and that is also the possible explanation behind the long silence. He also said that she has been on many leaves recently and that is why it is difficult to know when she will be back, he hinted that she might be experiencing stress but obviously felt like he had said too much after that and left the topic. He then instructed me that if I cannot get a hold of her I am to try to contact her boss Miro Muinonen or then Mr. Muinonen’s boss Miikka Mikkonen. Then he laughed drily and said that after him there is only heaven.
As these few examples from my research diary illustrate the early encounters with the people working in the Parliament were very pleasant and even enjoyable experiences. Everyone I spoke with seemed happy to help, relaxed and genuinely very interested in what I was doing. Yet it was all the time clear that it was not really their decision whether I was going to be able to conduct the work I wanted to. The hierarchy, the ranking order, was clear and it was brought up repeatedly. Everything was going to be possible if the management would say so. In hindsight, the innocent remark on how the next thing after manager Mikkonen is heaven gives a correct picture of how the powers of the highest management are seen inside the administration, as omnipresent and as something to respect and even fear. However, I continued making my way gradually towards the highest management in order to gain a permission to do research ‘inside’. After a few days I managed to get a hold of the next manager and to arrange a meeting with her.

3.10.06
I arrived in time and waited for Minna Makkonen in the lobby. Whilst waiting I collected all the brochures introducing the organisation that are there. Will have a look at them later on. Then she arrived. From the beginning she seemed very pleasant and had a very friendly and easygoing manner. It was obvious that she was and is very interested in research in general and in particular my research. She asked many questions related to my academic background and research related activities before this. She said repeatedly that they really need this kind of research.

Together we worked out a strategy: she will read over my brief, I will then get it back from her with suggestions and start lobbying with the MPs, taking advantage of my networks and contacting anyone and everyone I possibly can starting from Paavo Lipponen\(^3\). She will talk to people in the administration and once she thinks the time is right (after some lobbying) I should again contact one of the managers, or rather first their secretary; Miikka Mikkonen’s secretary Maija Mönttinen and ask to meet him. She says that it is important that I have some political support because if for example Paavo Lipponen says it is OK to do this research then it really

---

3 Paavo Lipponen was Prime Minister of Finland from 1995 to 2003 and Chairman of the Social Democratic Party of Finland from 1993 to 2005. He also served as Speaker of the Parliament of Finland 2003-2007.
is ok, nobody can stop me after that. She says that as far as lobbying goes especially the members of the chancellory committee are important and brings up names such as: Heidi Hautala, Janina Andersson, Tuija Brax, Mia-Petra Kumpula-Natri, Sari Essayah, Anni Sinnemäki, Jyri Häämies, Ben Zyskowitz⁴.

I was beginning to ‘get the picture’ that was then later only fortified by my fieldwork experiences. The hierarchical ranking order inside the Parliamentary administration was becoming clearer, meeting by meeting. I was, however, also getting another image, one of a workplace where everything was not ok. Manager Makkonen was clearly distressed when she talked about the working community and culture of the administration and it immediately became very obvious that they were having problems within the management, that is, between certain managers. She told me she had been on leave several times due to the emotional strain caused by the situation. My mind was cast back to one of the conversations in the beginning with Antti Alhonen and I realised that this was the situation he touched upon when he made his remarks on her absences. I was wondering how this will then affect everything else.

24.10.06
I finally got the all ok regarding my ‘sales letter’ from Minna Makkonen and started “lobbying” first in a rather indirect way (using existing networks and connections). The mission was to find out who is the best person to ring to get to Lipponen’s attention and eventually I managed to get a name. I emailed the person and after some waiting they rang me last Saturday. The phonecall was better than I could have ever even imagined. They were also excited about my research proposal and repeated the same thing Minna Makkonen had said i.e. that they too have thought about doing something like my research project and that this kind of research is vitally important for the Parliament. They then promised to take care of the rest of the matter with Lipponen et al and then send me an email as well as copy into the email one of the managers of the Parliamentary administration, Miikka Mikkonen.

⁴ All of these people are prominent MPs or previous MPs in the Finnish Parliament.
The phonecall and the events that followed it seemed surreal and I remember thinking that it cannot be true, this cannot be happening like this, out of the blue on an ordinary Saturday. It felt odd that something this big (for me at least) could be decided upon this easily. I also felt awkward in relation to the organisation, how would they view me coming in as a result of Mr Lipponen’s command? The situation was absurd but simultaneously I understood that to the person helping me it was just an ordinary task, just another duty to take care of. It was politics and Politics performed and functioning right in front of me and I was now a participant of the game. In hindsight it seems like the most fitting way of entering the organisation.

The email that gave me the access

Dear Hertta Niemi,
Secretary General Seppo Tiitinen and speaker Paavo Lipponen think your research is a good idea. The assumption is that you will proceed with the preparations together with the Parliamentary administration.

Best regards, Kaius Kaartinen

After receiving this I also emailed Miikka Mikkonen to be polite, saying hello and hoping for a fruitful cooperation.

And then I am ‘in’...

16.11.06
I am having a meeting today with Manager Mikkonen. His secretary called last week and organised this meeting and today I am going in. It is clear I have moved to the higher level of management as they no longer arrange their own meetings. It is unclear what to expect as I have no idea what he is going to suggest, if anything.

Going in I was nervous and early. The person who picked me up from downstairs was not his secretary but some kind of general assistant. She seemed relaxed and I was trying to make jokes. Manager Mikkonen was on the phone when I arrived and continued to be on the phone for about 10 minutes. His secretary told me to sit down and wait. Mikkonen then appeared and for his first words he asked if we have met somewhere. I said no, I don’t think so and we sat down. I proceeded to tell him
some background details about my research and he started telling me historical stories about the Parliament and the administration. He was very chatty and very full of stories. He stressed that they always cooperate with researchers. I told him about entering simultaneously from Political and administrative sides and he said that that is a good strategy and that I was now in the right place as if anyone was going to hire me it was him.

He mostly told me things. He told me people in there have generally worked there for years and years and that they have the crème de la crème of the employees in the public sector are in the Parliament because they can offer the best pay. He said that nobody really leaves a position in the Parliament apart from if they die or start their pension. He says that at least everybody in the managerial level thinks that they work in heaven. What happens otherwise he didn’t comment. He mentioned their rather bad results in work satisfaction surveys and said that the employees don’t seem happy and then he moved to new things. One of those was the management’s weekly Swedish lesson where they go through the website of the Swedish parliament and talk about it in Swedish with their teacher. He stressed that their language course is a great method and as a consequence all his managers communicate with their Scandinavian guests in Swedish not in English. He stressed that during the language school they discuss the way things are done in Sweden and ponder whether to use similar structures and methods here. He also stressed that Swedish and Finnish structures are almost identical on the higher level as the Swedes copied the Finns for their system.

We talked about practical arrangements and he said that I am welcome and that they are willing to help me in every way. When I presented my wish to be there in the organisation he became a bit hesitant but promised to consider it. He wanted to see my cv and I promised to send it to him when I return to my office. He also wanted my research plan and I gave him the plan stressing that it is flexible. He said that they would consider hiring me to some project position. He asked me if I had been to the Parliament’s new building. I said yes, as a freelance journalist whilst I was writing for a newsletter. I mentioned the name of the newsletter Pohjan Akka and he immediately asked: are you a feminist? I felt uncomfortable and paused and before I had time to answer he said: it is ok I do not mind if you are. I was even more uncomfortable and finally answered that yes I am. For a moment the atmosphere was very awkward and strained.
Meeting turns into a lunch

At this point the meeting started clearly approaching its end and I was saying things like, well I look forward to hearing from you then. He, however, surprised me by suggesting lunch and I agreed. We walked to the new building cafeteria and on the way he told me more stories about people who work there and described the organisation in a manner that made it clear that he was very proud of it, asking me did I not think that it’s surprising that there could be such an organisation where people work for over 20 years. He started the conversation by asking me to tell if I thought that PhD studies generally are useful in that do they bring more theoretical knowledge. I gave polite answers and tried to talk about different kinds of PhD studies. He then went on to say that he will now give me ideas and I should listen to him very carefully. He also noted that he has an idea for PhD but no time to do it as he is too old to spoil his life with a PhD. He said that in his view the Parliament’s role is as a controller of the government5 and that to him that is the most important role of it. He said that he has not seen this kind of perspective and that it is important. To look at how parliament can or cannot control the government and how the different support structures work in aid of this. As an example he said that Finnish MPs have only one assistant while in Peru they have 4 per person, does this matter was his question. He expressed concern for the quality of governing and democracy, how well does all the information reach the MPs. The Parliamentary Administrative office’s service principle is “immediately and well” and he said it works like a charm and that MPs especially always get everything they need immediately and that they would all testify that to me. He also said that sometimes between government officials there can be a bit slower pace but that even there he has always received first class service himself.

He pointed towards the induction days that are organised for the new MPs and said that I should go there and listen. Although he himself does not talk there anymore. He tells me that he used to always say to the MPs that don’t you think that you came here to rule, you did not, you came to control the government. He then stressed that I should not forget the concept of control. At this point I bring up the aspect of control between officials who have worked for 20 years and MPs who have worked for a year and what that might look like and he insisted that those relationships are collegial and good and that there are no issues of control there.

I return to this theme of control at the end of this chapter.

5 In Finnish: “Eduskunnan tehtävä on kontrolloida hallitusta”.
Into the library

24.11.06 at 14.21
Manager Mikkonen just rang to inform me that I am warmly welcome into the library of the Parliament. He has arranged for me to have a researcher’s place in there and he suggests I should come on Monday and take it. He is not sure what kind of desk it is but he has booked it for me. He then said that this way: you can be in the outskirts of our “camp”⁶. Later on they will then review whether I could also be inside the camp, have some kind of position in the actual offices of the Parliamentary administration. Well, access is constant negotiation. I knew it. I will have to negotiate with them all the way. This feels like a game as he knows very well that I am not interested in the library. The library seems like some kind of compromise. He does not throw me out completely (and according to the other managers this is not possible as Lipponen has said I can stay) but neither does he let me in properly. However, as I have no choice in the matter and this is my best offer I will go into the library on Monday morning at 9 and see what happens, where to start, how to be, what to do.

I am still thinking about what he said about control, how he changed the level of the discussion away from the administration contra MPs level into the Government contra Parliament level. I am thinking about the informal and formal relationships between the MPs and the general administration and the possibilities of control that exist there. Thinking about the different forms of control between levels of hierarchy in the Parliamentary administration. All the different forms of control inside the “camp” Parliament. Control has already now been the reoccurring theme in all the meetings I have had in this house. I wonder if there is any way to not to be controlled all the time whilst working inside this camp? What struck me was the element of utter control and no control that seem to exist in parallel. Or perhaps the element of control is there all the time but invisible?

27.11.06 Monday
I was told to go in a bit later as it was Monday and so I went in little after 10. The person Mikkonen had told me to find was not there, she was on a holiday but another person came instead. She explained to me what a place in the researcher room entails which is really nothing from my perspective apart from having a desk inside the right building. She also printed out ‘the user instructions’ for me from the internet.

⁶ In Finnish: ”Pääset tänne meidän leirin laidalle”.
She did not seem to know what to do with me. I felt the same way. I did not know what to do with this place or with her and so we chatted in a nice manner for a bit.

We agreed that I will go again next Monday and start going two days a week until Christmas and then after New Year every day. Everyone I met in the Parliament today was very nice and they seemed to know about my work (how, I do not know? gossip?) and they also seemed very welcoming. That felt nice and although I had been disappointed that they only allow me into the library I was still feeling better after my morning visit. It seemed as if it will somehow be possible to do this research after all. It is, however, already clear to me that sitting in there is not sufficient, I need to ask for more. I am not interested in observing the researchers. I am thinking of asking if I could be allowed into meetings upstairs.

12.12.06 Monday
I was in the Parliament today to receive my keys and to sign a contract that starts officially in January. The person I met was very friendly and gave me a tour of the library as well as the key to the room where the assigned desk is. I will receive internet access starting from January and for now will only be visiting there every now and then probably just familiarising myself to the collections and readings. I feel very frustrated about everything.

13.12.06
Going to the Parliament again today to talk to Manager Mikkonen. I am not entirely sure what to say to him, what to ask for. I am thinking I have to ask for more access. The library alone is not enough, does not really help me. I need to ask for more, need to be able to be present in the actual organisation. Maybe I can ask if I could start doing interviews from January onwards?

Just back from the parliament and it went well! He is still reluctant to let me in any more than I am now i.e. in the outskirts of their ‘camp’ but he is still helpful and gives me documents and at least hints that eventually things might work out. It seems that step by step I am approaching my goal. I am very excited. I wrote some notes while talking with Mikkonen and that was good too. The plan is now to read through all the material I can find regarding the administrations strategy and planning and personnel plans and then start interviewing once I am more on the map regarding the history of these things and how everything works. I also received many names, people I should talk to.
Manager Mikkonen has so far said no to all my suggestions for more access, I suggested participating in their management meetings, and he said that it would be pointless as they would simply talk over my head and I would not understand anything. But he did say that I could maybe one time go and see how it is. He also said that I could partake in the strategy meetings, kind of leader training in Haikko if there is something like that coming up. He told me to come and see him if ever I need to and I will be coming and going as much as I can from January onwards. He advises me on some things he thinks I should read. He mentions the induction guide’s for the MPs (only in Finnish), induction timetable (in Finnish) as well as the separate and detailed Governance legislation related to the Parliamentary Administration (Eduskunnan Hallintosääädökset, 2005, in Finnish). He also points towards the Constitution and the clause regarding the Parliament as well as the legislation on the Procedures of the Parliament including the procedures of the Parliamentary administration7 (Eduskunnan kanslian ohjesääntö in Finnish)8. There is also a separate induction book for the administrative side of the organisation-and that is currently being printed – he says I will receive it later [I never did receive it]. I asked for other documents and he said it is possible to get more. I already received the personnel strategy document9 and he says it is modern enough and needs no more fixing. He also tells me they have a very accurate recruiting plan, people are recruited and then trained within the house, no career managers are needed there.

He tells me that the personnel strategy applies to the personnel management only and otherwise there is no strategy. The law is the strategy. He then proceeds to tell me that according to the Montesquieu’s power triangle the Parliamentary administration is located in the law corner of the triangle, as separate from the government as possible and this constitutes their vision and strategy.

He says I should familiarise myself with the previous work done in the organisation as well as the previous work satisfaction survey results. Then I would see how people feel about “stuff” and understand the structures, nobody has analysed the results so he thinks that maybe I could. The average of the state results was 3.3 and the Parliamentary administration got 3.2 last year and 3.3 this year he points

7  http://web.eduskunta.fi/Resource.phx/parliament/relatedinformation/constitution.htx
8  However the Parliamentary Offices annual report in English is available online see: http://web.eduskunta.fi/Resource.phx/parliament/aboutparliament/reports.htx
out. Mikkonen has one potential explanation for the not so great result. He says they have loads of people whom have never been in a ‘real’ job and who have bad tolerance for anything even slightly negative. He then says: we have princesses here, both male and female. I nod and make notes and nod and make notes.

**A mini-ethnography:**
**a morning in the Parliamentary library**

I arrive around 9am just as the doors are being opened by the janitor who takes care of the general lobby. I say good morning and he nods to me. It's always very quiet in the library in the morning, I have noticed that most people studying or doing research there are only arriving around 10am. I enter the lobby and then make my way onwards through to the library towards the researchers room. On my way I nod to the librarian (a woman in her mid 40s) and she nods back. I have been coming here now for about few weeks but nobody seems to pay any attention to me or my being here. There are for example notices saying that bags are not allowed in the library side of the building and yet nobody ever says anything to me even though I tend to come in with at least three bags.

The same applies to everyone here. The place has the same feel as any bigger library. There are people coming and going and the librarian kind of looks through you when you address them. Much in the same manner as people serving in busy cafes or working as sales people in busy shops.

I walk across the library lobby where the lending desks and general computers are. There are also some plants, the windows are in the ceiling. On both sides of this rather spacious room there are more rooms. On the right side are the special librarian’s offices. They are the ones one ought to consult if one wants something special from the closed archives. On the left are the reading rooms for studying. The special librarians offices are like little fish bowls with big glass windows and one can see into them if the curtains are not pulled. The reading rooms are two big spaces full of cubicles and their walls are covered by rows of journals and books that cannot be taken out from the reading rooms. Colours of this space are mostly dark green and dark brown apart from the floor which is white/greyish and the special librarians curtains which are orange.
I enter the researcher’s room that is right in the last left side corner of the general hall. The dark green door is always locked and as the lights are off when I enter, I know (or guess) that I am the first one in. The researcher’s room is a long narrow room with a darkened (one can see out but one cannot see in) window in the end. In the middle of the room there are cubicles that divide the room into roughly 15 individual spaces. The partitions between the cubicles are so high that one cannot see anyone else without making a special effort, even when standing up.

I start reading, sitting in my own cubicle with my own desk light on. The general lights in the room have also been switched on by me so whoever comes next can guess that someone is in. In the door end of the room (near where my place is) there is a noticeboard full of old notices of events that went years ago as well as lists of people who have been sitting in this room years ago. I am looking forward to the new list for this year. So far it has not showed up.

An hour goes by and around 10 o’clock other people start arriving. First one arrives and walks behind me. It’s a male in his 30s and I have seen him before. I turn around to greet him and he nods quickly and walks towards the end of the room. I have no idea where he sits and I try to spy but cannot make out which cubicle is his.

I read on and after a while the next person arrives. She is a blonde woman in her 30s and the only other person I have ever seen there. I greet her but she ignores me. Then a while passes and the person sitting opposite me arrives. I hear him coming in and try to stand up in time to say hello but he is not to be seen. After a while I can hear him sitting down but at this point I feel too awkward to stick my head over the partition so I give up and carry on reading.

I read and read and nothing happens. It’s very quiet. The other people in the room do not make any sounds. I can barely tell they are there and it is not a big space. Perhaps the books surrounding us swallow the noise? I get up a few times and walk to the bathroom crossing the whole big library hall. The librarians ignore me and other people in the space are students checking their email, they ignore me too. In the general lobby (one has to walk across it to get to the ladies room) there sits one janitor who guards the gate to the administrative side of the building (upstairs) and watches who comes and goes. He too ignores me and reads his *Ilta-Sanomat* [a tabloid newspaper in Finland].
I come back from the ladies and go to the “break room” to have coffee. Nobody else is there. In general I have only ever seen people there on the phone. Never two people talking or something like that. Also people going there seem to be mostly people reading in the reading rooms. They seem very young, studying for entrance exams or something like that. I have no idea where my colleague researchers go for their breaks as I only know how two of them look like and those two I have only seen inside the researcher’s room. I don’t know how the other people there look like so I can only guess who they are. That is one my favourite things to do on a break. To try to guess whom all are researchers.

I finish my coffee and go back to the researcher’s room. Nothing happens for the next hour. I can hear the clock on the wall ticking and the silence is almost like noise when you concentrate on it. My main thought is, how is it possible to sit so quietly? I know for a fact that there are four of us in the room, possibly more but I cannot see anyone nor hear them. I can sense them and once someone moves it’s almost like an event on its own.

Around noon people start shifting and it is obvious they are about to go somewhere. One can hear coats being put on and chairs pushed back. I sit as straight backed as I can to try to see them as they pass by my cubicle but I only manage to see the blonde woman leaving. The other person (whoever they are) manages to escape me before I catch a glimpse. Then it’s silence again and I sense there are people left in the room but they don’t seem to be moving or leaving now.

I start packing my books and locking my drawers and try to make some noise to give someone a chance to stick their head up and say hello but nobody does. I put my coat on and make it for the door. As I enter the main library lobby the man in his 30s walks back to the researchers’ room and nods again. I nod back and walk through the library hall, nod to the librarians, they ignore me, and leave the library. I pass the janitor and try to say bye but he hides behind his newspaper and ignores me. I leave the building and start walking towards my own office.

***
This chapter and the following chapters are intensive in terms of data and
detail, and thus for the sake of increased clarity in terms of the purpose of
it all I will here remind the reader of the two main research questions. They
are:

1. What is it like to be a “non-Political employee” within a Parliament, – from
the perspective of people employed within administration; managers; women
and men?

2. What are the specific character and characteristics of the organisational
formal and informal processes and relations within the employed, non-
Political, part of the Parliamentary institution?

Some reflections on the library time

My experiences in the library always seemed somehow surreal. The library is
like libraries generally are and as such there is nothing extra ordinary about
it apart from being behind the house of Parliament and as a part of one of
Parliamentary buildings. The surreal quality of the library time was probably
a consequence of not really knowing what I was supposed to do there. It
just seemed strange to be placed there and I kept looking at my notes from
the meetings with the managers and wondering whether I had not expressed
myself clearly enough. Wondering why had they placed me in the library and
simultaneously, it fit the pattern of the organisations reactions to my wishes.
From day one in the citizens advice centre they had offered me the library,
probably at least partly because that is the place where people conventionally
do research either on or for the Parliament in different ways, as employed
researchers for the Parliament, independent researchers using the library’s
facilities or as students studying for their examinations.

However, there was nobody for me to observe in the library as I was not
only in the library but in the researchers’ room in the library and thus the
only people I could have observed there were the other researchers. I felt out
of place in a different way than I did later on, post-access, in the actual offices.
Thus during the time in the library I was trying hard to make sense of the space
and the people in there and simultaneously feeling very much sidetracked. In
hindsight it was a more interesting period than I ever understood then and one could say that by being sent to the library I experienced first hand the logic of their particular organisational way of dealing and controlling things and people that seem somehow problematic, people who don’t immediately seem to fit in the agenda or the general organisational landscape. Thus I was not shown the door but I was placed at the margins, in a place where I could “do no harm” and at the same time I could not say that I did not get access and thus the all important wishes of the Political part were fulfilled.

There is a similarity in the logic of the solution to place me in the library and the general logic of their ‘disposition\textsuperscript{10}’ culture even if I did not understand or see this at the time. As such this can then also be seen as an example of the organisation displaying some of its ‘social total institution’ qualities. Amongst other things social total institutions are also very much closed worlds where informal, inter-organisational, rules apply.

**The access**

Looking back to this phase it is evident that although I was not where I wanted to be, in the actual offices, I still had already had a few important glimpses of how the Parliamentary administration functions as a workplace. The phase seemed and still seems very long and was marked by growing frustration. The access process is a central part of this phase as that was what I mainly did, or rather what I was mainly able to observe. The phase mainly consists of my meetings with levels of hierarchy and with different managers and their opinions on what I should or should not be doing in the house and where I should be placed.

The access process again reflects and shows the vacuum-like elite nature of the organisation, the power of Politics in the house on both sides of it, as well as the managerial disagreements on what could and could not be done. During the access negotiations I was dealing with individual people from different parts of the organisation either on the phone, via email or face to face. Thus I was not able to see much on how the organisation in general or even any part of it was working from day to day.

\textsuperscript{10} An unofficial procedure where a person is removed from their initial work tasks due to for example an organisational conflict situation, more on this in chapter 5.
Using yet another of Goffman’s conceptual formulations, it can be said that I was only allowed into the ‘front region’ of the organisation and the ‘back region’ of it, i.e. the area where things ‘really’ happen, where the everyday life of the organisation takes place, remained at this point out my reach (Goffman, 1959). This is all the more fitting as in Goffman’s conceptualisation the ‘front’ and ‘back’ regions of social life (or different presentations of oneself as it was) Goffman also brings up the importance of clear boundaries. From the beginning both the organisational boundaries and the control of them were a crucial feature of the organisational life of the Parliamentary administration, both concretely and abstractly. My view of the organisation at this point, however, mainly consists of different individual encounters; I saw the organisation as it was performed especially for me, as I was negotiating my way in through the different layers of hierarchy and bureaucracy.

The weight of the Political part of the organisation

Despite these limitations on my view of the organisation during this first phase the significance of both opinion and wishes of the Political part of the organisation in relation to the informal and formal processes of the organisation was already visible. This was not least because it was initially the Political part that initially made the decision that secured my access. As is to be expected the Political part’s role is central for the organisational workings. It is also the main gatekeeper of the facilities as it holds the highest power to make decisions regarding the administration, this is done via the Office Committee. However, the relationship between the Political and the political seems much more complex and multilayered than I had anticipated, and the full analysis of that relationship is beyond the scope of this work. Serving the MPs and doing it as well and fast as possible is the key goal and task of the organisation and everything else can be said to be secondary. This ethos is evident in all the data gathered from the organisation and present in the manner employees, both managers and non-managers, talk about their work.

Serving the Political part is not only the key task it is also seen as “a natural” fact that this should be the case. The managers do point out that there is a need for more managing but there is still a strong common consensus, made
stronger and reinforced by the naturalising discourse, that it is only natural that, for example, managing of the human resources should take a secondary role to the actual task of the organisation, serving the MPs. For more on this please see chapter five on the interviews.

Academic research on this area reflects and repeats this “natural” relationship in the sense that almost everything written on the Parliaments is from the point of view of Politics, the Politicians or at least on them. Yet the Politicians, even if they work together and are serviced by the administration, are still physically and mentally in the other part of the organisation. Does the fact that the administration mainly has a support function, is a metaphorical and actual ‘back’ region of the Parliament and always acts in the shadow of the Political parts, as all the public sector administrative sections tend to do, mean that it is not or should not be interesting? That it is only natural that this should be the case? I argue that the public sector elite administration in general, but particularly the Parliamentary administration, are all the more interesting because of their peculiar position, ‘the natural’ backseat, the shadow. This position means that there is a level of immunity even invisibility the administration possesses, and that then in addition the position of the Parliament in the society creates an interesting, relatively unexplored space filled with power.

The all important control

Already at this point it seemed that as an institution the Parliamentary administration is rather airtight. Control was a constant theme that arose from even the early discussions. I refer to control here as in control in multiple levels: individuals controlling themselves, controlling others, being controlled by others, by the organisational borders, boundaries and rules as well as seeing the role of the organisation on the whole as those that control the government. Control was a central concept and a source of tension during this phase as during this phase, more than in any other part of the research, there was a direct need for the organisation to control me and this was somehow evident in my every encounter with them. One can also assume that the vacuum-like nature of the organisation works in a manner that intensifies every experience, good and bad, inside the “camp” (an expression used by a manager to describe the organisation in Finnish ‘leiri’).
When discussing a bureaucracy, control is a generally important concept but it is also important in relation to variety of dysfunctions found in variety bureaucracies across the world. There has been a longstanding debate on the ‘unanticipated consequences’ and ‘dysfunctions’ of bureaucracies that has been pointed out by various organisational analysts (March and Simon, 1958; Selznick, 1949; Gouldner, 1954; Merton, 1957). Control is a central element in all of these mainly because rules and divisions are central to the development of these dysfunctions. The constant emphasis on control can create rigid behaviour and defensive routines. Furthermore the division of task and responsibility, i.e. control of them, can lead to departmental goals being elevated above whole system goals. The impersonal rules can lead to the minimal acceptable standards becoming transformed into organisational targets and behavioural norms (Mabey, Salaman and Storey, 1998, p.238).

The borders of the organisation were controlled not only physically but also through discourse. The boundary between the organisation and the others, i.e. the outside world, was repeatedly made visible. One manager described working in the organisation like “sailing alone around the world only we are together in this one boat.” A boat, a camp – these are both limited areas that begin and end clearly, and again one can see the defining features of a ‘social total organisation’ (Hearn and Parkin, 1987). These kind of elite organisations are in general more likely to be clearly controlled in terms of their boundaries and more likely to develop characteristics of total institutions as well as more likely to create a type of vacuum around them (Thedvall, 2007; Annesley and Gains, 2009; Rhodes et al, 2007). And thus people working in them could be seen to display at least some of the similar behavioural models as people living in total institutions do (Goffman, 1961).

The awareness of being apart from the rest of the society is a defining characteristic of all the employees despite of their rank or place in the hierarchy. They, the employees, seem very aware of the status of the Parliament and proud to be working for it and they like to point out the specialness of their organisation. Thus even things that are seen as problematic and complained about can in the next sentence be described as only natural as this is such a special place to work. This duality in relation to the organisation was visible from day one and it became stronger and clearer as I proceeded to get closer to the core of the organisation, “the camp”.
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In the light of the first phase of the fieldwork the Parliamentary administration seems to function like a ‘social total institution’ (Hearn and Parkin, 1987), with high emphasis on different forms and aspects of control and many defining features such as the importance of the Political parts that are seen as “natural”. Thus being a non-Political employee within a Parliament means accepting the natural superiority of the Political parts, the different formal and informal control mechanisms as well the formal and informal hierarchy. It also means being to a degree separate from the surrounding society, special in a particular way, on top of the nation’s cupboard. The possible differences of experience between non-managers, managers and women and men are impossible to determine after this phase but will be evaluated in the following chapters.
5. The fieldwork, being an employee – phase two

Introduction

“I don’t know, the loyalty and capacity should be directed to the legislative process, the staff is only here to take care of the basic tasks, I don’t know how that could be changed”.

The one question one often hears about ethnographic research is, now that you told us this long, and perhaps even rather boring, story then so what? What is the point of all this? This chapter is again about telling the story, and a different phase of it, but also about making sense of it, the themes rising from it, and, how they in turn can be reflected on in relation to the research questions. Through this process I am seeking to answer the ‘so what?’ question. More specifically, the different aspects of managing and management of the Parliamentary administration is the main theme that runs through this phase and this chapter. This is due to the simple fact that I worked closest with the managers and thus they became the natural focus of my attention. My original research idea was to explore what kind of a workplace the Parliament is but the management became the main focus with the fieldwork process shaping the research into what it is.

1 An anonymous manager answers a question on the future possibilities of human resource management in the Parliamentary administration.
This chapter, perhaps more directly than any of the other chapters, seeks to answer the first two research questions as it tells the fragmented story of what it's like to be a “non-Political employee” within a Parliament by reflecting on the research diary, interviews and the two reports. I write what might be called a fragmented story as the different parts of the data give rather different angles into the organisation. The research diary entries can at times seem rather gloomy, even negative. This is probably firstly, mostly because of the organisational problems that existed in the particular department where I worked. The tense situation coloured my working days in the administration and was in a sense present all through my working in there, especially as, I was physically in the middle of it. However, the interviews offer some balancing of the picture as they generally convey a very positive view into how it is to work in this organisation. The survey, i.e. the two reports compiled based on the survey, offers both negative and positive responses about the workplace and working in there.

5.3.07 Monday
I have just returned from the morning meeting in the Parliament and although things look good they are still not unproblematic. As it turns out I have been offered a job but it’s just one of the managers, Makkonen, who has offered it to me, the offer has not yet been run by all the other managers. Thus I might get to do it and then simultaneously, they might just say no.

We had a long meeting this morning with Makkonen and she wants me to design and do the research for their personnel strategy evaluation. She suggests hiring me for three months and probably on hourly rates (so I would keep track of my time etc and it would be more flexible for me). This could all work or not depending on the other managers. So far the plan is only between us. I don’t know what to think about this but I go along with it, I want to be employed in the organisation.

The plan now is that Makkonen writes a memo on this suggestion and sends it onwards and then it’s just wait and see. I can start preliminary planning on what could be done (how the evaluation could be done) but she advises me that there is no point in wasting any big amounts of time on this before we know if it is at all possible. What happens now is simply waiting.
16.03.07
I am now meeting three managers, Makkonen, Mikkonen and Muinonen in the parliament at 11.30 on Monday. We are going for lunch then signing the contract at 13.00. I am not sure whether I could now celebrate or not. So I remain cautious and wait to see what will happen next.

19.03.07
[As arranged] I went in for 11.30 and manager Makkonen picked me up from the library lobby. We then went upstairs together and met manager Muinonen. After that the three of us spent a few minutes talking in Muinonen’s office, we went through my contract details and he asked me a few questions and it was all very nice and ok. This was the first time I met Muinonen and he seems like someone one can get along with.

Then we all went for lunch together and manager Mikkonen joined us for the walk to the cafeteria, he did not, however join us for the lunch. On the way to the cafeteria Mikkonen and Muinonen told a few rather terrible jokes but in general it seemed like the three managers do not have a very good vibe amongst each other. The atmosphere was awkward and it was almost like without me Muinonen and Makkonen would not have been eating together. [Later I then discovered that this all links with the crisis situation within the management and that this is indeed the case. They were not in good terms with each other.]

At lunch me Makkonen and Muinonen sat with a third person whom they knew, at least superficially, it seemed. He was a government official from the Lemon department with 40 years of service behind him. The conversation was very light and social. A few times manager Makkonen brought up things like stress at work and the others seemed very ill at ease. Manager Makkonen seems rather unhappy and the way she is communicating her distress to her colleagues seems heart breaking. I feel awful having to witness it and I have no means of helping her or finding out what is really going on. The situation is, however, very obviously difficult for all parties. It is obvious that there is a lot of history between these people. It is impossible not to notice it whilst eating, spending time with them, even if everyone is being more than polite at least when I am present.

The uncomfortable lunch ended, we returned to the office and it was time for me to have yet another meeting with manager Mikkonen. Manager Makkonen walked me there but did not come in, she went off to another meeting and I went in
alone. Mikkonen met me by the door, asked me in and told me to sit down. It was somehow immediately clear he was not going to sign my contract. He made me read out loud parts of the contract and wanted to know who wrote them and why it was written that way. I could not answer most of his questions as I had not been drafting the document.

He then said that the contract says nothing about lunch benefit and that I should get it. He made his secretary check whether I would get it or not. He then said that he wants to see a research plan before he is willing to sign anything. I said, that whatever he wishes for I am ready to help with it. He said that my contract can start from Monday but he will not sign it until he sees a plan. I said ok. He said: I hope you do not take this in a negative way but this is a way these things should be done, by the book. I could not understand what was going on. It was clear to me that something that I did not understand was happening as I had understood that everything had already been agreed upon. But I agreed to everything and nodded and wondered, there was nothing else I could have done.

The whole time I was being treated like a child. In the end he welcomed me back with a plan and told me to get on with it. I thanked him and walked out feeling baffled. I was then supposed to go and collect my employee card [and I did wonder how that could be done when there was no contract] but as the people in charge of cards were already away I was told to come back on Tuesday morning. I agreed to meet one of the secretaries at 9.25 on Tuesday morning to get my pass.

20.03.07
I met the secretary at 9.25 and we went to get my photo and employee cards. She was friendly and shy and had a very nice manner towards me. I was being as nice as possible. The person in charge of the cards and security was also nice although they were sick. He confessed he had fever and was swearing for having to work. They seemed to know each other well it became obvious in the way they talked. He was firm and short but nice and asked me if I needed a parking space. I said I don’t and then they showed me where bicycles are kept. She also taught me how to stamp myself in. Exciting. Then she walked me out. I will go back tomorrow morning at 9.30 to meet another manager and draft a version of the research plan for Mikkonen. Hopefully he will agree to work on that. This is all very exciting.
I finished writing my research plan for Mikkonen and emailed it over and suddenly it has been accepted by all the three managers. More or less unanimously, or that is how it seems to me. Reality and how things seem to be are, however, two different things in this organisation. That much I have already learned.

The described events illustrate well that the organisation is not only split into the Political and the political. The political i.e. the workplace part, is further split into two. The different formal and informal processes shape the everyday work and things can change rather fast based on something that seems very much like an informal decision. There is a metaphorical front of the organisation with the organisational chart and clear marching order following the law regarding the Parliamentary procedures, very clear hierarchy of issues and people who take care of them. However, there is also the rather strong ‘back’ of the organisation that is open for negotiation provided that one possesses enough social capital and is generally well ‘liked’ within the organisation and thus able to “work the negotiation system”. This also seems to be one of the main sources of the general insecurity and the feeling of lacking organisational information amongst the staff. One never knows how the rules and policies might change and if they will. Very few things within the administrative parts of the organisation are non-changeable and this “flexibility” is explained by the “natural” fact that the organisation needs to be as flexible as possible to be better able to serve and service the Political part. Thus the informal and formal organisational culture are rather different, yet interconnected.

Drafting more research plans

21.03.07

I arrived at 9.25 am and left about 15.00. As I came in the morning I met manager Makkonen. The meeting was good but a bit tricky too as she wanted to discuss her situation in relation to the organisation. I feel great compassion for her, it is clearly a terrible situation to be in. She has many times already said flat out that she is in the end of her tether. What makes it worse is that nobody else has said anything about it (apart from that early brief mentioning of her leave). I am having to balance between genuine human compassion and trying to be objective and work. Ethnography is hard. I wish I could help her but I don’t think I can. She
is aware of this all. She has already said to me that she does not think we should lunch together as she thinks that I should not be seen with her too much, that would hinder my work in the organisation. What can one say to that?

However Makkonen is a professional manager and she pulled herself together in the end and was able to help me. After a brief chat we called in Muinonen to give his views. Muinonen seemed still a bit embarrassed over the previous Monday's events related to Mikkonen not signing my contract. He obviously felt there was a need for explanation for this behaviour and made excuses for Mikkonen saying that it was after all Monday and that Mikkonen must have been on a bad mood due to the recent [Political party] election loss.

Muinonen seemed rather positive about the whole thing, Makkonen was far more negative and she was almost saying that this could end here and now. But Muinonen insisted that this will be just fine and Mikkonen will sign the contract once he receives the plan. We then went over the details of the plan and agreed that I will send them both a version of the research plan and that they will then comment on it and then we hope to send it to Mikkonen soon [i.e. today or tomorrow].

22.03.07 Thursday
I am, finally, right in the heart of things, in my new office in the Parliament. Arrived in the morning as proper people do a little before 9 am. Then I have proceeded to find the masters thesis I need (Stenfors, 2005), get a telephone, and meet a whole bunch of people related to all these things. I got a very warm welcome from the secretary and she has guided me into the world of coffee rules (we all buy a package in turn) and introduced me to a few people on the corridor. Most of the people are super friendly but there was one really grumpy one. I later discovered that she was not happy that I was sitting in the gift room as she works with the gifts and did not know about the arrangement. I am meant to carry the phone around with me at all times. I also went and met Muinonen and now I am just hoping to get the contract signed. It feels pretty awkward to sit here like this. Any minute someone could come in and say that I must go and that I have no work here. Makkonen is not around, at least I haven't seen her and her room is dark. Muinonen seemed friendly and said he would get back to me in no time.

It is rather crowded in these offices and thus the only available room is this “gift room”. I am waiting to get my key for this room as it cannot be left open due to the valuable contents. According to Muinonen I should get my key today. I also
managed to get myself a lunch date with the secretaries as I confessed that I don't know how to get to the cafeteria. One of them immediately offered to take me there with her colleague so they will pick me up soon. That is good as I want to learn the route there. I just received my first piece of mail in the organisation, an internal newsletter called Info, everybody gets it. It says I have been hired and it also tells about this pensioner’s club, a club that everybody who has worked here can join once they become pensioners.

Just back from lunch. I sat with secretaries and two other ladies from our department and everybody seemed friendly and eager to have me here. They told me about their internal exercise classes and said I should join them. Notable point is that I have entered this place right in the middle of post-general election busyness and everybody is more or less rushed off their feet. All the people are busy and the place is buzzing with newness. I will start exercising with the ladies from the department [attending a few yoga and ballet classes with them] and I will also go to the induction events for the new MPs today.

At lunch I told the ladies that since nobody really knows what I am up to in there I would somehow introduce myself, send an email or something like that. They all seemed very happy about this. It seems like openness in terms of organisational activities is not the top most concern in here, people keep saying to me that they don’t know what is going on. Is that true or is it more a feeling, result of the size of the organisation? In any case I told the women at my lunch table that I am writing my PhD on the Parliamentary administration and that I will be happy to tell them more about it all once I have been officially hired. They seemed delighted about that too and happy to help. I realised while talking to them that I will not be able to really work with them ever. My role as an eternal outsider researcher started taking shape in my head. They told me also that this is a hard house to get to know. One woman said she has worked here for two years and still feels like she does not really know what is what. So it seems like an ultimate challenge to find out what the situation will be like in three months. I will do my best. They also pointed out that I need to be able to visit and see all the departments. I will have to meet people from other places and talk to them.

When I returned from the lunch I found the altered version of the research plan from my desk. Muinonen had basically turned the document into numbered points. I still thought it was ok and returned it saying it’s fine. Now just wait and see again.
Busy morning, met Muinonen at 9 and after that have been stuck in the coffee room for over an hour talking to variety of people. Muinonen and I met at 9 and he had about half an hour for me. My main point in meeting him was to discuss the possibility of interviews [he said yes, gave me one name and will think more] we also talked about practicalities emails etc. I should get my keys today and email address by Monday.

Some key events

I will now describe some selected incidents from the time I spent working in the organisation. The stories are selected as they offer different aspects of organisational life as well as illuminate some of the key issues that were topical during my time ‘in’. There are three levels of analysis here: me, specific events, and the organisation. The events are generally speaking rather important for maintaining the different informal relations and processes as they offer ample opportunities for mingling and networking with the colleagues from different departments and sections of the house.

However, before describing these events I need to introduce the more general concept of social capital. From my observations it is clear that, social capital is an important part of the functioning of this organisation. Thus one needs to discuss social capital here and to do that one needs to define how the concept is viewed and defined in this work. Bourdieu differentiates between economic capital, social capital and cultural capital, and his definition is fitting here as it sees social capital as intrinsically instrumental. Bourdieu draws attention to the potential advantages for the possessors of social capital and sees that there are often deliberate attempts to be more sociable in order to build stronger social capital resources. Bourdieu’s definition fits the way social capital is used and utilised in the Parliament. Social capital is thus here seen as “the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalised relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition” (Bourdieu, 1983, p.249).
Social capital and different types of recreational networking are of very high importance in this organisation and thus being liked, and having high quantities of social capital, more generally, become an important structural factor in gaining or losing power internally. Even if the organisation is at least in theory and to a degree (that is debatable) “gender mainstreamed” and has an equality plan, the internal social networks, that are very much a key to political influencing and decision making, are still dominated by men. Thus women’s limited ability to access these networks limits the possibilities of participation they have.

This lack of ability to participate fully could have been said to be visible in the equality survey too: “a large part of the female respondents reports that they cannot control the amount of work they are expected to do or have impact on the kinds of tasks they are expected to do to a degree that they would like to. They also report that they do not receive enough information about new tasks nor internal changes within the organisation. This illustrates structural gender inequality issues that are more difficult to “correct” than clear cases of harassment.” (Niemi 2007b, p.3 see appendix B for the original report in Finnish).
The opening festivities  
of the new Parliamentary season:  
A coffee session and an evening at the Opera  
– becoming an outsider

The tradition of the Finnish Parliament is that whenever a new Parliament is elected its opening is celebrated with a variety of events. Some of these events are open for all the people employed in the House, and some are only open for the people in the Political part and the highest managers of the political part. I started my work in the Parliament just as the new Parliament was starting and through some luck and good timing was able to attend two of these events: the first, a celebratory coffee service in the actual Parliamentary main building is open to everyone working in the Parliament; and the second one, an evening at the Opera to those who are allocated tickets. I received my ticket from a colleague as he could not make it there.

The coffee takes place in the afternoon and I was told the day before that we can all go. However, nobody told me that I was expected to wear black and white [as I then later discovered, is the dress code] and although I was dressed better than normally, I tried to dress rather formally everyday, I was still wearing light blue and dark brown and really stuck out in the crowd. I thus spent most of my time feeling utterly mortified and not being able to fully concentrate on anything else except my wish to flee as soon as possible. The event itself meant luckily mainly standing around in over crowded rooms and halls of the Parliament trying to balance a cup of coffee and spot the President. My colleagues and I wandered around and stood around awkwardly making small talk with each other and after a suitable interval everyone returned to work. I asked repeatedly [in a friendly manner] why nobody had said to me that I should wear black and white clothes for this day but they did not answer. They just kind of laughed it off and said that it is not so serious. They seemed to think that I should have known this, that it was common knowledge. It was, however, also a little serious. I could see people were staring at me during the event and it was obvious they were speculating who the idiot was. I tried to make jokes about how I would not need to introduce myself to anyone now; I would simply have to say that I am the woman who came to the Parliamentary opening coffee wearing dark brown and light blue.
That same evening was the opera and I checked repeatedly what people were wearing there and managed to get the dress code right this time. However, I also came to know just how much of an outsider I was during the opera night as none of my colleagues wanted to have anything to do with me in there. I tried to make small talk with them, hang about them and generally socialise in a pleasant manner but they were not playing along. They kept on disappearing and ignoring me and eventually I just gave up and spent all the intervals hoping I could become invisible, trying to look natural whilst standing alone in the foyer full of people chatting to each other. It was an awful night. I later discovered I had been seated in the part of the audience where the managers and ‘important’ guest sit and could not help but wondering whether my good seat was a source of envy and thus a source of my social pariah status amongst my colleagues? I also later discovered they all went for beers afterwards. It is perhaps needless to add that I was not told about these beers or asked to come along.

Thus both events of the opening festivities were challenging albeit in different ways and they both stand out as the events were I most clearly felt like I was receiving a loud and clear message: you are an outsider. Ordinary working days were not like that at all, although I was far from ‘an insider’ during ordinary days too, people were always much more approachable, very friendly and helpful to me.

A morning in the gift room

One of the interesting and even to a degree humorous aspects of my stay in the organisation was that I was having to stay and work in an office also used and known as the gift room. This meant that I was sitting in a very small office surrounded by the viewing selection of official gifts of the Parliament and it also meant that at any point someone could come in. The ladies working with the gifts (who escorted people in) always knocked before they entered but still, there was always a chance someone could come in. Either one of the people working in charge of the gifts or one of them together with someone else who came to choose a gift for a visitor or trip. A normal day was punctuated by the short visits of the people working in charge of the gifts, it was not so often that someone form another department came to view the gifts as they had
been more or less the same for a longer time and thus people probably knew what the selection was and simply rang to place an order when they needed to take a gift to a trip or for a visitor. The ladies in charge of the gift were very polite and I could see that they tried to stay away, out of my way. In return I tried to be as friendly and invisible as possible, here is an excerpt from my research diary describing one morning in the gift room.

26.3.07
I come to work little before nine and find my office door open and one of the gift ladies inside picking things up. I start taking my coat off and she smiles and says hello and I do the same. She makes a visible effort to leave quickly and soon she rushes out asking me if I want her to close the door. I say it’s ok, I prefer to keep the door open. I sit by desk, start the computer and get to work. I am drafting the questionnaire questions for the survey and thus working by my computer for a bit longer. After switching on the computer I, however, go to get some coffee. On the way to the coffee room I say hello to those colleagues who have their doors open and that look up. There is nobody in the coffee area so I just take some coffee and make my way back to my desk.

A few hours pass by, I am working on the [HR and gender equality] questionnaire and don’t move, and then one of the gift ladies knocks on the door and comes in to tell me that someone is coming to choose a few gifts. I say fine and smile. She smiles back and goes away. I turn back to my work and after a couple of minutes there is another knock on the door and the lady is back, now with the person choosing the gifts. The person does not introduce themselves, they simply smile uncomfortably and then start discussing [in a quiet manner although they do not whisper, thank goodness as that would be really uncomfortable] with the gift lady whether the scarves are nice or not and that perhaps a cd would be a better choice, the conversation continues like this, they are pondering the different scarves. I feel ridiculous and growingly uncomfortable, even if they are clearly not paying any attention to me. They are however standing about 20 cm away from me [the room is very small and thus it is full even if I am in it alone, never mind when three people are in it] and it is virtually impossible to pretend that I’m not there, would not hear every word they say. I am beginning to feel like I should join in, give them my opinion of the scarves and the cd’s. They discuss the pros and cons of the different choices and I sit and try to concentrate, it is not really working. I feel that making a comment on their
conversation would probably make me feel a bit less silly but simultaneously I realise that I should not say anything. That they are taking care of their business and I am simply to shut up as that will make everyone’s life easier. The person cannot seem to be able to make a decision between the scarves and the cd’s and simply stands there trying to decide and discussing the options.

Now the situation is starting to annoy me, does she not realise that I am in fact working here? Or trying to at least. The gift lady clearly does, I know that but she cannot do anything about it, cannot throw out the person and she is just not able to make a decision, it is beginning to get a bit inappropriate. She has already spent a too long time making the decision. The polite thing to do would be to make efficient decisions due to this uncomfortable arrangement. But she does not seem to realise this at all and even the gift lady is feeling uncomfortable now, making comments that make it clear that she thinks there should be a decision now. In the end the person finally decides, takes both scarfs and cd’s and the gift lady ushers them out in a friendly but efficient manner. I feel like I am invisible and to be frank insignificant. Obviously my presence did not bother the person at all, in fact they did not seem to care whether I was there or not and that is fine as it should not as the room is used for both purposes. Simultaneously it would have helped if they would have somehow even acknowledged me or the fact that I am working, by for example apologising for taking so long. I leave for lunch still annoyed about the whole incident but simultaneously I find it and my own reactions very funny, the whole thing could be an excerpt from a comedy show.

The gift room and the unclear situation around the use of it is one example of the many little things that were for different reasons left for the employees to deal with “by their own devices”. The managers seemed unwilling to solve the situation and yet it seemed to be causing endless minor frictions amongst the staff. Nobody was quite sure who was and was not supposed to be in the room and all the people involved with the room seemed to think that they had a claim to it. People did not seem willing to openly discuss the matter, ask the managers or do anything about the situation except be irritated by it, complain about it and then accept it. This kind of behaviour or features, parts of it is, however, rather typical in organisations where there are longstanding problems.
Lack of open discussion on, even minor, things that were seen problematic was definitely a feature of the organisational culture in this organisation. One of my colleagues even pointed this out for me during one afternoon coffee discussion (Research diary 13.3.07), whilst complaining about different practical matters that had been decided upon without discussion or had not been decided upon at all: “I really wish we could all together discuss matters more. Official discussions but also unofficial discussions would be very much needed, about everything, really. This would help so much. We all want to develop a better workplace but for some reason we do not do anything about it”.

Harvey and Albertson have discussed similar types of behaviour and termed it organisational neurosis. They write:

“Organisation neurosis stems from collective dynamics unique to the organisation. Thus, organisation develops social norms and standards, neurotic in character, the breaking of which by individual members results in the application of social pressure to conform. For example, some organisations develop dysfunctional norms mitigating against open discussions of important organisation issues” (Harvey and Albertson, 1971, p.698).

**Seminar on equality planning**

Towards the end of May 2007 time became tighter in terms of planning and executing the two surveys; they needed to go out as soon as possible as people were about to start their holidays. There was a major rush with everything. We, that is, me and the Equality Working group still managed to organise and hold a small one day seminar internally in the Parliament for those interested in equality questions, the forthcoming evaluation survey, and the writing of the new equality plan. We booked two outside speakers for the seminar, and they were Professor Viljanen from University of Turku who specialises in constitutional law and basic rights and human rights questions (he was booked for his constitutional knowledge, I am told that in this house it always important to refer back to the law, then nobody can contest your expertise), and equality consultant Sinikka Mustakallio. I also spoke at the seminar.
The aim of the seminar is to highlight the different aspects of the equality work currently done. Viljanen talks about the legislative aspects, Mustakallio about the concrete equality work in general, and I talk about the evaluation survey that will be conducted [for the full presentation see appendix I]. Very few people turn up, pathetically few one could say given the size of the auditorium. The whole event also has a strangely strained atmosphere but this I have already witnessed to generally be the case in this house when equality is discussed. It feels a bit depressing. People seem reserved and again slightly, collectively paranoid.

Whilst sitting in the half empty, dimly lit auditorium listening to Mustakallio I was thinking about the complaints made by the personnel [in the interviews, in the corridor and coffee conversations] on not receiving enough information on what is going on in the house. Why is the staff complaining about not receiving information about things that are taking place in the house and yet they do not bother turning up when there is an information event regarding something this crucial? Is it a question of lack of time? Lack of interest? The topic being difficult? One can, again, only speculate.

A crisis meeting

As I spent more time in the organisation it slowly became clear to me that the problems some of the managers were talking about in the organisation were in fact impacting on everybody in the department as well as the general atmosphere. As time went on and people started talking more openly to me and also with each other when I was present. Moreover, everybody had their own explanation for the reasons of the process and the inflamed state of affairs. People generally had strong views about the situation and very different ideas as in what had caused it and whose fault ‘it’ really was. What seemed to matter most in terms of the working environment was the fact that the situation had been going on for a very long time and thus had affected the work done or not done within that section of the organisation. There were different views in terms of whose fault was the fact that it had been going on for so long but they all seemed to agree that it had in away become everybody’s problem, people had chosen sides. Manager Makkonen’s point that I should not eat with her nor be seen with her too much started to make more and more sense. I realised that it mattered whom one was seen with as
it was seen as siding with them and she had pointed out that if I was to stay as neutral as possible I should not be seen to spend too much time with her. During my time in the organisation I heard from many different people (also from other departments) of multiple attempts to somehow solve the situation. Some of the attempts were seen to have caused more harm than help but none the less, none of the efforts had so far worked to improve matters.

The issue seemed to split the organisation into two parts, or more specifically sides and everyone seemed either upset or bothered by it. During the time I spent in the organisation there was a very public attempt to solve the situation. The management had hired a consultant to come and settle matters, to hold a crisis meeting. I was allowed to attend the meeting. I was hesitant whether to do so, it seemed like a very sensitive situation and almost did not want to attend even if I knew that I had to. The arrival of the consultant was a definite event and most people were really looking forward to it. There were high hopes that the situation would eventually be solved.

21.05.07

We all sit down in the meeting room that is relatively small and now that more or less everyone’s there it is crowded. I make my way to the corner to be as invisible as possible. The air is already thick and people are opening windows, the atmosphere is very tense. As the consultant arrives she shakes hands with everyone in the room. She has a very “officer like” style, manly handshake and a firm gaze. I find her intimidating.

The different parties of the issue seem nervous. There is clear positioning in terms of who sits where, people choose more carefully than usually it seems.

The highest manager of the offices is not present but the number two is and he opens the events. He states that there have been issues with the working climate and that the consultant is here because of that. The consultant takes over from there.

She says that this is just the beginning and that this event is organised in the name of openness and that she will now tell them what will happen. She starts with confidentiality and stresses that everything that she will be told will remain secret, confidential. She asks whether people are ready and willing to commit to the project and that she wants to meet everyone personally, is everyone willing to come to her office (gives the address) and talk about the situation, one by one. She also says that she has already discussed the situation with two of the managers,
the health and safety supervisor and the workplace doctor.

She then launches into the different types of employees one can find from this office: she mentions the developer of the working community, the developer of the work, the developer of the individual. She brings up the “mobbing accusation” that exists here and points out that it is a serious accusation. She stresses that according to the new laws the supervisor can send an individual to “ability to work evaluation”. She states that a workplace is not a day care place/a care place/treatment place and one has to respect and appreciate other people’s work and the ideas of what they do for work. She then says that there are know-it-alls’ here (who? thinks probably everyone in the room or maybe all the others immediately know who these besserwissers are?) who want to point out that others cannot do something or that they can do everything better.

She then launches into her own conclusions, she says she wants to further provoke the situation and says that she has not heard anything directly. She says that cliques are ok if they are kept up in good spirit, positive way.

“I cannot perform miracles, if you don’t want to change anything, everything will just go on”. At this point the health and safety officer arrives.

The consultant asks everyone, what do you think? Are you going to participate? People answer with a mild yes. Two people say something about the generalities, someone asks about the timetable of the whole thing as summer is just about the begin and that means everything ends in the offices for a few months, she also points out that there have been many attempts to solve this situation. The consultant says that she is tough and that she will get back to this over and over again. She says she has read their work satisfaction reports and thinks that it is time to do something, not just talk about doing something. Another person points out that couple of people who are involved are not present.

The consultant talks again, says that there is need for common rules, what else do you need she asks? Another person asks about time, how long will this take? Consultant answers roughly 3–4 hours, but that lack of time is not an issue that she can sit longer hours, after work if need be. She then talks about her experience of over 30 years and that anonymity is automatic.

One person says that as a workplace they are lacking a joint ability to talk together thus it is so silent in this meeting too, silence speaks for itself. Another points out that there are new people but that the situation has started a long time ago and as a newcomer it is hard to adjust to something like this. Consultant wants
to know when she came and then asks that if someone is still new after 3 years who is old? People [relieved it seems] start talking about the length of their working years in there, one person reports 28 years another one 26 years. Consultant asks another question: who came last? The person is pointed out. Consultant says that new people are good in a sense that they can see more clearly.

I notice that it seems to be perfectly ok for these people that I am there, they seem to be used to me by now and my presence does not seem to evoke any reactions. I feel like I am part of the community but simultaneously somehow partly out, I am glad to see that my presence is ok for them. Still I am very careful to remain quiet and neutral in my corner.

They launch into a discussion of who does what in the organisation, tasks. One person opens windows (air is and has been really thick for a while now) and accidentally breaks a decorative elf (sitting on the windowsill). There starts a discussion on whether the elf is important or not. Consultant ignores the elf conversation and carries on with the mapping of what people do and asks people to put their hands up as she calls tasks. Consultant gives her email address and says people can email her. She then asks is this awkward? One person says yes, another one no, the rest are quiet.

Then one person points out that it is awkward when people don’t talk about things, when they are just silent. The consultant asks why does one of the managers not know what their tasks are? The manager says that their manager does not give them any tasks. Another person jumps in and says that she has only started in the organisation a while ago but that all the time people talk about this situation between the managers. In this situation it seems like one cannot develop ones work and hears odd stories all the time.

Another person jumps in and points out that not everything is bad, that the questions of power and responsibility are difficult and that personal problems get meddled into the workplace problems but that for instance the people she works with are nice and everything is ok but that the problems within this part of the organisation radiate to them too. Still she says not everything is rotten.

The consultant asks a question again: is working here still OK? Someone says yes, one just has to close the door, work and close the door and avoid all the other issues. Is it ok to close the door asks the consultant? Yes, and one has to in here says another person. Another person answers the earlier question and says that work goes on normally but that there is a lot one could develop, a workplace is a place
where one should also like to be and this should be automatic.

The consultant starts talking again and says that one interpretation of this discussion (a not such a nice one) would be that there is not so much work to do when people have time to ‘play all these games’. She then asks whether the work and safety officer is in charge of the work and safety issues for the whole organisation? The answer is yes. Work and safety officer says that it is always a joint action and if something does not work he will try to help.

Consultant asks when the work and safety officer started working in the organisation? She also asks whether he has already been put down? He answers that yes there have been attempts to put him down but that he wont change and that he is already very rooted in this place and that all these people and matters have been present from the beginning.

Consultant asks more questions: Does everyone have their own office? Yes people mutter. Is the ergonomics of the office good? Yes again is the answer. Is the ventilation/air conditioning good? People agree that there is a lot of room for improvement here. Food good? Yes, it is. Wages good? Yes, they all nod in agreement.

Then the consultant asks the two people sitting next to each other what is it that they do in there? They answer and tell that it is mostly serving the MPs. Consultant asks whether training/education is available for everyone working in here? The answer is, yes everyone who wants to, can go, can suggest it themselves. Then the consultant tells that there will, however, be a new saving parliament and the money for education and training will be cut in the 2008 budget. Another person says that during their career this workplace has been the first place where they have been able to develop themselves (for example studying languages, IT, sports) and that they have thoroughly enjoyed it all.

Is there something else asks the consultant? The manager who is present asks whether it would make talking easier if he would leave the room? Another person says that it would make things easier if everyone leaves. I think to myself that this is a perfect example of a remark one should perhaps not make. At least not right here, right now. Even if it is a joke.

When are you on your holidays asks the consultant? She receives the list of holidays. Realises that it is better to start after mid August as that is when everyone is present again, is that ok for a shared session she asks?

The individual sessions she wants to try to start immediately after this statement she announces that the session is over. We all leave.
I go and sit in my room and ponder over the event. It was an attempt to solve everything but it was done in such a manner that one left the room feeling guilty. The consultants style was very much “I take no rubbish” and I guess there is a reason for that but for me it just seemed unpleasant and unnecessarily harsh. There must be another way of solving situations like these? How should one deal with organisational violations? Especially with these people whom are all confessing their willingness to cooperate? Was she there to find a solution or someone to pin it all onto? Somehow I was not sure. It was clear all through that the problem has existed for ages and I do not know enough about it, have not seen all the sides and events to really have an opinion. I just know that things were difficult and inflamed inside that office and that they should be put right for people to be able to work properly. So far nothing had helped and the working community as a whole was suffering from it.

Some reflection on the crisis meeting

The general feel of the crisis meeting was stifled, uneasy and uncomfortable. Then again it was only a beginning for something that was probably going to be a long process. I did not participate any further than that initial meeting and thus I do not know where the process went from there. As an outsider I was mainly honoured for being allowed to participate, that they thought that I could be there, and baffled by the stifled energies in the room. Even the chattiest and liveliest people seemed nervous and quiet. Everyone seemed to be observing each other and speaking seemed to be an enormous effort. It was clearer than ever to me that they really had long standing problems in the organisation. I wished that I could point out all the positive aspects of their working community, to somehow make them feel better. Simultaneously it was clear to me that this was not something that could be easily fixed.

This conflict is at the heart of many of my negative observations. It was ever present in the everyday life of the workplace in varying ways i.e. the atmosphere changed whenever there were new events and it was also obvious that it have been going on long enough to spiral out of everyone’s control. As pointed out before it was also a source of my own paranoia. Some of the informal processes were most certainly taking shape because of the conflict, for example the dealings between certain managers were taken care of in
an informal manner due to their inability to communicate with each other. However, the conflict was also no longer something that could be solved by some skillful, hands on, human resource management. It is, however, more than likely that part of the problem was that no one had done anything about it for a very long time. The intervention was coming too late for the general atmosphere to be recovered at least for it to recover fast. The entire organisational life, together with the organisational underlife was coloured by the conflict and it had taken a shape of its own in the corridors. In this work I have named it the Undertoad.

The underlife and the Undertoad

“The general themes that are seen as crucial and in need of attention in Parliamentary administration are: strategic management, personnel management, fast and efficient reactions to crisis, more open and faster circulation of information, participative management, policies that would cover the whole organisation and create same rules for everybody thus increasing the trust instead of the “maneuvering -culture” (Niemi, 2007a, pp.16-21, translated from Finnish by the author original as an appendix A).

“The Underlife of a Public Institution is concerned with the attachment the inmate is expected to manifest to his iron home and, in detail, with the way in which inmates can introduce some distance between themselves and these expectations” (Goffman, 1961, introduction).

Goffman uses the term underlife as something that can be compared to the underworld of a city, something unofficial, below the surface. The underlife of a total institution consists mainly of different acts by “the inmates”. Primary adjustments are the efforts an inmate makes to conform with the institutions, wishes whereas secondary adjustments are the variety of efforts to avoid doing so. Thus underlife refers to different organisational coping mechanisms featuring particularly in total institutions (Goffman, 1961).

I felt that one notable and re-curring feature of the organisational underlife in this institution at the time was something I have here chosen to call ‘the Undertoad’. The concept of the Undertoad is borrowed from John Irving’s

5 Original in Finnish: junailukulttuuri
novel (Irving, 1978). He uses it as an allegory of strong feeling of dread, one senses that something is wrong and thus feels the presence of “an Undertoad”. The origin of Undertoad in Irving’s book is the word “undertow”: a child is warned not to swim too far as the undertow might be too strong and pull them below. The child uses his imagination and the undertow turns into a fictional ectoplasmic character, lurking under the surface, something to be afraid of. The child, Walt, later dies and the concept Undertoad has also been interpreted as Irving’s allegory for nearness of death, even death itself. Here, however, the concept of Undertoad is used to describe the presence of the feeling of paranoia and dread in the corridors, a type of residue of dysfunctions, organisational issues and perhaps even violation over the years that had not been dealt with. Undertoad is one form of organisational underlife, an informal part of organisational life. It is however not so much an action but rather an atmosphere. Perhaps a result of mutual distrust and consequent dread, a feature of this particular organisations culture. When social capital and being liked are so important and one’s place in the different hierarchies is central the features of underlife become very significant. Those who “belong” more and those who do not become distinct groups and paranoia colours the social interactions.

The feeling of general insecurity was a recurring phenomenon. In some of the interviews that mapped the organisational territory before conducting the surveys it was mentioned more specifically, the interviewees pointed towards general insecurity caused by the lack of clear and shared rules saying that it results into things being decided case by case and according to whim (the maneuvering culture). There was also a lot of complaining about lack of information over different organisational changes and procedures. The perceived problems in internal flows of information figured strongly in the survey and in the mapping interviews. The feeling of lacking information then seemed to translate into a lot of corridor speculation regarding the organisational events and at times to degrees of paranoia.

Thus some days the Undertoad seemed to be more present in the corridors than others. There were days when doors were mostly closed all day long; other days the corridors were buzzing with life, doors open and people were making jokey remarks and bantering, however, the buzzing days were not as many as the closed door days. In hindsight it seems that the Undertoad, the feeling
of general paranoia was mainly and mostly caused by the inflamed situation between certain managers in the administration. Whenever something was happening between them, everyone seemed to be aware of it. Simultaneously it could have been, also and to a degree, my own paranoia. I knew relatively well what was going on and was affected by it too. One can see reading my research diary now that the organisational crisis was getting to me. I too was becoming increasingly paranoid. I had started to feel like I was part of the organisation in some complex manner and was adapting to everything that went around me. There is a possibility that what I then interpreted as general paranoia was indeed there too, at least to a degree, but that my own paranoia was feeding these interpretations. Again one can speculate.

**Silencing: a potential one source of the Undertoad and an example of an organisation violation?**

During my time in the Parliamentary administration I met people who were silenced. They were either on their way to ‘the disposition’ as it was called inside the organisation or ‘there’ already. Placing people into ‘disposition’ meant that these people were removed from their original working duties and placed somewhere else in the organisation to perform a different task, usually rather isolated from the working community. To my knowledge it is not an official procedure (even if it can be found from other public sector organisations in Finland for example from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs), but rather an unofficial way of handling “difficulties” and “difficult” employees. However, it never became entirely clear to me how this procedure works and despite of my repeated questions to a variety of people nobody seemed willing or able to fully explain it to me. Usually when I asked about the procedure and the number of people that had been ‘dispositioned’ I was told that there are some people in ‘disposition’ but not many (the exact amount also remained unclear, I was able to count three separate incidents). These people were mostly described as being somehow socially difficult, unwilling to cooperate but nobody seemed to be able to clarify what exactly had they done to be ‘dispositioned’. However, I was told about the procedure, that it exists, by several different people during my time on the field. The described
problems attached to the ‘dispositioning’ seemed to be rather tangled webs of disagreement. When I asked why those ‘dispositioned’ people were still employed, why could they not be fired I was told that the organisation simply had to avoid scandals at all costs. If people were fired they could go and “tell all” to the media.

One extract from the surveys’ open-ended questions comments on ‘disposition’ and managing of difficulties when asked what the highest management could do to improve the Parliamentary working environment: “… all the work satisfaction survey results on our unit have been negative but the only thing that has happened as a result is that we have had a meeting and the management has said that the door is there you are free to leave and in fact you should leave if you are not happy. The highest management should interfere in these processes and see them through so that there would be other consequences than just threatening to fire people or the generally used punishment of excluding people from the working community and removing their duties from them …”.

The Undertoad, the tension, one could feel around the office was thus not just the crisis situation between the managers but also the general sense of insecurity flaring up. The feeling was more concrete in the department where there was an ongoing crisis situation. There the silencing (Foucault, 1979. p. 27, Hearn, 2004a) of the variety of problems seemed to have reached the point of no return and started working as an organisation violation with its own life, harming the working environment and spreading through the corridors, dividing people into camps and affecting everyone’s work if not directly then indirectly. Silencing as gendered communication took place in many different forms in this organisation. It featured as din i.e. as in spoken meanings and words meant to silences certain parties during lunch or in a coffee room but it also worked in the form of actual silences, certain people not talking to each other, all different forms seemed packed with a variety of multiple level meanings and stories behind them but they also seemed as considerable displays of power (Harlow et al, 1995; Flam, Hearn and Parkin, 2010).

The silencing and silences seemed to work in every level in this organisation. It was sometimes the case that someone was simply silenced in a social situation but also the most powerful people within the organisation did not necessarily ever have to explain, their silence was their privilege. Silencing was visible on all levels, macro, meso and micro and in certain levels some of
the meetings I attended could also be interpreted as bringing people together, letting them congregate in order to silence them, for example the gender equality meeting and the crisis meeting (Hearn and Parkin, 2001). Placing people into ‘disposition’ is also a very aggressive form of silencing via exclusion (Husu, 2001) by removing them from their duties and excluding them from their previous working community. The procedure of ‘disposition’ and the people whom have faced this would require much more investigation.

The departmental meeting

At the end of May the survey questionnaire including both the human resource management and gender equality questions finally was sent out to all employees. In the very last day of May there was the first departmental meeting (since I arrived) that I knew of and I was allowed, even encouraged, to attend. There were eight people in the room when the meeting started. The first thing that came up was the length of the survey; it was considered to be too long. The manager taking the meeting asked questions about the survey and told the attending people about me and the survey and there was detailed feedback on the form of the survey. All this seemed a bit arbitrary given that the survey was already out, but it also seemed that it was important for the people attending to get a chance to comment. Yet it is impossible not to think that there I witnessed and even participated in yet another form of silencing. After the survey was dealt with the meeting proceeded with other matters.

There is question about one job position, one person asks why was the position not advertised. The question is not answered. They proceed with other positions, language courses and the problem of July (it remains unclear to me what is the problem of July). There are other things linked to July, there will be two summer “girls” organising the Lipponen archives (his newspaper cuttings, during July) and someone wants to know how old they are. Someone else wants to know whether it is possible to be in the small dusty room (where the clippings are) for a whole day. Another person is talking on their phone whilst the manager taking the meeting is talking; it is very disturbing.

The July problem turns out to be the closure of the parliamentary restaurants and the consequent other solutions to provide lunch for personnel. There are two
nearby restaurants that have been made available, one can use the parliamentary meal tickets in them too and one has to clock oneself in and out when going to lunch. There will be a reminder on this to the entire staff. Then there is some talk about the decoration that needs to be included in the contract regarding the restaurants and renovation. The parliamentary restaurant in the old main building will be closed during July and the renovations should go fast. The deal regarding the restaurants and arrangements will be signed on the 18th of June. The Governmental auditors (valtiontilintarkastajat in Finnish) will stop existing as of 1.7 and become part of the parliamentary offices budget wise too. This will have impacts on the work done by the personnel secretaries. Also one needs to find out what type of art works do the Governmental auditors have in their offices.

Meeting is moving on to UPJ, what is the update. There is still a lot of unclarity regarding the process one room in the offices is reserved for the UPJ negotiations. Then there is general talk about the induction, there should be only one folder containing everything, there should be a report on everything that did not work, one person is going to training on how to discuss difficult issues at work and is happy to share the information afterwards, two people are attending a course where one is taught good strategies of information management. The meeting takes all together one hour and is quite frantic. Again I am thinking about the complaints of not receiving enough information? Why do they not attend these events when they would receive information? The information events where I have been present have all been half empty.

Below a few excerpts from the open-ended questions of the survey relating to the organisational flows of information:

*  
“One receives information too late and it’s too little. Certain things one has to read from the newspapers. “This is not everybody’s business” –thinking is too wide spread in this house.”

*  
“the basic information is all there, the staff is very service orientated and ready to help; the problems are more on the side that many policies and practicies are based on spoken information.”
Organisational culture in the Parliamentary administration

The particular culture of this organisation in general, as each office then in turn has their own micro version of the macro culture, is a mixture of administrative culture, legislative culture, elite culture and Finnish political culture, further combined with two parallel hierarchies: the Political and the political.

“Governmental policy is, on the one hand, part of politics; therefore it is marked by political symbols and values, distinct from other kinds of policy (Frissen, 1985, p.12). On the other hand, governmental policy is characterised by the institutional context in which it is established, viz. bureaucracy. Thus the symbolism of governmental policy is “determined by the organisational culture of bureaucracy” (Virtanen, 1987, pp.12, 28). Important part of the organisational make up of the Finnish parliamentary administration is an absolute and shared respect for the legislative work done. The legislative work generally takes precedence over everything else and that is both implicit and explicit in the social contracts of this institution. It also serves as one example of the Political parts culture being visible on the non-political parts. The legislative decision-making processes are often kept secret until the very end and this culture of secrecy is visible in all the organisational decision making processes, in all the informal processes and particularly the social processes. ‘Who knows what and when they found out what they do know’ - is a crucial question in terms of power in this organisation.

Bureaucracies are not often described as webs, more often they are seen as clear cut iron cages or something else that gives an image of absolute order and yet that was the exact image that came to mind whilst spending time within this organisation. Social capital and social relations played such a significant role in the workings of this bureaucracy that only the metaphor of a web does justice to the complexity of the internal relations. The culture of Party Politics is one where popularity and different power games linked to personalities, different types of lobbying, official and unofficial deals and networking matter in gaining or losing power. These features of the Political parts of the organisation can be seen, in a toned down version, in the employed parts of too. This is not to say that people working in the employed part of the institution would constantly try to spin things or act according to party Politics but rather that the organisational culture of the employed parts of these institutions has adopted some of the
features typical to the culture of the Political parts. This would also go some way towards explaining the previously mentioned culture of maneuvering. To put it simply, within the employed, non-political parts of the institution it also matters greatly who is your friend and who is not, building and losing alliances plays an important role in the organisational reality and one’s status in the webs of liking is of crucial importance.

It is necessary to point out that this is not specific to Finland; Annesley and Gains point towards the importance of formal and informal process networks and trusting relationships at the heart of the British core executive:

“As Burch and Holiday note, ‘more formal relations within government are underpinned by close informal contacts, friendships and acquaintances’ (1996, 65) and that ‘in all organisations, a substantial amount of business is conducted through such channels. Often, a decision can be shaped or even determined in moments before or after formal meetings, during a chat in the corridor, by telephone, or over lunch’ (pp.65-66) Bevir and Rhodes (2006a) also report on the importance of 1:1’s (one to one) and KIT (Keep in Touch) meetings and their role in ensuring the departmental memory and oiling the trusting relationships necessary for the smooth running of business” (Annesley and Gains, 2008, pp.15-16).

The above described culture is visible in the administration of the Finnish Parliament too and has several implications for managing and working in the organisation. The experience of working in the non-political parts of the Parliament as an employee seems to vary quite significantly depending on one’s position firstly in the official and secondly in the social liking hierarchy. Due to the rather classic gendered segregation of work in the Parliamentary offices the experience is also notably different for women and men and again rather different for managers and non-managers. Most of the managers are still men and the different homosocial (Kanter, 1977; Lipman-Blumen, 1976) forms of networking and socialising seem an important source of power amongst the managers whereas the secretaries and other office employees were mostly and mainly women. As the importance of different informal processes, social status, is central for everything this creates interesting power divisions and perhaps offers one explanation to the question of why the staff continuously feels like they do not receive enough information.
Another extract from the surveys open ended questions, an answer to the question what the highest management could do to improve the working environment: "…remove ‘the favourite people’ system, give equal benefits to people who further educate themselves and stop hiding the fact that some people don’t do their work by secretly giving their undone work to others."
Some reflections on gender, power and personal networks

Below are a few selected comments from the open-ended answers of the survey regarding gender equality in the Parliament (translations by the author):

* “I am a man and the Parliament as a value conservative institution generally treats men better than women. I am, however, also a feminist and as such very bothered by the way particularly young women are treated in this house. Particularly the men from the provinces seem to exist in the previous century when it comes to their manners at work. The way they talk about women and openly stare at their breasts is depressing. Even more serious is the clear belittling of colleagues [other MPs] due to their age or gender. Is there another workplace where a senior colleague can say to their younger colleague that why don’t you just come here and sit on uncles knee? It must be a great feeling to hold your first speech as an MP after that.”

* “Equality problems here are not just about women or their discrimination. In female dominated areas also men can me discriminated against. Men are, however, not that ready to complain about unfair treatment as it is not seen as part of the male role.”

* “Only during the last few years I have bumped into situations where it has been clear that a woman’s opinion is not as important as a man’s. In my previous workplaces I have never encountered this kind of incidents.”

* “The representation of women in the projects, working groups, UPJ⁶-working group and other instances that make decisions (there are little or no women!!!!).”

* “The employees are expected different things based on their gender. I think women work more, are more reliable and do more consistent work than men doing the same work. Men know how to take the work in a more “relaxed” manner.”

---

⁶ The new salary system that was introduced to the whole Finnish public sector.
Annesley and Gains (2008) have displayed the impact and importance of gendering the structures of political institutions. Their research has shown how the role of women and feminist policies within institutions does not depend on one’s individual drive and capabilities alone but rather is a many sided situation where institutional history and structures as well as ability to work them have major impact on outcomes. Their work is about the core executive in the UK, the networks, advisers and civil servants surrounding the government and ministries but the culture they describe applies to the administrative offices described in this thesis. The equality evaluation (Niemi, 2007b) done in the Finnish Parliamentary offices pointed towards structural inequality, i.e. processes and ways of working that act against women, exclude them.

There is a clear lack of sensitivity or interest towards gender in the Finnish Parliamentary administration. Gender is absent from the general discussions in corridors and coffee rooms and when it did come up it was mostly brushed aside as something that was not relevant, we are all equal here. Even in the equality working group meetings there was sometimes a clear air of nonchalance. The gender issues were seen as a non-issue and not very relevant nor interesting. This seems to be a consequence if not a result of what Burch and Holliday have termed a gendered disposition. By gendered disposition they refer to the initial structures of the democratic governance.

Annesley and Gains argue that the gendered disposition then in turn creates a situation that affects women’s (in their case woman ministers’) possibilities of, for example, introducing feminist policy change within these institutions. I wish to add to that argument by stating that this gendered disposition also affects women’s possibilities of career progression and ability to gain power in these types of institutions as well as their working conditions in them. Thus part of the reason why people were for instance not attending the equality seminar in larger numbers could be seen to be the structural resistance towards the whole issue of gender equality - much in the manner of the rest of Finnish society it is considered to be something that is not a problem anymore if it ever was.

Gendered disposition is very much a structural problem with a strong historical background. Thus it does not materialise in one person’s behaviour or one particular style of leadership and as such it is often difficult to pin point. It is a deeply ingrained part of the organisational culture and socialisation process of these institutions and thus something that is not easy or quick to

This type of structural gendered disposition can thus be argued to be the core of the equality related problems that came up in the equality evaluation done in the Finnish Parliamentary offices in 2007 (Niemi, 2007b). Structural inequality is something that is not necessarily easily visible but it shows in the social networks within the Parliament, although it is much more visible on the Political parts of the house. For example only a short while ago it became public that the Finnish male politicians had a secret sauna club, the women MPs did not even know about. However, this thesis argues that although the two parts of the organisation are separate worlds in many ways they are also part of one working organisation thus sharing many organisational features, if not completely then at least to a degree.

**Back to the research questions**

This phase was characterised by more informal being, I was already working but not as hard as during the next phase. This is also the phase during which I spent most time on the actual field, in the workplace. The phase offers rather drastically contrasting angles into the organisation and into the experience of being a non-Political employee within the Parliament. The fieldwork was coloured by the tensions and appearings of the Undertoad and simultaneously the interviews and one on one’s with different representatives of the management (more on them in the next chapter) were providing a very different, positive view of working in this institution. Thus it is safe to say that one answer to the first research question is that the experience of working in the Parliament as an employee varies greatly depending on ones position in the various networks and hierarchies inside the House. One’s experience of the working in the non-Political parts of the Parliament depends greatly on one’s position in the official hierarchy but the weight of the unofficial social hierarchy is great and the particular department together with the actual working tasks also has a great impact. Thus the Parliament includes several different workplaces within one workplace and the experiences seem to range from overtly positive to clearly hostile approaches to the employer.

---

7 What is it like to be a “non-Political employee” within a Parliament? From the perspective of people employed within administration; managers; women and men.
6. Working as an employee, producing reports – phase three

Introduction

As an employee my task was to conduct the survey consisting of the two parts. In the end the human resource management strategy survey was sent to roughly 490 employees. Of them, 229 people answered; thus nearly 50% of the people who work in the Parliamentary administration answered that part of the survey. The equality evaluation survey was sent to 680 people out of whom 320 people answered; thus again nearly 50% of the people responded (see appendix F for the survey questionnaire and the attached letter.) For the official summary of the two reports see end note 1.

Survey responses by the managers

Out of the all the respondents 27 were managers. The highest management together with the middle management (according to a chart made by the administration themselves) consisted at the time of a group of 32 people. Due to the fact that women were so few within the highest and middle management the answers were not divided by gender in order to protect the anonymity of the respondents. In the actual survey there were some questions that were only targeted for the managers and others that were only for the employees. When the managers as a group were asked whether they thought there is a need for development in
the management of the parliament the answers were largely divided. Roughly half of the managers agreed that there is a need for development; 43,8% of the respondents agreed, 43,8% disagreed, and 12,5% could not say. Almost 90% of the management respondents thought that issues related to personnel management were not given too much attention, and almost 70% thought that the managerial performance in terms of personnel management should be evaluated more amongst the management.

When the managers were asked whether they thought that the highest management posts should be changed into temporary positions, 36,4% disagreed, 18,2% could not say, and 45,4% agreed. When asked whether the managers should be rewarded for successful personnel management, 24,3% disagreed, 24,2% could not say and 51,6% agreed. Almost half of the managers that responded (45,4%) agreed with the statement that the management of their unit has changed significantly over the last five years, 27,3% could not say, and 27,3% disagreed. There was also a statement related to the personnel management issues and whether they are often dealt with in their units. To that 48,5% of the managers agreed, 21,1% could not say, and 30,3% disagreed.

When the work of the managing group was evaluated in terms of how often personnel related questions are dealt with 18,8% of the respondents said often, 59,4% could not say and 21,9% disagreed. 68,8% of the managers thought that the recruitment possibilities of their unit are good, 18,8% could not say, and only 12,5% disagreed. The managers also had a positive outlook to the issues related to the retirement of the personnel, over 70% did not see the retiring of the managers as a threat to their units capacity to function, 9,1% could not say, and a mere 15,2% thought it is a threat to their functioning. None of the managers wanted to change their duties and power in relation to their tasks. Over 50% wanted more power in relation to wages and job transfers. When it came to training, holidays, leaves of absence, new personnel and letting go of their staff over 60% of the managers wanted their power to remain the same (Niemi, 2007a).
Survey feedback on the managers/managing from non-managers

In the survey responses regarding the functioning and working of the management, the responses from the non-managers are rather varying. The nearest/immediate managers generally got more positive responses than the highest management on the general questions regarding management. The nearest/immediate managers received positive grades in terms of being supportive and treating their personnel equally and with those grades the Parliamentary immediate managers exceed the grade point average figures of the state administration. The grades on fairness, being supportive of innovativeness, confidential interaction and cooperation are, however, all below the averages of the state administration.

Three-quarters of the respondents reports that they are able to work independently on commonly set goals. Over 60% says their immediate manager is interested in the results of their work and over 50% report that the things agreed with their immediate manager lead to action. Over 50% also say their immediate manager organises enough time for conversations related to work.

Over half of the respondents were also clear on the goals and aims of their own work, feel that their work is suitably challenging and that they have agreed on their goals together with their manager. A clear minority disagrees with these statements and on the question on the goals of one’s work slightly over 20% felt they were not clear on the goals of their own work. Measuring the results of one’s work and through that developing their work seems slightly problematic, however. Almost half of the non-managers feel that the way their work is evaluated at the moment does not support their general development at work.

Giving feedback also seems to be somehow problematic, as 37,4% of the non-managers says they receive positive feedback, 27,4% cannot say, and 35,2% feels they are not receiving enough feedback. Also 18,9% does not receive negative feedback, 33,2% cannot tell, and 47,9% receives negative feedback. Here one can detect an area where some kind of improvement would be called for as the lack of feedback is also mentioned a great deal in the open-ended answers (Niemi, 2007a).
Some 60% of the respondents said that their unit could use some general strengthening of the value base. Over 60% hoped for more pre-emptive measures in relation to the ageing personnel; nearly 90% of the respondents wanted more focus on the capabilities of the personnel; and over 50% thought that there is a need for more career planning development. When the questions were targeted on areas of immediate managing and the impact this has one’s own work, such as wages, transfers between tasks, training, holidays and leave of absence, over 60% of the personnel was of the opinion that their immediate manager had a right level of power in all these aspects apart from wages. In terms of wages almost half of the respondents thought that their immediate manager had the right level of power, and a little under 40% thought that their immediate manager’s power should be increased, roughly 15% of the respondents thought that their immediate manager should have less power in terms of their wages (Niemi, 2007a).

In the end of the part of the survey dealing with management there was a question whether the highest management of the parliament acts in a supportive manner in relation to one’s work and whether it upholds an image of general goals and policies. The grade point average of the answers is below the state average (2,8). Only 5,2% of the respondents said ‘yes’, 40,3% said ‘no’, 31,9% said ‘occasionally’, 17,3% ‘rarely’ and again only 5,2% ‘mostly’. Going through the open ended answers one can also clearly see that the personnel generally reports a need for a more goal aware and tangible approach from the highest management.

To sum up, the survey answers speak in volumes on behalf of more hands on, informative, active human resource management. Particularly the highest management of the house is seen as non-committed to their task as leaders. An extract from the open ended answers of the survey illustrates this: “There is a need for clear managing not just taking care of things.”
On the interviews with the managers

Firstly, it has to be noted that the interviews with the management offered some of the most positive experiences during the time I spent in the Parliament. They were generally very pleasant and interesting experiences and gave a valuable glimpse of life in different parts of the organisation.

As already listed in chapter three all together 36 interviews were conducted during the spring, summer and autumn of 2007. Out of these 17 semi-structured research interviews were conducted during or after the survey with the Parliamentary managers (see appendix J for the questions of the manager interviews). The managers I interviewed during the process were all hoping for more all-encompassing actions and policies such as the strategy document. They were all pointing towards a need for a more united strategic management of the Parliamentary administration. They said there is a need for everybody to have the same training and a need for more cooperation between different departments of the administration, and they also all said that they need more peer support from their colleagues to be better managers. When asked to evaluate their own management style and their colleague’s management styles most of the respondents said that there are very many different styles of management in the house but that the majority of the managers are so-called content managers (experts). All of the respondents also said that the managers of the Parliamentary administration are very committed to the work of the Parliament. The differences then lie in the commitment to the human resources management or whether it is seen important or not (Niemi, 2007a).

The managers largely agreed that the actual human resource management strategy of the Parliament is a good, valuable and useful document. Many of the managers said that they had found it a useful tool for managing (particularly difficult situations) but all of the interviewed managers also said that the practical implementation of the strategy has not been what it should or perhaps could be. Another theme of the interviews was the new wages system (UPJ) that was at the time of the interviews still at preliminary phases, i.e. the evaluations were on the way. The topic of the UPJ was rather controversial as there was a lot of critique that came up in the corridor conversations, surveys open-ended answers and all the interviews. Generally the manner
the evaluations were being done was questioned and it was pointed out in
most of the interviews was that there were no women in the UPJ evaluating
group. The managers I interviewed pointed towards the possibilities the new
system provides in terms of creating a more just and functioning system and a
possible new management tool. Simultaneously the respondents pointed out
that the possible beneficial effects are all dependent on the way the system is
set up. If the set up is not done properly the new system was seen as a real
threat instead of a possibility (Niemi, 2007a).

As one of the interviewees answering the question: What kind of
challenges does UPJ bring to your work? How could that best be supported/
aided? (what kind of HR strategic plans etc.? “UPJ … gives a possibility to have
a discussion with ones own employees on their tasks, positive experience, a tool for
a manager, took a lot of time … [however he then continued]… the next stage is
difficult to understand what can be done as the basic work is done very carefully
and now I am worried about the evaluation groups work, whether they get to the
same end result …”

This quote represents a typical managerial worry in the Parliamentary
administration. The managers were mostly worried over the lack of general
standards, joint cooperation to develop Parliamentary management. There
was a strong consensus that the Parliamentary management needed developing
but also a rather strong consensus that this was not going to be possible in the
present fragmented manner.

Based on the interviews I thus already had an idea that the managers
were generally more satisfied with their work and working conditions. They
also gave rather similar answers and tended to complain only about the lack
of time and possibilities for developing management in general or the human
resources management in their individual departments. From the managerial
perspective the Parliamentary administration seemed largely, from the
beginning, to offer a rather challenging but satisfying work place.

As part of the interviews a SWOT analysis was conducted with all the 17
Parliamentary managers that gave me an interview. The results of this are
summarised in the chart below. The answers were surprisingly consistent,
and there was a rather firm consensus on the state and future of the
organisation. Naturally some of the answers were more positive than others
but on the whole there was a strong consensus that there is a need and room for development of the management techniques and common practices. The themes the managers bring up are the same ones that run through the entire data (Niemi, 2007a).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>The Present Strengths of the PA:</strong></th>
<th><strong>The Present Weaknesses of the PA:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An interesting, stable, safe, valued, valuable workplace on top of the nations cupboard, excellent benefits, colleagues chosen amongst the best of the public sector, economically independent institution, knowledgeable and motivated staff, excellent resources and technical support, further education always supported, work itself is interesting and not always easy but challenging in a good way.</td>
<td>Previously strong cohesion has been ruined by the tumultuous growth of staff numbers, large dispersed organisation, separated offices and all this further diminishes the cohesion, fragmented administration and management applied in an uneven manner, no strategy, unclear management responsibilities, unclear power relations between politicians and government officials, different rules for different parts of organisation, management group is not functioning the way it should, the whole organisation is in a way stuck in the 70's.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>The Future Opportunities of the PA:</strong></th>
<th><strong>The Future Threats of the PA:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The HR strategy and policy are unused opportunities, by taking care of them in a sufficient manner one can achieve anything, the commitment, capabilities, knowledge of the staff and the resources of the organisation are also an unused opportunity, creating shared rules and unpacking of unnecessary bureaucracy, adding democracy when deciding on policies, re-organisation, active task circulation, clearer policies, more flexible task descriptions, management team could also be used much more as a tool when re-organising the organisation.</td>
<td>The age structure is sloping, personnel unsatisfied to the extent that it will soon have impact on the recruitment, the stuffy nature of the organisation will also have impact on the recruitment as the young people will not be interested in the hierarchical 70's style authoritarian managing style, the house is mentally falling apart and the material resources cannot fix that, development is widely resisted and own territories are fiercely protected.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Management training day

As my last task for the organisation (or what was then supposed to be the last task) I was asked to take over one of their two management training days and go over the results of the two surveys done. The organisers wished that in my presentation during the day the focus would particularly be on the survey evaluating the successfulness of their current human resource management strategy. They also wanted me to ask a senior colleague to come and lecture on general issues related to well-being at work versus productivity and then to run a workshop for all the participants together with him (this senior colleague has a “name” as a researcher and is an expert in these areas). I agreed to all this and proceeded with planning and organising.

The day itself went generally well. I was mostly met with a friendly and interested audience consisting of most of the high and middle managers. There were, however, also some openly hostile remarks during the day and especially the less favourable results (from the managers’ perspective) of the two evaluations were immediately openly questioned and belittled by some of the participants. Some representatives of the highest management were also not attending all of the presentations. Both the survey and the interviews with management had already pointed out that the management’s overall dedication to the actual managing tasks were perceived to be very unevenly spread. Some of the managers were deemed very ambitious, hard working and popular amongst their staff, whereas others were renowned for their lack of interest in any kind of managing, lack of people skills or general effort when it comes to managing their individual bureaux.

This unevenness in commitment was visible also during the training day. Some managers took the presented results of the survey very seriously, participated in a focused manner and were eager to discuss even difficult matters amongst themselves as well as with the me and my colleague. Others were openly questioning the validity of the survey and claiming that the existence of any problems in the organisation is indeed very questionable. They made remarks questioning the results and were sure that the result was based on just one or two unhappy people taking their revenge by giving unfavourable answers. They were also eager to point out that the actual task of the Parliament, the legislative work and the organising around that was fulfilled in a very good manner and that whatever the staff wanted was more or less irrelevant as long
as the main task of the organisation was completed in a best possible manner. Below are some examples of typical answers to the question: how would you compare your style as a manager with the other managers in the house, the extracts are selected from the interviews with the managers.

* 
“… we are all experts and previously it was enough [for a manager in the Parliament] to just be an expert, nowadays more management training is needed … the highest management lacks the strategic vision, lack of management, there is a problem that needs to be solved in the highest management.”

* 
“… with part of the managers we share a very strong commitment to our work … but then I can change my mind if reality demands it, politics is not part of my criteria [for decision making] …”

* 
“… people coming from “the outside” have similar ideas … the house is full of very different managers, people, styles, it is difficult to compare … crisis at work are tended to far too late …”

* 
Also during the day it became obvious that whilst some of the managers, that could not stay the whole day and consequently came and went during the day, always made sure to make their excuses thus making it clear to me and my colleague that they still held the event important even if they had go somewhere during it. Others just kept disappearing and reappearing without saying a word. Their behaviour seemed to openly signal at least a level of indifference towards the event and the topics of the day. These were largely the same people that also openly held the opinion that there are more important matters to take care of in the Parliament and that the event and the topics handled during it were not a high priority to them. These types of attitudes amongst some of the managers had been very evident all along during my stay in the organisation.
Mostly the participating managers were, however, interested in developing the organisation and their management tactics in different ways. They saw creating a better strategy for personnel management as well as a general strategy as very important goals in developing the organisation and they also eagerly communicated their interest in these developmental projects to me. Many of them had already made their pro-development and pro-strategic development thinking clear when they were interviewed, as well as off the record, unprompted, just stopping me in the corridors. The managers representing the “pockets of resistance” within the Parliament had also expressed their direct hostility towards me and the research tasks undertaken as well as openly refusing to cooperate. They would, for example, not respond when asked for an interview. Having said that, it is necessary to stress that most of the managers of the different offices of the Parliament were, however, very eager to be interviewed and happy to participate.

Management training day
– group work material

Before the management training day I composed questions for the managers together with my colleague based on the material that had risen from both of the surveys. The managers then, during the group work part of the day, answered these questions in groups. After they had been working on the material in groups we went through their answers all together. Each group had answered two questions. My colleague organized which groups answered which questions and during the unpacking part I acted as a secretary typing up their answers while the colleague was prompting the discussion. Thus I wrote down all the answers the groups gave to the questions. It is also important to point out here that whilst writing down the notes the computer was linked to the screen so that all the participants were able to read what I wrote, whilst they discussed the matters. They were thus able to correct me if they felt that I was recording their answers in a wrong way.

It is important to point out that the members of the groups are not recorded anywhere and the answers have been regrouped, the groups have been numbered randomly and thus none of the individuals can be tracked, and they thus remain anonymised.
**Question one:** The Parliament should improve its performance regarding fair treatment and equality issues: HOW?

**Answer 1.** What does equality mean? The research includes X group of personnel (researcher’s note: seen by the managers as not directly parts of the organisation) and that has an impact on the results, future arrangements in relation to wages system are maybe a possibility to fix the situation? The rules have to be clear and see through and the same for everyone, organising open follow up system is important, there has to be a way to right possible wrongs in the system, each unit should have a meeting that is systematically held as this way there will be a chance to have impact on one’s work and through that the work related well-being, development discussions -> everyone should have a chance to have them/participate.

**Answer 2.** Wide ranging discussion, the validity of the survey, how can the survey act as a basis for the personnel politics when there were not that many people answering the questions, the survey is just one contribution to a conversation that has been on going, the terminology of fair treatment and equality -> subjective experiences, especially fair treatment is very difficult to turn into quantitative results/measure in general. With the help of new wage system (UPJ) one can fix the problems related to equality and fair treatment, during the process one can pay attention to these things (organization X and the example set by them, possibilities).

**Analysis:** This reflects well the general attitudes towards the equality questions and fair treatment they are not seen as very significant and particularly not if they are not clearly quantifiable, measurable. The argument that one heard often was that the problems were merely subjective experiences. Many times negative feedback was interpreted as an individual, singular, subjective experience. The surveys were both seen as not valid sources of information. This is even if they repeated the same themes that had been repeated in every survey and research done in the organisation since 1992. The new wages system (UPJ) was seen as holding a lot of potential for organisational improvements.
* 

**Question two:** The Parliament should improve their performance in terms of openness: HOW?

**Answer 1.** Methodological problem, the survey did not measure the openness as such but people’s perception of the level of openness which means that this too has a subjective side linked to it. We believe in the power of the intranet, in municipalities etc intranet where one can participate in discussions with immediate managers/highest management. Unit meetings, manager/employee discussions, one must create a certain atmosphere of openness to a unit/organization, one must tolerate critique, we thank the manager X (of highest management), he comes to talk to us about the personnel politics of the whole organization X etc. these kinds of policies should be increased, the managers should start visiting different parts of organization, openness will increase.

**Answer 2.** The decision making point of view, two levels, the preparatory level and the level of already made decisions. When it comes to decisions already made the openness works, official documenting etc. Problems mainly when it comes to preparatory work, different level meetings of office managers, entering the units to report on the projects that are being prepared, concrete way to increase openness.

**Analysis:** Again the issue of mere subjective experiences is brought up. Also, however, the secrecy issue, the aspect of organisational life that is often described as natural and unavoidably as it is, i.e. the necessity to keep matters secret whilst they are being prepared, is opened up and there are suggestions how this could be changed.

*
**Question three:** The Parliament should aim to be a model employer in terms of good personnel politics and good treatment of personnel: HOW?

**Answer 1.** Lacking in terms of good personnel politics, in fairness and openness, creating common rules for simple things, electronic surveillance of working hours etc. Amounts of euros, rules + other clear instructions will remove suspicions, there will also have to be information about them, in this house it is difficult to create strict guidelines but it is something we should aim for. New technology, intranet will assist in this.

**Answer 2.** Personnel strategy (existing) just needs to made active and special attention needs to be paid on this, on the level of basic units, in an open manner and with interaction. One needs to know the problems that realisation, mechanisms, the demand of consistent and equality in interaction and solutions, also diversity needs to be taken into consideration, management group could have a directing, analyzing and an aware role.

**Analysis:** One part of the management’s eagerness to develop the management of the house shows here; again the nature of the house is brought up as a hindering factor stopping the creation of commonly applicable policies.

* 

**Question four:** The management practices should be developed towards a more encouraging model: HOW?

**Answer 1.** Not many concrete ideas but we are thinking about best practices policies, how a manager can encourage the working unit when its due, a party after an achievement or something like that, the management needs to actually meet people in units that could have a positive impact, this means activism from bottom up at least to a certain point, the gates of paradise are open also towards outside, sometimes an employee is not in the right place and one should consider best solutions from the point of view of what is in everybody’s interest … .
Answer 2. Two most important things came in the previous answer, the highest management needs to become more active in meeting people in the units: to properly encourage requires being familiar with employee’s work and knowing people, one cannot encourage if one does not know what’s going on, this has to do with everyone in the management, one needs an encouraging management development program tools to encourage.

Analysis: The theme of the Parliament being a paradise-like workplace is brought up here (I heard it in few other instances too) and simultaneously the other theme that is brought up by the management in relation to negative feedback, the possibility to leave. I find this an extremely interesting way of responding to critique by your staff, pointing out that people are free to go if they are not happy. Yet it seems nobody leaves and instead people end up in the disposition.

* 

Question five: Personnel management should be further developed within the Parliament: HOW?

Answer 1. One needs to make sure that the immediate managers of the employees have the required skills for personnel management, a process not ready on one go, requires training, personnel management also requires time, one needs to have it/budget it.

Answer 2. Personnel management: skills, conditions of the contract, necessary requirements for working, the skills of the managers and the support for the managers in their duties, functional personnel management does not exist without skilled managers on every level of the organisation. The responsibility lies in every level of the organisation, all the employees, means are there, development discussions, weekly meetings, openness, training, learning organisation -> creating the kind of culture that all the members of the organisation tolerate critique and know how to give critique. A process, does not happen over night but can be developed.
**Analysis:** If there is one theme that runs through the data on the managers it is their wish for a more unified and mutually supportive managerial work. In general the theme of more common policies, common rules, common practices is notably popular.

***

The atmosphere in the room during the day was not overly positive or constructive but it was not entirely negative either. Somehow the managers all seemed to be on their guard, reserved and to a degree they seemed to be constantly observing the highest management and their possible reactions. The Undertoad seemed to be present too, if only at the furthest corners of the room. It was clear that the situation was not problem free and the problems between different managers and the different sections of the Parliamentary administration were, at least to a degree, visible during this training day too.

After the day was done we had cocktails and snacks in a bar. Most people had, however, left immediately after the day itself was over so there were not that many people left having the cocktails, it was to be frank rather empty. I left with my colleague relatively soon after one drink and it seemed like one should have maybe stayed a bit longer as people were starting to relax and it was obvious they were feeling more eager to talk. However, I felt exhausted and really just wanted to be as far away from there as possible.

When walking out from the venue my colleague turned and to me said: “I never ever thought that kind of managing would even be possible anymore. The whole day was like nothing I have ever seen in my life”. He found the attitudes of the management old fashioned and unacceptable, impossible. He seemed stunned by the atmosphere and the remarks he had heard during the day. It was a relief to me. It almost felt like there was “a witness”. Someone else had seen at least a glimpse of what went on inside the organisation and also thought it was not entirely ok.
Some reflections
and analysis on phase three:
Management, morals and myths

Phase three offered further answers to my research questions as it offered deeper knowledge into the views of the managements and wider knowledge into the views of the non-managers in the form of the survey.

As has been pointed out before, a feature of the Parliamentary administration as a workplace is that certain members of the management, ‘the pockets of resistance’, continuously questioned everything that was done to improve the managerial work within the house. During my stay in the Parliament it was from the beginning obvious that there were “resisting” managers whom had no intention of taking into account what their personnel were communicating to them but rather they were all the time looking for different ways to illustrate how the different surveys done over the years were not valid or that the methods were not right or suitable to show that anything would be wrong in the Parliamentary administration. The group work material illustrates this attitude in various ways but it also shows other kinds of attitudes. There were also managers who do think that there is room for improvement and who are eager to work towards a better system, better management techniques and better organisational culture in relation to personnel management and human resource strategy.

Both the HRM (Human Resource Management) and Equality evaluation reports for the Parliamentary administration received similar kinds of responses from the outset. Within the organisation they seemed to be mostly seen as negative. In both reports, however, it was clearly stated that the problems experienced by the respondents were in fact what could be described as “normal” organisational problems. Thus the negative reactions made me wonder whether people were reacting the way they were due to the perceived “higher status” that this type of elite organisations is seen to possess in the eyes of the people working in them, as well as people outside of them. Does their “higher status” as custodians of national identity mean that these organisations are somehow seen to be “above” normal organisations and thus above “normal” organisational problems? Is revealing any kind of problems within them experienced as a minor insult as it reveals their mere mortal qualities? This is one possible explanation.
Further on, do the alleged “higher morals and values” of any democratic system of governance require that the organisation behind them also has to at least look like it is also on some kind of moral high ground? Even if this is not feasible for any organisation anywhere and thus should be ruled out as unrealistic? Is there some kind of myth related to the moral qualities of Political institutions involved here? This is one of the possible future research topics.

There is a common theme that runs through the data and it seems to be linked to the position of this institution in Finnish society. All the employees, regardless of how unsatisfied they are with their immediate working environment or their managers, say they are proud to be working for the Parliament, that it is an interesting and challenging place to work. In a manner I also got a taste of that. Or rather I can see why people would feel like that. The Parliament has an aura of greatness about it and somehow one feels proud to be part of it. Even I felt it during my temporary visit. I felt honoured to be working there. Why? I really am not sure but I think it links back to the road that cuts across the Hietaniemi cemetery, the national identity, history, nationalism - a bundle of issues that in many ways seemed rather alien to me before this research process.

I have also been thinking back to the language used by the people working in the Parliamentary administration, particularly when they describe their workplace and what is good about it. One could not avoid the image of something “mythical” taking shape in one’s head whilst listening to them. One metaphor that was used a lot by the people I interviewed and talked with during my stay was that working in the Parliament meant that one was positioned “on top of the nations cupboard” (kansakunnan kaapin päällä). By using this metaphor the employees seem to be portraying a mental map where the Parliament is clearly somehow above the rest of the nation. An interesting question regarding the final stages of this research process is whether that particular image or myth of the organization is at danger when evaluation reports like the ones mentioned here reveal something relatively “normal” about the organisation?

Refusing to see the Parliamentary Offices as just a workplace ridden with all the same problems as any organisation, as well as having additional ones stemming from the unique nature of the organisation (the proximity of Politics etc), could also go part of the way towards explaining why the organisational problems that came up in these evaluations are actually in no way new.
Although the Parliamentary administration has not been much researched, there is some previous commissioned (by the Parliament themselves) research on the personnel management of the organisation (Moilanen, 2002) which highlighted similar problems to those found in this research.

In the summary of the report of evaluation of the impacts of the existing HR strategies I write: “... The end result of the evaluation of the impact of HR strategies within the Finnish Parliamentary Offices is simply put that there is nothing wrong with the HR strategy documents of the Parliamentary Offices. The strategy document has opened new discussions and given rise to themes that, according to the personnel, were really not discussed before the strategy document was written. The reasons behind the fact that the document has not had as much impact as it could have are to do solely with the actual implementation of the HR policies and practices. The policies have not been applied to the extent they could have and this in turn has most probably to do with the relatively quick growth of the organization. Large and dispersed organisations are very difficult places for trying to create common policies and more importantly trying to make sure that everybody follows them. Making this happen requires systematic, long term work and more than anything it requires strict coordination between the different parts of the given organisation.” (Niemi 2007a, p. 3, original report in Finnish as an appendix A).

This is meant to point towards organisational issues that could be dealt with by a more effective management team and binding joint decisions. The report lifts up structural issues that are at the core of the organisational problems in the Parliamentary administration. It appeared to me that the results were seen by the management as simultaneously the employees’ fault, and a result of my supposedly poor methods and lack of skills as a researcher. However, this kind of reception is again rather typical when one is doing research that seeks to be both scientific and immediately applicable to concrete situations within the given organisation (Rolin and Kaakuri-Knuuttila, 2006).

So for the remainder of this chapter I also turn my attention to the latter policy and practice aspect of this research with regard to HRM and GE. Both reports are rather clear in stating that the problems experienced in the Parliamentary administration, whether on HRM or GE field, do seem to stem from long term structural problems. On the state of the general equality situation within the Parliamentary offices I wrote in my other report:
“The most central problems related to the gender equality situation within the parliamentary office based on this evaluation were not crude cases of harassment based on gender but rather would seem to be structural and unequal policies and ways of doing things that tend to favour mostly men and have very long traditions. A problem when it comes to this kind of structural inequality are particularly different forms of action and thinking that are not even seen nor thought as creating inequality between men and women. To shed light to these types of procedures and to question them the organisation needs systematic, long term, practice-orientated equality work.” (Niemi 2007b, p.2 original report in Finnish appendix B).

From both these extended excerpts above it should be clear that rather than the problems being solely a result of lack of management they are in fact a result of combination of factors. These include structural issues, a consistent lack of management of anything but the facilitation of the legislative work, very difficult, longstanding problems in personal relationships in the management team, and a consistent and fast growth in size of the organisation. The equality evaluation report also states clearly that harassment is not a major problem in the Parliamentary Offices. This is a rather important “detail” that was later totally ignored, when the press later wrote about the “harassment scandal” of the Parliament.

When one compares the survey results from 2007 with the survey results from 2001 (Moilanen, 2002) one can see that the results have dropped slightly all across the answers. The 2001 survey was conducted as the basis for the existing strategy document and includes many same questions and is thus comparable. In 2001 83 % of the respondents agreed with the statement that the results of one’s work are agreed upon with the manager, in 2007 the corresponding figure is 75 %. In 2001 90 % of respondents said that they know the goals and aims of their own work and in 2007 the corresponding figure is 88 %. In 2001 65 % of the respondents thought their work was suitably challenging and in 2007 the corresponding figure was 64,4 %. Receiving feedback seems to be an area where the situation is more visibly worsened, in 2001 56 % or the respondents reported they receive feedback from their immediate manager when they have performed well and in 2007 the corresponding figure is 37,4 %. In 2001 59 % of the respondents reported that they receive feedback from their immediate manager when they did not perform in the expected manner. In 2007 the corresponding figure was
47.9%. However, the most drastic change is visible in relation to the question whether the measurement of the results ones work helps one to develop in their work. In 2001 26% agreed fully and 2007 12.3% did (Niemi, 2007a).

After analysing both the survey results and the interviews the overall impression is that the Parliamentary Office’s human resource management strategy has not been taken full advantage of. The strategy document itself is a well thought out, carefully put together document and the actual content of it was not criticised in the survey nor in the interviews conducted. The only comment related to the actual strategy document that came up in the variety of survey and interview answers was that it could have even more concrete policies and solutions for conflict situations.

Thus the reasons that the human resource management strategy has not had a more visible effect seem to have more to do with practical implementation of the strategy rather than what is written in the actual strategy document. The reasons for this are according to my research as follows: the general lack of commitment towards the strategy, the general lack of cohesion and togetherness between different departments (due to geographical and work task-related reasons), the nature of the work done within the organisation that includes many special requirements, and the organisational working culture that always sees the legislative work as coming first thus “unavoidably” leaving less time for human resource management. Both the management and the employees share the naturalising discourse on the aspects of work life when discussing the work done in the organisation. It is seen as a “natural” fact that the legislative work takes precedence and thus managing human resources is always of secondary importance.

Similar problems have, according to a variety of different commissioned research results, been present in the Parliamentary Offices at least since 1992. Again it has to be pointed out that the reasons behind these problems are certainly manifold but in the light of the results if this commissioned research one of the main reasons behind the ineffectivity of the human resource management strategy is the fast growth of the Parliamentary Office’s organisation together with the “natural” secondary status of management within the administration.

The organisation of the Parliamentary Offices has grown rapidly in size and the common policies have not been updated enough to keep up with the
growth in a way that would sufficiently meet the requirements. The present large size of the organisation demands a very different kind of strategic and managerial approach than the previously relatively small organisation that worked with tight internal cohesion. No human resource management strategy will reach the optimal effectivity in the administration unless the strategy is activated in a way that ensures that the policies entailed in it are relevant and are binding for everyone who works in the Parliamentary Offices, all the way from the very top to the bottom of hierarchy. Human resource management has to become “naturally” equally important for the management as the main task of the organisation.

This chapter was initially meant to be the official end of the thesis until the events described in the next chapter started and consequently changed the whole shape of the research process and this book creating another, unintended phase.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HR</th>
<th>GE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• General lack of commitment in terms of HRM strategy.</td>
<td>• In terms of the equality related questions and attitudes the atmosphere in the Finnish Parliamentary administration represents in many ways a very typical Finnish workplace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• General disperse nature of the organisation (geographic and task related).</td>
<td>• The equality situation of the Parliamentary Administration is generally seen as rather good and the respondents report that this is due to the general lack of harassment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Nature of the work done it the house and the consequent special circumstances.</td>
<td>• Simultaneously part of the women respondents reports that they are verbally harassed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The working culture of the Parliament that sets (understandably and for necessary reasons) the legislative work and related tasks as top priority.</td>
<td>• Relatively large part of the women respondents also reported that they cannot control the amount of work or the work they do in a manner that they would wish to and that they do not receive the information they would need to in terms of internal changes of new jobs within the organisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of attention towards HR management.</td>
<td>• These responses seem to point towards structural inequalities that are difficult to point out and because of that also difficult to mend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quick growth in size of the Parliamentary Administration.</td>
<td>• To change these types of structures, practices and policies there is a need for systematic, longitudinal equality work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The organisational policies have not followed the pace accordingly.</td>
<td>• To change these types of structures, practices and policies there is a need for systematic, longitudinal equality work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The present organisation would require very different strategic management than the earlier smaller organisation that was largely based on internal cohesion and face to face communications.</td>
<td>• Generally men are clearly more satisfied than women in terms of the equality situation in their units and in the administration as a whole.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The HRM strategy document will not become as effective as it could be before it is adopted as part of the active management. This adoption needs to be conducted in a manner that makes all the policies and practices binding for everybody employed in the Parliamentary Administration, from top to bottom of the hierarchy.</td>
<td>• The responses are very close to the responses given to the equality evaluation that was conducted in 1997.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. The exit – phase four

"The position of the Finnish Parliament as a legislative organ and as an organ that makes the main decisions regarding the state budget creates an atmosphere of untouchability around it. This atmosphere has kept the outsiders at bay, there have not been questions about the way the institution is governed." (An editorial in the leading Finnish newspaper HS 6.4.09 translation by the author)

Introduction to the order of events

• September 2007 Management training day

• Autumn 2007 silence (I’m in Sweden)

• Autumn 2007 approached by Tulva, December 2007, agree to do an interview with them

• February 2008 approached by YLE, a radio interview in Swedish, then morning news in Finnish -> the media attention starts

• February 2008 Approached by HS -> refuse to be interviewed

• February 2008 The ‘naming’ article appears in HS the following Sunday and the alleged harassment scandal really starts.

• March 2008 The parliament gets in touch with me wanting more “figures”. Several Parliamentary managers ring me repeatedly over this matter.

• March 2008 I am contacted by the Speakers secretary to come and meet the Speaker of the House so that I could explain the figures to him but this does not materialise.

• March 2008 I write them a separate report with the figures

• March 2008 I am called into the Parliament to be heard in the committee for work, well-being and equal opportunities. I write another report for them summing up the earlier three reports.
The exit process

The exiting process from the field, from the Parliament officially started in the beginning of September 2007, and it has now, whilst writing this, taken well over two years. This chapter outlines the process as well as the extra work done for the organisation, due to their specific requests, during the process (see appendices E and F for the reports three and four).

As has already been pointed out, the access process was a relatively difficult and long one. In hindsight the access process was far less laborious, emotionally and otherwise too, than the exit process turned out to be. The term exit process is chosen as the exiting process is still not over and complete. In some ways it might not be over until this book is out and the possible reactions of the Parliament have been dealt with. In a way, however, this lengthy process with all its twists and turns can be said to reflect the essence, the very nature of the organisation, the way they cope or rather do not cope with matters, good and bad, or at least the way it looked like to me around the time my official contract ran out in September 2007.

Part of to the Parliamentary office’s organisational being is the sentiment that nobody ever leaves the organisation on their own accord, because they want to. During the time I spent there I heard repeatedly from various employees that “once employed here people never leave” (”kun tänne tullaan töihin täällä pysytään” Research diary: several dates) and thus the relatively short visit during which I was employed there can be seen as breaking one of the unspoken codes of the Parliamentary administration’s organisational culture. Perhaps even in more than one way one could say but that is a matter of opinion.

There are, however, times when I have wondered whether I will ever be rid of the place, whether the institution will ever let go of me and whether I in turn can let go of the institution. This “once employed, forever employed” feature, that seemed to be the case no matter how difficult the workplace might be perceived to be, is something that some of the managers too seemed to find curious. This was demonstrated in the answers of the management training day questions with comments like “if it is so difficult to work here one can always leave … nobody forces anyone to stay here” (“jos täällä on niin vaikeaa olla niin pääseehän täältä pois … ei täällä ketään pakoteta olemaan töissä”).

Thus it perhaps should not be a surprise that it was relatively difficult to leave them, I was even told by few colleagues in a jokey manner that: “… you
will never really leave ... once you have been established here you will always keep on coming back in some shape or form ...” (“... et sinä enää lähde täältä ... nyt kun asetut ja totut niin palaat aina kuitenkin takaisin jossain tehtävissä ...”).

When doing ethnography, it is, however, not just the accessing and exiting that can be demanding. An added and linked complication comes from the relatively high level of mixing with one’s “informants”. This then in turn raises different kinds of issues, for instance, the question of the required level of self-protection. During this exiting process and especially during the most intensive peak of the media attention that will be discussed in more detail below, various ways of protecting me were discussed with my supervisor. There are obviously a number of other qualitative studies where same kind of experiences have been illuminated but for some reason the issue of self-protection during and after conducting the research has not been discussed that much apart from the obviously scarring research fields such as crime-related research. Susan A. Ostrander writes that whilst researching “elites” of different kinds the difficulties in gaining access have been discussed to a great extent “... whereas the difficulties of protecting the research and the researcher have been rarely discussed” (Ostrander, 1995, p.135).

The chapter discusses the different sub-phases of the exit process, leaving behind the field of research. It also discusses the varying degrees of necessary self-protection that were considered, applied and discussed during this research process. Protecting myself, the research and the data in general as well as the anonymity of the informants is something that is still, whilst writing this, dealt with, at least to a degree. Protection has been needed in relation to the media but especially and perhaps more so in relation to the field. This is again in line with the findings in the work of Rhodes et al (2007). They too note the general difficulty of gathering data amongst the elites and the consequent required special procedures.

The process became so complicated in the end that I had to limit my contact with the organisations to the minimum. Limiting the contact was important in order to be able to gain perspective and distance from the organisation seemed instrumental in that. Limited contact became necessary also due to what I experienced as aggressive behaviour of few people within the organisation. I, and more specifically the way my work was reported, was directly blamed for the way the media was dealing with the evaluation reports. These few people
blamed me for the whole media attention, stating that the problems were all
down to the fact that the research was conducted and reported the way it was.
This was not pleasant feedback and it has taken a lot of adjustment from my
part to accept that it was, however, only a rather typical part of the process
of doing research amongst “untouchable” elites and thus should not be taken
personally even if it at the time felt very much so intended.

***

Change of pace

Oddly, my last month, or one could say last months, in the Parliament were
rather eventless. This can be seen to be mostly due to the time of the year. It
was summer and most of the staff were on their holidays and consequently the
office was rather empty. Thus towards the end of the summer I did not sit in the
office that much either but rather chose to write elsewhere. Frantic writing was
required in the end as I was working to finish the two commissioned evaluation
reports (Niemi 2007a, 2007b see appendices A and B) in time. The last weeks
of my stay in the Parliament were thus also in many ways the easiest time spent
in the organisation since the very early days that were spent in “the edge of the
camp”, i.e. in the library. The lack of people present in the offices meant that
there was not so much to observe. I got to focus on one thing at the time and
this seemed very easy; while an almost normal situation during the fieldwork
period was doing at least three or four tasks at once.

Those slow summer weeks were the beginning of the exiting process and
during that time I was able to get some distance from the demands, trials and
tribulations of the workplace. Simultaneously it was challenging and exciting
to write the commissioned reports (Niemi 2007a, 2007b, see appendices A
and B) even if I already had an inclination that I was not going to become
popular by writing them.

My memories of those final days are underlined and overflowing with heat. It
gets extremely hot in that specific part of the Parliamentary offices in the summer
and this is one big reason why writing away from there was a good option for me.
Other memories include stress and writing a lot as well as occasional encounters
with some of the staff whilst doing interviews or having a coffee break. The
staff that was present in the offices during this time were all very supportive as
well as increasingly curious about what the reports would entail and say. They knew what I was working on and that whatever it was it was “about them” and obviously in a way “for them” too. It feels surreal to me that they probably all now have some sort of an opinion or view on the reports, and yet I have never had the chance to talk to any one apart from the management.

The reason why I was able to talk about the results of the evaluation research with the managers was that my final task in the organisation was the previously described training day for the managers where we together, via my presentation and some group work unpacked the main results of the survey.

The media on the alleged sexual harassment in the Parliament

“The relationship between media and politics is intrinsically and unavoidably a tense one. There will never be any kind of sweet harmony. Media’s core task is to reveal and criticise and the core task for politics is to take care of common matters despite of media’s constant following. If both parties take care of their duties in a proper manner, as they should be taken care of, then the tension will always be there” Kalevi Sorsa a long serving MP, party leader and a multiple Prime Minister (Pernaa, Laaksovirta and Lumme, 2007, p. 114).

Sorsa is right. The relationship between the media and the Parliamentary administration seems a bit more vague and complex though. They naturally have to deal with each other as the media for example watches over the Parliamentary accounting on regular bases (for example to see and report how the MP’s funds are administered) but for some reason the channels of information do not seem to be fully open or they are but in a rather selective manner. During the management training day it became evident that the equality evaluation report would require some commenting, and that the Parliament should perhaps somehow take some of the figures up with the media themselves but for some reason they declined to do so. Later on the manager of the Parliament’s Information Department Marjo Timonen even said that in the interview with the HS. She pointed out that they should have taken the responsibility of publishing the results themselves and thus avoid some of the unnecessary aspects of what then became a scandal1 (HS 4.7.2008).

1 See Breit (forthcoming) on defining societal scandal.
Another curiosity regarding this relationship is that there is an extensive list of journalists, the official Parliamentary journalists, accredited to work there. However, none of them noticed neither of the reports until the YLE\(^2\) journalist brought them up. And all the while the reports had been sitting in the Parliament since autumn 2007 and were open, public documents. Why were they not noticed? I do not know. Perhaps the administration of the most important house of the country is not interesting enough? Or was not at the time? Or is interesting only sporadically when the political side offers no immediate news? Again one can only speculate, I have no way of answering these questions.

During autumn 2007 I was analysing my data and researching in Sweden, and whilst away was contacted by a journalist from a feminist magazine Tulva. They had learned about the research I had done and wanted to do an interview. I redirected them towards one of the managers of the Parliament and asked them to at least be interviewed first. Finally, it was agreed that I would do an interview with them a little before Christmas. During the interview I was uncomfortable. I also insisted on reading the article before they publish it. This was done and some changes were made but the journalist never took the changes into consideration nor did she ever even send the magazine to me. None the less the story eventually published was more or less acceptable to me. Once it came out, however, a whole host of other things had taken place and everything had changed thus making the article look very different. It is, however, perhaps suitable and only fair to note here that the journalist of Tulva was the first journalist to contact me. Even if the Tulva article too brought up the harassment themes it did have a more general focus on the Parliamentary equality situation (Tulva 1, 2008).

I had returned from Sweden just before Christmas and not heard from the Parliament for a while. I was not expecting to hear from them either. The plan was to write and work on the manuscript all spring long. Then in February 2008 came the phone call that changed the nature of this exiting process. A reporter had “found” (both of the reports are public documents due to the fact that they have been filed in through the official registry) one of the evaluation reports written for the organisation and wanted to interview me on the subject. As the journalist was a representative of the national broadcasting

\(^2\) Finnish National Broadcasting Company Yleisradio.
company (YLE) it seemed reasonable at the time to comment and I agreed to an interview. I was not entirely happy with the way the questions were as in the initial communications I had repeatedly stressed that the sexual harassment was not a major theme as it was not the most serious inequality point of the Parliamentary administration but rather wage and structural inequality are. However, the journalist chose to largely ignore this point and as it turned out this was just a beginning of what was to come. After that interview one more interview was done with the morning news on television, again the national broadcasting company (YLE) but this time in Finnish. In comparison I was very happy with their questions and the way that interview came out.

After the interview for the television I went to have breakfast and tried to avoid televisions. As I was teaching for the whole morning I had my phone switched off until lunch. When the teaching was done I started my way towards the train station in the thickening snowfall and rang my supervisor. He was not happy that I had not contacted him earlier, especially as we had discussed the Tulva interview rather thoroughly before my agreeing to do it, and also was clearly worried that something was said or done that was not a good idea. He also insisted I would not comment anymore, certainly not without discussing it first. I agreed as it did not seem to be my place to say anything more about the reports and thus I started saying “no” to the journalists. All the way from Vaasa (west coast of Finland where I had been teaching) to Helsinki I answered my telephone and politely refused the journalists redirecting them to one of the Parliamentary managers, the chair of the equality committee.

Most of the journalists I spoke to that day were very nice and polite but some became openly hostile and aggressive after I said that I would no longer comment. They tried to pressure me into giving an interview and implied that the Parliamentary management had perhaps told me not to comment. I want to make it clear that I had nor have not at any point received any kind of advice from anyone in the Finnish Parliament regarding how I ought to behave, comment or not comment - neither in positive (guidance) sense nor negative (forbidding) sense. All further comments had to be saved for this book, as any further dissection of the matters in the press back then would not only have been out of my control (as things already were, as it turned out) but could have jeopardised this research. In hindsight not commenting was the right solution.
After the interviews the matter started to live a life of its own within the media and in many ways it seems it spun out of everybody’s control. The media focus was almost solely on the alleged harassment cases and the issues that the report depicts as the most serious ones did not receive much attention at all. (see appendix B for the report). Below is one excerpt from the very beginning of the equality report summing up the general situation of the Parliament. It is perhaps not remarkable that this was completely bypassed in the midst of the media hype. None the less, it is rather interesting that the issues listed below as problematic as well as the issue of wages discussed in detail in the report were more or less ignored. Here is an example from the report that does not correspond much with the headlines written on the topic.

“Based on this evaluation it seems like the Parliament is a very typical Finnish workplace when it comes to their attitudes and values related to gender equality. Many Finnish workplaces hold that they have a rather good situation in terms of gender equality if they do not have gross cases of sexual harassment (Mustakallio and Saari, 2002). Within the Parliament the gender equality situation is seen as generally good and large part of the respondents say this is because of the general lack of harassment” (Niemi 2007b, p.3 see appendix B for the original report in Finnish).

The media scandal started many good and useful public debates, and it also shed light to many issues that had not been discussed to that extent in Finland and in public before. The societal value of it all seems thus clear and despite the many misquotations of the reports and their contents I am still of the opinion that it was, in the end more a good than bad. However, there are a few things that occurred during these media debates that I do not approve at all and of those the most important one is the publication of the anonymous accusations of harassment by the HS. Everything else aside, the publication of those names given to the journalist by anonymous sources placed me in an impossible position. It started the speculations whether the names in fact came from me and whether I was the anonymous source. This did not only give a very twisted image of the ethics of this research and me as a researcher but it also led the attention towards a very typical Finnish way of dealing with any difficult issues, i.e. hunting for the guilty parties instead of trying to work out long term solutions. Let it thus be noted here that I do not approve of this type of witch-hunt journalism.
The reporting in the leading Finnish newspaper, HS during Spring 2008

Writing about the media and the attention around the equality evaluation has been hard for me and I spent the entire spring 2008 trying to write these parts of my thesis. I could not bring myself to properly read the different stories produced on the matter and thus I was not able to write the section dealing with the media. Now whilst writing this (initially August 2008 and then revised subsequently) it is apparent to me that I could not and should not have written this part any earlier. There are elements in ethnography that require time to digest and one simply has to allow for it. In any future ethnographic research that I will conduct I will most definitely add an extra six months for general digesting purposes. Time creates distance, gives perspective, and lets something that felt so personal to become more distant; thus everything receives a place that is more in proportion to the general picture.

Whilst looking at the articles that were published on the two evaluation reports one can see certain patterns immediately. The news written about the equality evaluation focused from the beginning on talking about the number of people who had been experiencing harassment, sexual or other kind, within the Parliament. All the other equality issues were more or less ignored in these stories. I have gathered the headlines of the topic in HS from the breaking of the news until July 2008 and will here offer a translated summary of them in the order that they came out as well as reflect on how the content of them.

On the 25th January 2007 HS, had a headline stating that women in the Parliament have experienced sexual harassment [original headline in Finnish: “Eduskunnan naiset kokeneet seksuaalista häirintää”]. The article does not mention any other aspects of the equality evaluation apart from mentioning about the culture being old fashioned and male-orientated (a direct quote from the evaluation report). It focuses solely on the harassment section of the evaluation.

The following day brought yet another headline on harassment, now the statement is that it is difficult to improve the situation in the Parliament when it comes to sexual harassment due to the hierarchical nature of the house. In the same newspaper there is another headline about harassment, pointing
out that there have been headlines about physical harassment before this too [Kähminnät otsikoissa ennenkin]. Now none of this is wrong but why is this the only thing that is taken up? Why does the press remain silent regarding the wage differences between men and women in the Parliament?

On Sunday 27th January the article that is the turning point of the events is published. The article lists names of alleged harassers that the journalist has received anonymously the headline states simply sexual harassment [Seksuaalista häirintää]. Again there is no mentioning of the other equality problems mentioned in the report. I am beginning to wonder whether there is a reason for that. Is it perhaps easier for everyone involved to deal with a clear cut issue of sexual harassment that could be seen as “exceptional” and between particular individuals, and that could also be swiftly solved and removed by finding the guilty parties? It would be far more uncomfortable and in the long run more labourome to admit that yes, in Finland women are paid less than men and this happens in the heart of the democratic system too where there are also still women who do not have the structural equality needed to gain control over one’s own work (Niemi, 2007b). Harassment as a problem seems to something that is easier to deal with. It is without a doubt bad, one can always condemn it but one can also treat it as an individual problem and implement showcase programmes to deal with it. Dealing with unequal wages or structural inequality requires money and shifting power relationships.

On the 29th January the theme continues as Minister Wallin’s (Minister of Culture and Sport) comments are the headline of the day. He has stated that there is to be zero tolerance for harassment [Wallin: ahdistelulle nollatoleranssi]. Again valuable and important points are made regarding harassment but none of the other issues are mentioned. That same day the equality ombudsman states that the equality law does not bind the MP’s as they are not officially employed by the Parliament [Tasa-arvovaltuutettu: Tasa-arvolaki ei koske kansanedustajia]. The article continues with her statement that an MP can only be sued if the harassment is so bad that it can be considered a crime –interesting that these are the laws made in the Parliament. Another article in the same day’s paper goes through the Sundays naming article (written by the same journalist as on Sunday) and states that the MP’s behaving badly need to be exposed. The headline of the story is: the nameless and named [Nimettömät ja nimetyt].
The next day the paper contains the same themes: sexual harassment and whether or not the guilty parties should be exposed. Different people representing the female sections of the political parties have commented on the matter and they have mostly been against naming the harassers [Puolueiden naisjärjestöjen johtajat vierastavat seksihäirikköjen ilmiantamista]. The editorial of the same day’s newspaper states that the survey asked not to name names and that the responses did not include any names. It also takes up, the first time since the first headlines, some of the other themes of the equality report. The wages are mentioned for the first time and the title of the editorial is: revolting news from the Parliament [Vastenmielisiä uutisia eduskunnasta].

The following day, the 31st January, brings a column on the harassment scandal. There is a mentioning that there are other equality-related issues in the Parliament (apart from harassment) but then the focus is back on the harassment and how it could be linked to the different cultures the middle aged men from the countryside and the young women from the cities have. The same day’s paper also includes headlines on how some of the female MP’s want the equality law to bind the MP’s too; again the article talks only about the harassment. A criminal law professor writes that day in the opinion section that in his view it is the Parliament’s duty under the equality law to make sure nobody is harassed whilst working in there, whether they are an MP or not.

On 1st February 2008 another editorial gives an overview of the reactions to the research reports from the provincial newspapers and the positive news is that this time the focus is more about the politics still being a men’s world. Then the following day there is an article where Heidi Hautala3 says the Parliament has to deal with their equality problems on their own. The law will not be changed for this. Hautala brings up other aspects of equality (unequal policies etc) but the article ends with reference to harassment again.

The day after that there is an article on how the Women of Lappland will teach the men behave (Tomerat lappilaisnaiset opettavat miehet käyttäytymään). Interviews done up north and its bringing up the issue of different cultures again, how things can be misunderstood. The next day there is an article referring to the main Swedish speaking newspaper in Finland

---

3 A Finnish Politician, ex-MP and MEP and a previous chair of the Green Party.
Hufvudstadsbladet (HBL) and points out that it writes about men receiving better salaries than women in the parliament. The article also mentions that the managerial positions have more men than women in them.

Then on the 5th February there is an article on harassment again. This time about the monitoring efforts taking place inside the Parliament. According to the article, they are monitoring whether new cases have emerged since the survey. Reading this I could not help but thinking that the whole thing is getting out of hand on every level. The article includes sentences on male MP’s having tears in their eyes because of harassment allegations. It also includes the Speaker of the House stressing that this will not and cannot continue.

The very same days paper also includes a piece of news on one of the MPs named in the newspaper whom has taken the matter to the police. The same day’s paper also includes a recreational quiz where one of the questions this time is how many of the women working in the Parliament (whom answered the survey questions) have experienced disturbing sexual harassment. The possible choices are half, third, quarter, fifth.

There is a few days pause and then on the 7th February 2008 an article on another MP whom has complained to the Council of Mass Media in Finland (CMM). The article is speculating whether HS made a mistake or not by publishing the anonymous accusations. The same day’s paper’s television pages mention a programme that will consist of a debate over the harassment scandal started by the HS article. The following day (8.2.2008) the day’s harassment headline is that there have not been new cases of harassment in the parliament according to the parliamentary groups and the Speaker and that one of the leaders of the parliamentary groups MP Kalli wants to clear the reputation of those MPs accused of harassment. Again there is no mentioning of any of the other equality issues. The paper also includes another article discussing the matter where the writer is condemning the harassment and sees the treatment of the matter at the societal level as an indication of the equality train moving backwards in Finland.

Again a few days break and then on the 10th February an article discussing the difficult relationship between the MPs assistants, the MPs and the government officials. No mentioning of the harassment or equality, even if the article does bring up the extremely hierarchical nature of the Parliament and points out that this is visible in the relationship between MP’s and their
assistants. The same day’s paper contain also an article where the Secretary General of the house, Mr Tiitinen states that the harassment issue was blown out of proportion in the media. He has made these comments in the regular Saturday television program dealing with politics (Lauantaiseura). Tiitinen also brings up the MPs assistants and says that their arrival can have changed the situation for the worse when it comes to harassment. The following day (11.2.2008) there is a strange “jokey” column purely on the harassment issue.

On Valentine’s day (2008) there is an article on how again one of the MPs named in the original “naming” article in HS has filed a complaint to the Council of Mass Media in Finland (CMM) regarding the harassment accusations.

On 20th February 2008 there is a piece in the Opinions section: Two MPs and a city council member write about the inequality of the wages as well as the structural inequality. They call for more attention to these matters and say that the Parliament should be able to guide the way for the rest of the nation.

After a few day’s pause on the 23rd February 2008 the Parliament is in the headlines again, but this time it is about the administrative failures in the house. A journalist has found a consultant report that states that the Administrative office does not have a clear strategy. The sharpest critique is directed to the three leading government officials. The same day’s paper has yet another report of an MP filing a complaint about the harassment allegations.

The next day, the 24th February 2008 the Secretary General of Parliament, Mr Tiitinen has commented on the critique of the previous day, saying that it is all based on “I think/feel opinions” (mutu in Finnish). He does not think that the administration needs anything specific to be done about it and points out several organisational changes over the years. The administrative manager Mr Ahonen has also commented on the critique and has a slightly different opinion. He says that the consultant’s view is not a surprise (nor should it be as I and many researchers before me had reported the same thing) and that there is a clear need for development. The chairman of the working group developing the administration, the Speaker of the House, Sauli Niinistö, comments that fast growing organisations may lag behind on their organisational features. Niinistö says that the parts of the Parliament producing administrative services should not look any different than any other

---

4 A longstanding conservative politician, a member on National Coalition party in Finland.
similar organisations. He also states that the goal is that the parliament would set an example for the rest of the nation as “an ideal machine”. The working group is finishing their work soon and the goal is that the new policies would be in action and implemented in the beginning of 2009. One of Niinistö’s goals is that there would be “a firewall” between the law-related work and the administration to avoid “over servicing” as nowadays a government official is helpless when an MP tugs your sleeve and wants something, Niinistö says. The article also stated that the chairs of the parliamentary groups were happy with the reorganisation plans.

Again a few days without Parliament related reporting and then on the 26th February another article: the Parliament has known for years that it has problems with its administration states the headline. The article more or less summarises my other evaluation report starting from the fact that the parliamentary administration has known for years that it has problems. It quotes me word for word and tells (and this is news for me too) that the research report written by me (Niemi, 2007b) is part of the material used (alongside with the consultancy report) by the parliamentary working group that is now further developing the administration. The article also uses my quotes from the report pointing towards the personnel political problems in the parliamentary administration.

On the 28th February 2008 there is an article again about the administrative problems of the Parliament but this time its coming from the angle that there are two different views on whether the parliamentary administration needs fixing or not. The battle is Mr Tiitinen (not) against Mr Niinistö (yes). The article states that Mr Niinistö’s presidential campaign has already started and part of it is to show a heavy hand to the Parliamentary administration. The same day’s paper has a column-type article stating the obvious problem, the duality of the parliament and the fact that the administration is continuously overlooked because the other side of the house is seen as so much more important. There is even a third article on the Parliament and its administration in the same day’s paper and this one is headlined: “the Parliament will immediately start developing its administration”. How this will be done in practice or what exactly it means is not completely clear yet but they will start with the MP’s assistants and their wages. The speaker was reassuring that although things will change, nothing will be turned “up side down”.
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On 2nd March 2008 the newspaper still continues on the administrative renewal of the Parliament and continues polarising the two men, Niinistö versus Tiitinen. The journalist is of the opinion that administrative reform will either rise or fall with Niinistö and the pressures are high. Niinistö is also seen to be campaigning for presidency already now and thus has extra pressures, and cannot fail, according to the journalist. The same day’s newspaper also again reviews the different opinions expressed in the regional newspapers. Keskisuomalainen (Central Finn) has published strong views on the need for a spring clean in the administration criticizing the current system and calling for limited periods of office for the leading government officials. Savon Sanomat (The Savo Messenger) also thinks that it is time to renew the system and that it is good that Niinistö has started it. Kaleva (A north-based newspaper, name does not translate) repeats the point that the difficulties are something that the Parliament has been aware of for a while now.

The next piece comes on 7th March 2008 and it is on the MPs’ assistants contracts, they will be published in the internet from summer onwards. This is a way to increase public control on how the money is spent. This is part of the beginning of the renewal of the assistant system; another part is that these kinds of contracts cannot be done anymore after this. In the future all the MPs assistants will be hired and paid a salary by the Parliament. The Chancellery Committee made these decisions as well as deciding that the development programme for the administration will continue under the supervision of a big steering group, the chancellery committee with its substitute members i.e. the work is supervised by 11 people.

On the following day 8th March 2008 it is reported that another MP, Lintilä, has also complained to the CMM (Council of Mass Media) regarding the HS article on harassment in the Parliament. CMM has now also received a file of complaint from: MPs Esa Lahtela (Social Democrat), Tero Rönni (Social Democrat) and Pekka Vilkuna (Centre).

On the 11th March 2008 there is again a story that now a fifth complaint on the harassment article has been filed, MP Mäkinen (National Coalition, conservative) has also filed a complaint to the CMM regarding the same article in the HS. This means that all the seven MPs mentioned in the orginal naming article have now taken action. Lintilä, Vilkuna, Lahtela, Mäkinen and Rönni have all filed a complaint to CMM. CMM will process the case
next week. On top of this MPs Rajala and Oinonen have asked the police to investigate the matter further. MPs all claim that their reputation has been stained without any real evidence.

On the 17th March 2008 there is an article about Minna Canth’s day5 and on what has happened regarding equality lately in Finland (an interview with Tuulikki Petäjäniemi6). The article takes up the matter of harassment like this: “What does the text message scandal7 ... and the sexual harassment incidents in the Parliament tell about the present state of equality in Finland? It is really good that sexual harassment has been brought up that it is now discussed. The law states that it is not allowed and this time it looks like the law has changed before the attitudes. Usually it is the other way round.”

There are long detailed articles on the 20th March 2008 on the CMM versus HS case. CMM has given its verdict and it says that HS has broken the ethical code of journalism when it comes to cases of: Lahtela, Rönni, Lintilä and Mäkinen. On Vilkuna’s case the paper is not responsible.

A few days later, 22nd March 2008 there is another review of the regional newspapers in the editorial and this time it is regarding their reactions to the CMM decisions. They all seem to be more or less in agreement that the decision to condemn HS was a right one even if it is necessary to keep on “watching the powerful elite”

The Sunday pages published on the 30th March 2008 include quotes from other newspapers and also quote stand-up comedian, journalist and Politician Lotta Backlund8. “The confusing thing about the debate was how the MPs and others reacted to the results. Women, whom had been harassed were quickly labeled as having no sense of humour and being simply complaining bitches. This regardless of the fact that in four out of ten cases the harassment had come from a male MP and given that they are roughly 100 out of the 1000 people working in the Parliament the number is high.”

On 5th April 2008 there is an article on MP Vilkuna again, he has filed another complaint and this time to the police regarding a television program

---

5 A day celebrating equality named after the famous Finnish woman Minna Canth who was working for and towards women’s emancipation.
6 An previous MP who has, amongst other things, held the post of an equality ombudsman.
7 The Finnish Minister of Foreign Affairs, Ilkka Kanerva had to resign after sending suggestive text messages to an erotic dancer and lying about it to the press. See: http://www.spiegel.de/international/world/0,1518,544755,00.html
8 Backlund has worked as an MPs assistant and written about the Parliament before.
called Ajankoihtainen Kakkonen (he was interviewed there live in January). The HS does not know what it is exactly about as Vilkuna will not talk to HS anymore.

On the 11th April 2008 there is a story on the harassment case (now with the police) as it has now progressed so that the police maybe prosecuting some of the HS managers (as they made the decision that the naming article will be published).

The following day 12th April 2008 the journalist Saska Snellman is writing about Watergate and pondering whether the time of anonymous sources is over. He states that they should be used only in very exceptional cases. He writes that if people do not trust the media anymore then the time of anonymous sources really is over.

The day after that 13th April 2008 there is again an article about the previous Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr Kanerva, and the textmessage scandal. The article states that the time was ripe for this to happen, all the more so as the alleged harassment scandal in the Parliament and the Prime Minister’s text messages9 gave context for the Kanerva case.

On 25th April 2008 there is an article announcing that the management of the Parliament will receive training to end harassment. There will be training offered in the Parliament on how to recognize and stop sexual and gender harassment. The parliament will also receive guidelines on how to act in a harassment situation. These guidelines have, however, existed in the Parliament before. Both the training and the guidelines are parts of the equality plan for years 2008-2011. The plan was in the Commission committe but was not fully accepted yet. There is still material regarding the wages that needs to be added and the plan should be accepted in two weeks time. The aims of the new equality plan are that there would not be any harassing in the Parliament, that women and men would be equally represented in the committees, that the wages would be equal and that men and women would have similar opportunities to progress in their career.

After a rather long pause on reporting on the 7th June 2008 there is a column on the situation in the Parliament stating that during the last six months the atmosphere in the Parliament has become significantly worse.

---

9 Finnish Prime Minister Matti Vanhanen has had a rather tangled and public love life during the last few years and some of his sexually charged private text messages have been published causing a lot of public debate.
The air is thick with suspicion and paranoia when the MPs are wondering who told on who and who got money and how much. The change started in the beginning of the year when the HS article on sexual harassment came out. Even if the case was condemned in the CMM it left its mark on the everyday life of the Parliament; suddenly there are eyes and ears everywhere. Then came Kanerva mess and now the election budgets. The main body of the column then focuses on the election budgets mess.

Mid-June, 14th June 2008 there is a story that one of the MPs that filed a case to police withdrew it and now regrets doing that and wants to file it again but the police will not accept it again as he lost his chance when withdrawing the first case.

On the 19th June 2008 a wide ranging article states that there is a lot to improve in the administration of the Parliament. The story is based on the consultancy report that has found that the basic services of the parliament in part are very inefficient. The consultant has come to the conclusion that the services could be produced with less personnel. The services in question are: personnel management, finance, estate services, security and information services. The Steering group of the administrative reform received the consultancy report on Wednesday. During the press conference the Speaker of the House, Mr Niinistö stressed that comparative figures are “calculative” and that the Parliament is “in its own league and quality”, so the numbers do not set the goals but the goals will be set through “other matters”. The numbers do not mean that the parliamentary administration is somehow too big but they do tell that the upcoming retirements for some government officials give the possibility to make structural changes in the organisation. During the next 12 years there will be roughly 225 government officials employed in the Parliament retiring (there are at the time of the article is published 475 employed government officials). Niinistö promised that nobody will be laid off.

The consultancy report was mainly focused on managing, responsibilities, what is included in people’s duties, defining services, planning and organising reporting and the duties and responsibilities of the managing group. The consultancy is offering a model for the whole administration that would fulfill the firewall idea that Niinistö has: tasks and services linked directly to law-making are separated from the basic services, both to different parts of organization. It is open who will be in charge of the organization that will
come out of this reorganization. There is an idea of a specific manager of the organization that would then also be the manager of the two people managing the two different sides of the organization (law- and non-law-related); another option is a combination of the office manager and chief secretary where the chief secretary would be in charge of the law-making services. As it stands the department is headed by the Secretary General under whom all the services are produced in differing organisations, secretariats, departments and units.

There is a smaller piece of news that just states that the administration will be reorganised and has been reorganised since last autumn (2007) as a result of the 100-years celebration scandal (money and wine-related). In February a consultancy review showed that services are good but the administration itself is swamped. The Commission committee will decide what happens next during the following week and the changes should be ready by January 2009.

On the 29th June 2008 there is a story on how the spring season of Finnish politics went from scandal to scandal. The journalist states that it can be said to have started from the harassment scandal in the parliament then followed by the Prime Minister Matti Vanhanen and his tangled love life, then resigned Minister of Foreign Affairs, Ilkka Kanerva and text messages, then the financial scandals related to election funding etc.

On the 3rd July 2008 there is an article on the consultancy report revealing that the Parliament is not as effective as it could be. The consultancy company Bearing Point has recently (on the 18th of June) presented the report on how to reorganise the parliamentary administration. The report states that there is room for more efficiency in the parliamentary administration. The consultants have reviewed how effective the parliamentary administration is compared to other organisations and according to the report one could cut the parliamentary service production by 130 years of personal service (in the long run). The same newspaper contains an article where the parliamentary administration condemns the consultancy report and the different unions in the Parliament criticize the administrative reorganising project that is currently proceeding. Both of the unions especially criticize the consultancy report by Bearing Point. The unions think the consultancy company did a weak job and that they did not internalize the special nature of the parliamentary functions. They also question whether the work has been done with enough expertise and care. The benchmarking process does not take into consideration that the parliament is
an official organ says one of the chairpersons of the unions Mr Lantto. He also states that the report was done in two months and that that is very fast. “It is almost solely the consultants view, the comments of the personnel were not considered … he says it feels wild that people work hard and then there comes a consultant that says that you are all expendable”. The consultants’ work costed 140,000 euros and if the consultants carry on until end of January it will cost the parliament further 213,000 euros. The Administrative Director of the Parliament, Kari T. Ahonen will draft a memo by mid-July on what the different options are for continuing the project. Lantto has a strong view how it should be done: we have so much basic information and so many reports that the developmental work can be finalized inside the house.

The Speaker of the House Mr Niinistö admits that the consultancy figures on effectivity are not exactly comparable: “The parliament is a very unique place when it comes to the nature of the work done here and everything needs to function beyond any measurement and the lawmaking work cannot contain mistakes. But the report does give a view on the effectivity of the Parliament”. Niinistö thinks it is a problem that the administration has a political atmosphere that in turn makes it hard to renew the administrative structures. “There is a very strong resistance to change in the Parliament and that is only natural. That’s why it is a good idea to use an outside consultant who can see things clearer and differently than the people inside the administration.” Bearing Point did not wish to comment.

The following day 4th July 2008 there is again an article on the Parliament. The harassment scandal taught us a valuable lesson on being open about things says the Public Relations manager of the Parliament, Marjo Timonen. She states that the report on the equality situation should have absolutely been published by them immediately but that the administration department wanted to publish everything in one go once the new equality plan is ready. “I, however, said already in August that I think this would be best publicized by us …”. She states that the resulting scandal was for her and for the other government officials a good lesson on the importance of openness. The article then goes on to discuss the setting of boundaries regarding the private life of politicians and she thinks that politics is changing and the scandals simply pave way to new ways of working and functioning.
The next day 5th July 2008 and again a story on the consultancy work and the arguments it has created in the Parliament. The Commission committee of the parliament is in disagreement over the report by Bearing Point on the administration of the Parliament. The unions of the Parliament have condemned the report that cost 140,000, the Commission committee will now decide whether the Parliament will buy the continuation plans from the Bearing Point (without vat 213,750 euros). The matter was in the Commission committee on the 26th June but it was not decided upon, was seen to need further clarification. The same days' newspaper has an article about one MP (member of the Commission Committee) accusing Kari T. Ahonen the administrative manager of forging the minutes of the meeting. Others say this is not the case, that the matter (whether the consultants will be hired or not) shall be decided later on.

After this I stopped following HS on this topic. There have been more news but rather sporadically. According to latest news, published in HS all the matters mentioned above, relating to the reorganisation of the administration remain open. The court case is pending and the Parliament has other kinds of new scandals to deal with as there is money missing from one of the Parliamentary clubs and the argument over the wine for the 100 year party is still going on although it is already clear that it will cost the Parliament quite a lot.

**The later reports and sexual harassment**

As mentioned before, during the alleged harassment scandal I was requested to send the Parliament the figures behind my equality evaluation report. The way they asked for those figures and contacted me was less than pleasant and here is an excerpt from my research diary from early spring 2008. I am adding it here as I feel that they give a very good account on the general feeling. The accusation was that it was the methodology and form of my research that had caused all the trouble and that had I reported in a more quantitative manner it would have been clear to everyone that the alleged problems were not really problems at all.
Research diary entry from 21.02.2008:

“... the Parliament in the form of manager X has again been in touch. He called on Tuesday 19.02 in the morning literally demanding “the figures”. It was an interesting phone call to say the least. He also informed me that my qualitative research has already caused him extra grief and that in the future I should know that when I am reporting something for the government officials it becomes public immediately. I remained calm and nice all through the phone conversation although at one point I really thought I was going to have to say something. Instead I asked him not to be so aggressive … I will give him the figures and in nice and neat form”.

I thus wrote an extra report for the Parliament (see appendix E for the whole report) and tried to make it as clear and all encompassing as possible. I will add an example here as well as adding the whole report as an appendix.

“As it reads in the evaluation report I wrote [page 3] the parliamentary offices equality working group has ordered this equality evaluation to function as a base for their work on the updating of the equality plan of the parliamentary office. The point of the evaluation was to gather thematic information on how people working in the parliamentary offices experience things and events linked to equality questions. Once making of the evaluation was agreed upon it was clear that the task to be done was to locate the themes that the working group can then focus on whilst they update the equality plan. It was never agreed that there should be some sort of accurate statistical analysis of the survey results. Due to this fact the number of people responding to different parts of the evaluation was not reported in detail.

After you gave me the task to send you the numbers I have gone through the whole material for the equality evaluation and produced this additional report where I have marked the number of responses next to each statement in numbers. On top of this I have also marked next to the statement the corresponding page number in the original evaluation where the issue in hand is being dealt with. In this report one can find all the required figures apart from the ones that reveal the responses per unit. Unpacking those into figures is not ethically feasible as it risks the anonymity of the respondents.
I am asking you kindly to consider that all the figures in this evaluation are advisory, give a certain flavour of the degree of the situation. On their own they do not offer any profound picture of the equality situation within the parliamentary office. To create a wider picture with different kinds of subjective experiences the researcher has used the answers to the open ended questions” (Niemi, 2008, p.1).

A relevant and necessary topic that I had to deal with already whilst writing the first evaluation report, then in the second figures report, and finally in the expert statement referred to and dealt with below was the issue of: how to study harassment? How to measure and quantify something so subjective and qualitative? I had not been and was not studying harassment but since I had suddenly become an author of what was known to some as “The harassment study” I also had to have more grounds and ability to explain the figures the survey produced, as well as explain how they should be looked upon. In a manner rather typical for ethnography my fieldwork thus took a whole new direction.

As I wrote in my fourth report (see appendix F for the whole report), the expert statement for the parliamentary committee on work and equality matters, the issue of the understanding, contextualisation of specific numbers is a central question when it comes to measuring harassment.

“From the equality evaluation that I wrote for the Finnish Parliament harassment and the number of harassed people was especially taken up and discussed in the media. The section that has to do with harassment had 145 responses (as the parliament announced in their own press release) but as the original evaluation states, different questions particularly in this part of the survey have relatively large variation in terms of how many responses were received. Because of this the numbers are not simple to interpret. If one uses a rough estimate one can state that there are at least 62 harassed people (out of 320 responses the percentage is 19.4 %) at most 145 harassed people (out of 320 responses the percentage is 45.3 %). It was, however, decided that the original evaluation suffices with percentage figures per question as the evaluation wanted to map out the larger themes and as even the smallest number (62) is rather high when discussing this type of issue.
Particularly when looking at figures dealing with harassment it is always important to remain within the context of harassment studies so that one would better grasp the relativity and the potential different meanings of the figures. (Gruber, 1990; Mankkinen, 1995; Sexual harassment at the workplace in the European Union, 1999).

In relation to the other harassment figures the numbers of the parliamentary office are relatively high, high enough to be taken seriously. Another serious matter linked to figures that should be taken very seriously is the experience of unfair treatment by the respondents (198/320 respondents: 61.9% reported that they have been unfairly treated for different reasons). In the original evaluation this was in the form of text, not figures. The most important reason for unfair treatment for both men and women was the position of the given person in the organisation” (Niemi, 2008, p. 2).

The study of sexual harassment is not as simple and straightforward as it was at times portrayed to be in the media reports. Trying to make this issue simple by forcing it into some simplistic list of names and figures one is undermining the complexity of the phenomena and in so doing one may also be undermining the severity of harassment as an act. To examine a phenomenon that is so deeply personal and yet has to be evaluated on some kind of general societal terms is a challenge to say the least. There have been (at least) three co-existing research orientations on sexual harassment and they are connected whilst they each aim to highlight the phenomena in different ways (Varsa, 1996, p.123).

A first tradition is based in United States and is mainly interested in mapping out how common sexual harassment is. It is based on the use of survey methods and human rights debates and the definition of sexual harassment is “… expression of unwanted sexual demands in an unequal power relationship”. The second orientation uses both qualitative and quantitative methods and is mainly located in Western and Central Europe. This is based on social policy debates and defines sexual harassment as all kinds of unwanted and intrusive behaviour by men towards women. In this tradition harassment is seen as escaping definition and can only be defined in the given context. In this tradition women are no longer seen as mere passive receivers but their active awareness and ability to control situations is stressed. Women are still seen as the main
targets of harassment due to their socially subordinate position (Ibid.).

The third tradition mainly emphasises qualitative data and is mainly located in the Nordic countries starting from the 1990’s, this tradition is very much part of the occupational health and safety debates inside the welfare states. Here the definition and distinction between positive and negative sexuality and sexual harassment are in use and in this tradition the intertwined quality of social and individual levels as well as the historical context are taken into consideration. Thus the experience of harassment is always linked to personal experience, social and historical context. All three orientations are based on different power conceptions through which they then define sexual harassment and the experience of it (Ibid.).

The Parliamentary management’s reactions to the harassment figures in their own organisation could be seen to reflect or to be very close to the first orientation. As representatives and members of institutional power they acted according to the way of thinking where power is seen as institutional, structural and static (Varsa, 1996). They wanted to know the exact number of cases to then be able to improve the situation by regulation and laws.

Since sending the new report with figures off to the person ordering it, manager X, I have not heard from them. One of the Parliamentary Committees, however, contacted me shortly after this and asked me to write and present a summary statement on the Parliamentary administrations personnel management situation drawing on my two reports done during 2007. This request was important to me as a researcher as it felt like at least someone inside the Parliament was taking my work seriously enough to ask me to come and present my research as an expert.

**The committee hearing**

I wrote an expert statement summarising all three reports as clearly as possible (See Appendix F) and prepared for the hearing. On the day of the hearing I was nervous and worried for possible hostile responses but the whole event was very pleasant, the members of the committee were treating me with respect, and nothing out of the ordinary took place during the hearing. There were a few questions that rather surprised me, one of them being the one on the origins of the names in the newspapers. A member of the Committee
wanted to know whether the names came from my work, from me. I found that surprising as I had expected everyone (at least within the Parliament) to know by now that this was not the case. Another surprise question came from an elderly male MP and had to do with the quality of the so-called ‘lift gaze’ (rising from the survey as a form of harassment). The person asking me the question had an ever so slightly challenging tone and what he basically wanted to know was if I could define what such a gaze is like. I responded by saying that answering was beyond my expertise but that I would imagine that it would be a gaze inside a lift (or otherwise confined space) that is considered unpleasant by the target. There were no more questions regarding harassment and the hearing ended in a pleasant note.

I have not been contacted by the Parliament since and as mentioned before the exit process is still, in a manner, not over. As I am writing this in autumn 2009 I am waiting to hear from the courts.

**Reflections on phase four and the research questions**

This thesis is in many ways non-conventional (due to multiple previously discussed reasons) and one of the non-conventionalities is that the context of the research comes in the end and via events that were not planned by anyone.

The media attention that followed the equality report, or perhaps it is more fitting to say the part of the report that the media found interesting, illuminated the position and relationship of the Parliament in relation to Finnish society.

The paranoia that seemed to be present in many of the discussions that I had with people in the Parliament (that I at times suspected to be my paranoia rather than theirs) could be partly the result of the relationship between the media and the Parliament. Thus phase four offers yet another answer to the research question one. Being a non-Political employee within a Parliament means also having to deal with the constant potential of media attention. Having to work in an environment that is more or less under observation all the time and thus having to deal with that extra pressure without losing sight to the proportionality, i.e. not becoming overtly paranoid. However, it
is necessary to point out here that this observation is very selective and the matters that do become the central for the media are not necessarily always the most central issues for the Parliamentary administration. Thus it also means having to deal with many different kinds of ‘thruths’ about your own workplace.

The Parliament as a workplace is a site of many contradictions for the employees. It is very much a public institution, unique in many ways due to the nature of its tasks, it includes a ‘natural order of things’ that needs to be accepted by anyone working in there i.e. that the legislative work always comes first in any and every ranking order in the House and lastly it has nearly mythical elements attached to it.

During phase four these mythical elements seemed to be implicitly present in the media reports. Whilst reading reporting on the Parliament one notices that it nearly always contains an implicit expectation of impeccability, that as an organisation they should be exemplary in every manner, stainless and pure to such a degree that it would, indeed, be mythical. However, when it is revealed that they are not (as unavoidably is the case with any human ventures) it is followed by disdain that is also near mythical. Sentences like ‘how is this possible in the heart of our democracy’ are not at all unusual and yet they are oddly naïve as it should be self-evident that any large organisation is likely, to a degree, to suffer from a variety of misconducts. Somehow the mythical status of the Parliament in the Finnish society is thus both replicated and reinforced by the media’s reactions. The myth is reinforced as even questioning the Parliament and what goes on in there never crosses a certain line; it never results in any serious changes in the actual organisation of the House.
8. The end

I am concluding this journey by returning to where it started, to the road that cuts across the Hietaniemi cemetery, that is, returning to the landscape of national institutions. All through this process I have been wondering whether it is possible to explore and write about the everyday life inside this institution without being blinded by its seemingly omnipotent features? I am still not sure. I think that I too got “slightly drunk” on the power that surrounded everything inside the organisation. It is a glamorous place in so many ways; power is ever present and the decisions made on the legislative parts, right next to the administration concern “us all”. It is also a totally non-glamorous ordinary problem-ridden workplace where many things could and should be done better than they are done now and where the “natural” precedence of legislative work can and could be preserved whilst simultaneously taking care of personnel management.

Someone once said to me that it is unbelievably pompous to start this book by writing about the Hietaniemi cemetery and the national Parliament with me in the middle, as if I was somehow equally important. But they had somehow misunderstood the intention here. Thus it is perhaps necessary to stress this one more time: I only feature here because of the nature of the research and the way that I can write. Thus despite the often very personal reflections the process and analysis has taken place on three different levels. These levels are - personal, event-based and organisational. There is the level of me dealing with the pressures of work and the events of the field and my reactions to it, there are the different formal and informal events taking
place as I am present, and there is the whole organisation with its different structures, ways and procedures – both formal ad informal. All three levels are present all through this work and out of the three the personal is the least important but yet still, to a degree, significant factor (Hearn, 2008). Each level has dominated at its turn due to the way things have occurred. However the analysis has moved between these three levels and through the four different phases reflecting on the research questions and conceptual frameworks. The different forms of data gathering have also offered very different angles into the organisational life of the Parliamentary administration. The partially unintended mix of methods brings forward mixed responses, both out of me and out of the field, the organisation and the informants; the themes, however, have been the same all through.

In this final chapter I highlight some of the main themes of the different research phases and reflect on how these themes in turn relate to my research questions and what, if anything, can be concluded. I will go over the main limitations of this work as well as what could and should be done in the future. I will not discuss what I would have done differently as many of the major turns of events were completely or very nearly beyond my control. Thus to start saying that I would change something is to a degree ludicrous. It is of course always possible to improve the quality of one’s work that goes without saying. However, apart from the interview questions (and to a degree the survey) I did not decide what happened. I was just there.

**Limitations**

Researching these type of elite organisations is always limited by their consent, what they see as feasible and what not. On top of that this research is limited (and simultaneously enriched) by its cross-discipline approach that has meant that a deeper evaluation of all the fields relevant for this work has not been possible. This work has, however, offered width and variety of new kind of knowledge on working and being a manager inside an elite Political institution.
Future Research

As well as the initial research questions there are also some additional discussion points that have arisen from the experiences on the field. I have been considering them whilst working on the field and whilst writing this thesis:

- Are the MPs and the political side in general seen as the customers of the Parliamentary office? Or as colleagues?

- A Parliament, in theory, represents the people of the given country. How, if at all, is that ideal visible in the management of the Parliamentary office?

- Do people working there see themselves as also serving the people of the given country, that is a higher ideal or the democratic principles or is it just work as usual?

- The administrative side is largely neglected in terms of research, not seen as very important or relevant. Is it realistic to think that the two different sides have no impact on each other?

As pointed out before, the multiple layers of relations between the administration and the Political parts of these institutions are an interesting and rather under researched territory. Thus future research should aim to map out a variety of top level, elite administrations, evaluating what kind of power relationship or balance the administration and the Political parts of these institutions really have. Based on this research it is not realistic to think that the Political part could ever be fully separate from the political and thus the relations between the two parts should be further examined.
The research questions and the phases

As part of the wrapping up of this final chapter I will remind the reader one more time of the research questions:

1. What is it like to be a “non-Political employee” within a Parliament? From the perspective of people employed within administration; managers; women and men.

2. What are the specific character and characteristics of the organisational formal and informal processes and relations within the employed, non-Political, part of the Parliamentary institution?

Question one is the harder of the two to answer, at least in an exhaustive manner, as that would entail listing a whole host of personal experiences of work and working in the House. Thus, in relation to research question one, one’s perspective to working in this organisation and thus to these two sides of the organisation, the formal and the informal, depends very much on one’s position within the organisation. The management, the employees in different departments, the men and women, are all very differently positioned in relation to the formal and the informal processes thus the experience of being employed by the Parliament varies drastically based on one’s position in the organisational hierarchy, the formal hierarchy and the informal hierarchy. One’s gender seems to alter this experience, as the weight of the social that is still largely based on the men’s networks, and thus as a woman one’s ability to participate in the ‘game’ fully is limited. This research originally intended to look at the experience of working in the Parliament more widely but in the end the focus was more on the management, mainly as I was working closest with the management and even the work I was doing for them also revolved around management. Thus managing in the Parliament became a central theme of this research, a focus point.

Question two is answered via chapters four, five, six and seven. The leading themes of these chapters: four-control, five- the relatively intense informal underlife, six- the formality of management and work tasks of serving and servicing the Political process. Chapter seven then offered - the context and media together providing an interlocking whole that illustrates or even represents the very character and characteristics of the different formal and informal processes and relations inside this organisation.
The chapters

Chapters one to three are mainly about setting the scene and giving an overview of the work (1.), outlining the conceptual framings (2.) and explaining and reviewing the methods (3.). The actual story and the “answers” to the research questions are in chapters four to seven, in the descriptions of the four different phases of this research. Each phase answered some of the questions, if not always entirely then at least partly, some aspects of them.

Chapter four – phase one

Chapter four - phase one - is mainly about the process of accessing the organisation and the theme that runs through this phase and its different turns is control. That whole phase is peppered by different managerial attempts to control me, control each other in relation to me as well as control the level of access that would, or would not, be granted to me. Phase one can be seen as the phase that gave the first tasters of what it is like to work in this kind of institution. This is solely, however, from the managerial perspective as I only had meetings with managers, and most of these managers were men. It later turned out that this reflects the gender reality of the organisation as well. Phase one and the unexpected and at times surprising turns of the access process also gave a good preview into the complex internal webs of informal and formal processes. These formal and informal processes frame all the work that is done in this organisation. It also gave a very truthful image of the weight of the Political part when it comes to decision-making.

Chapter five – phase two

Chapter five is mainly about being inside, getting used to working in there, and trying to understand the logics of that particular workplace and the organisation in general. Phase two continuously answers the question of what it’s like to work in this organisation. Only it does it in a more in-depth manner as the preparations for the survey and the interviews sent me around the organisation and gave me a wider perspective into the working life of this institution. I started to see how working there was different for the managers and employees and then in turn for men and women. The seemingly endless
variety of informal processes also started to become more familiar to me. The organisational underlife started making appearances in both positive and negative ways, and sadly during this phase it was mostly negative. Thus phase two is characterised by rather negative undertones. I entered the organisation during a major dispute between some of the managers and this had an impact on everything including the way I viewed the organisation.

My research diary is at times rather negative, even gloomy, but as there was a clear crisis situation in the process at least part of the negative tones can be explained by this. Simultaneously and contradictingly phase two was also when I was doing the interviews that are the most positive part of the research by far. Interviewing the management was, a very positive experience and the data reflects that. One gets a different picture of an organisation that has problems but not just problems; there are many very positive aspects too. The survey results then finalise the multilayered phase two as they are very much mixed. The survey responses include both positive and negative, utter unhappiness and simultaneous extreme pride and enjoyment of the challenges at work. The image of the golden cage comes alive when reading the survey answers, varying levels of discontent are framed by the utter pride of working for the national Parliament.

Chapter six – phase three

Chapter six is mostly about me doing the formal work tasks (writing the two separate reports, holding the management training day) given to me by the organisation. In terms of my dealings with the organisation it is very much a non-event, particularly in comparison with all the other ethnographic chapters. I was working hard during this phase and as it took place during the summer months I was relatively isolated in the offices. In terms of research questions it was providing direct responses in the form of the reports to most of them, as I was analysing the survey material and the interviews and thus learning a lot about the organisation whilst simultaneously comparing these notes to my own.

Chapter seven – phase four

This chapter and this whole phase represents the part of the process that was entirely unintended, even accidental. It is almost all about the media and the alleged sexual harassment scandal. It is an additional extra phase caused by
the events of the field and was not part of the initial research plan. However, it still answers the first research question to a degree as it offers another angle into things by illuminating what an employee has to live with whilst working in this institution. Phase four also offers some glimpses of how the formal and informal working processes mix with each other and how in some ways the lack of clear formal working processes can cause additional harm to the organisation. However, more than anything else phase four illuminates the context of the organisation, the extraordinary public, national status of this institution, its uniqueness in the way it is viewed by the media and to a degree even mythical status in terms what is expected from it. It gives another window into the life of the organisation by giving a glimpse of the context they operate in as well as giving an example of the way they deal with difficult situations. In some ways this phase is still not over as the court case is still pending.

The four phases tell a story of a workplace that is ridden with many “normal” organisational problems. However, even relatively normal organisational problems, for example, work-related stress (Barry, Berg and Chandler, 2003), as experienced by the employees and management, is somehow slightly different than in many organisations. The elite nature of the organisation impacts on the employees’ and managers’ sense of self-worth and the ‘glory’ of working in, this particular, institution, the position it holds in the society and the nature of (at least some) of the work done in there. This overrides or at least parallels much experienced stress or inconvenience. The legislative work and the core tasks of the organisation are the justification behind almost everything that takes place within the organisation. The legislative work thus also acts as the weight, the legitimation; behind the “naturalising” discourse explaining the way things are organised, the way they ‘have’ to be organised.

Based on this research it seems that the MPs are largely and mainly seen as customers of the administration. However, at times they do also appear to resemble colleagues too. This seems to be entirely dependent on the social, that is, informal relations and networks of the House. The political affiliations also clearly play a role in these relationships. However, evaluating to what degree this is the case remains to be evaluated in other research.

The Parliament’s role as a representative of the Finnish nation is visible, implicitly and explicitly, in the manner people working in the Parliament talk
about their work and their workplace. Even if they are sometimes complaining about the different aspects of the work or organization, they still often refer to the status of the institution, and seem to be aware of its specific and valued position. The status of the institution, however, does not seem to feature in the management styles as such but it might be part of the explanation behind some of the management’s nonchalant attitudes towards the staff complaints. The “if you don’t like it here you can go” – attitude can be seen to be at least partly due to the status of the institution, the management is safe in the knowledge that recruiting new staff is not an issue.

Apart from the already mentioned awareness of the high status of the institution within the nation, the elite status did not seem to feature (at least very visibly) in terms of everyday work. The democratic principles did not seem to be present in the day-to-day life of the organisation. The two different parts of the organisation, the Political and the political, are, however, very much interconnected and do have a multi-layered impact on one another and thus it is not realistic to think they would remain separate. This aspect is beyond the scope of this work.

The themes

This research has contributed to the knowledge on elite public institutions by illuminating the working life inside one of them, the Finnish Parliamentary administration. The importance of the informal organisational processes and relations i.e. the social capital and the skilled use of it in this organisation, cannot be exaggerated. Working in the Finnish Parliamentary administration means accepting and adapting to an organisation where the working culture is a mixture of very formal procedures including legislative procedures, and structures and very informal verbal agreements and arrangements, as represented by the underlife and social capital. The result is a rather strange mix where the specific character and characteristics of the formal proceedings are very clear and stated in the law whereas the other side of the culture the informal proceedings is very unclear and to a degree unknown, reinvented with every decision and practise.

Control was a constant theme (and a main theme in chapter four) that arose from most of my discussions with the organisation even if it was more
accentuated in the beginning whilst negotiating over access and what I was and was not allowed to do in the organisation. However, control in multiple levels was visible all through this journey: individuals controlling themselves, controlling others, being controlled by others, by the organisational borders, boundaries and rules as well as seeing the role of the organisation on the whole as those that control the government. The extraordinary context, that in this research is only provided in the very end via the dealings with the media, that this organisation exists in then adds into this. The organisation is to a degree isolated from the rest of the society and that further intensifies every experience, good and bad, inside their “camp”.

Chapter five illustrated the importance of the organisational underlife, social capital and social relations and the significant role they play in relation to everything going on the Finnish Parliamentary administration. The organisational culture of the employed parts of this institution could be said to have adopted some of the features typical to the culture of the Political parts. Building and losing alliances plays an important role in the Political part of this institution but it is important in the non-political part too, one’s status in the social hierarchy and the consequent social capital is of very much importance. Thus the “camp” is organised according to official hierarchies and structures that then intersect with the informal alliances and likings, the social capital part.

Chapter six, phase three, was very much about the formal work done in and for the organisation. It was also intended to be the final phase of the research, a winding down of the fieldwork before the exit. As a phase it characterised by formalities and hard work, writing and analysing the survey responses. However it was followed by the final phase, four, of the process (chapter seven). The events taking place during phase four were perhaps difficult for me at the time but they proved to be very useful providing the research with the wider context illuminating the relationship between the institution and the society around it. The media’s reactions to the equality evaluation results and the consequent “harassment scandal” offer an interesting view to the institution and the nearly mythical qualities expected from it. It seems that normal (to be very clear, normal does not mean automatically acceptable) organisational problems should not exist in a Parliament but rather the institution should be exemplary in every way, without a fault. When this turns out to not be
the case, the search for the guilty parties starts immediately. Thus the media reporting is also directly linked to the general way of handling the equality related issues in Finland (usually somehow linked to sexuality) as well as also illuminating the curious position of the Parliament in this society.

The phases of this research have provided different perspectives, positive and negative, on the organisation even if the themes that have arisen from the data have been consistently the same. Thus the concluding image of the organisation turned out to be a mixed one and as such is probably relatively close to the organisational “reality”. To sum up, one can say that the data can be divided into positive, negative and mixed. The research diary has a negative tone, my personal difficulties in dealing with the organisation and their internal disputes shows there clearly. The interviews, on the other hand, have a very positive, even pleasant air about them and this is fitting as they were indeed a very positive experience. The survey conducted then offers both negative and positive views into how it is to work in this organisation, the employees and the managers offering both positive and negative opinions.

The phases also illuminated, in different ways, the layers of historical working structures in the Parliamentary administration that are no longer functional and that can be to a degree contradictory or even harmful. The old face-to-face system that has been operating for a long time was based on people knowing each other well and there being not that many employees, so that things could be organised and decided upon via discussions and one-on-one communication, following what might be called ‘touch and go’ or ad hoc principles. As the organisation has become much larger the actual organisational policies have not followed its growth and change and thus the result is a situation where people feel insecure as decisions are (still at least part of them) made on the same touch and go principle and there is, at least, a feeling that anything can happen at any time. There is widespread dissatisfaction regarding the style, quality and general coherence of the management of the House, the centrality of the legislative work and the consequent “natural” hierarchy of different types of work done within the organisation creates another level of hierarchy within hierarchy, the levels and dimensions of control vary and impact employees differently and this element of control also relates to the problems regarding the flow of information within the organisation as well as with the world outside the organisation.
The different themes introduced within and arising from the research phases also illustrate what is perhaps the central theoretical dynamic of this thesis, namely the ongoing tension between the individual and the collective. The constant dialectic of the individual will versus collective will becomes apparent through all the phases and chapters, and, as pointed out at the end of chapter two, it is also a very visible feature in the theoretical and conceptual framings of this work. The resulting overall, and in a sense composite, image is one of an institution with an ongoing dialectical tension between the individual will and the collective will that is then also intrinsic to the structure and logics of this institution and simultaneously continuously in a flux, even if it can at times be resolved. I will return to this below in my final discussion.

Final discussion

One can argue that once religion gradually lost its role as the most important driving and uniting force for Western societies and thus also lost its binding power in societies (Durkheim, 1912), once the nature of the sacred and profane started to change, it was not just capitalism (as Marxists would argue) but also the nation-state and all the related political institutions that at least partially took over the role of the sacred. Thus modern western democracies take their political institutions very seriously and one argument of this thesis is that this could be at least part of the explanation why Political institutions, particularly Parliaments in secular democratic systems do have mythical, even to a degree sacred roles, as well as their more regular and profane roles.

Erving Goffman supervised Dorothy Smith’s thesis in University of California, Berkeley in the early 1960’s. One can argue that this is most probably at least partly where Smith got her enthusiasm for examining the everyday life of people and organisations. Smith did not follow Goffman’s interest in the dramaturgical turns of everyday life as represented by his book The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life, but she did conduct non-conventional and non-positivistic sociology. It is fitting that these two figures are linked in their work and life as they are also very much linked in this work. Both theorists have provided me the grounds for this work, the interest in the minute details of everyday life and the significance of the “mundane” administration, the work done behind the glories of the Politics.
Goffman’s work creates an interesting contrast with my data and I have used his concepts and ideas as a type of benchmark whilst describing this organisation as I came to know it. At times it may seem drastic as he talks about mental asylums and I discuss Parliamentary administration but the main point of comparison is not the nature of the institution as such but rather the weight and importance of different informal and social processes tangled together with the formal and Political working processes, the mix of formal rules and procedures combined with informal decisions and negotiations. Goffman’s work offers a wider context in which to locate some of these aspects of this organisation. What has been and is of particular interest in terms of the Parliamentary administration are the specific characteristics and particularly the interlinkages of the informal and formal parts of the organisational life. By the main features of the informal I am here referring to the underlife and the Undertoad, social capital and networks as well as the culture of liking and disliking. The main features of the formal are the work, working tasks and managing, the legislative work and the Political processes.

Further on Goffman’s work is also very useful for an ethnographer as he is careful to reflect on the limitations of the knowledge he has gathered adopting a level of reflexivity, trying to see why he sees what he sees. Whilst analysing the data I have attempted to understand the reasons for seeing what I saw and the way I saw it, while simultaneously not seeing some other aspects of this organisation. I have also attempted to question and to a degree analyse myself in relation to the field.

Administrative work, much like housework, rarely creates any fanfares, even if it is paid unlike housework. On the societal level, however, it is something that is very much taken-for-granted (again like housework), kept behind the scenes, and yes, largely done by women. It includes the most boring and mundane tasks, not the glamorous managing of posts. When administrative tasks are done well, people are pleased but no more than that as that is just the way things should be. However, when it is not done everyone is in trouble. Yet, rarely does the administrator get the spotlight. The housework of our highest institutions is, however, very much of interest to the whole nation as these people are, in effect, taking care of the core of our institutional structures.
Another interesting feature of the Parliamentary administration on the whole is thus also linked to Goffman’s idea of front and back regions but more in the societal level. The role of the administration is always that of the back region, administration is always the supportive function in the background. The administration is the “not so interesting” place where supportive work is being done. Simultaneously and unavoidably they hold quite a lot of power and as such are endlessly interesting; one rarely hears about the administration, it is always the front region of any given administration that tends to be interesting for example the military, the police, the hospital and so on. I argue that it is particularly these back regions that should be researched more, the higher up the better.

The Finnish Parliamentary administration is a gendered bureaucracy and a gendered public organisation (Barry, Dent and O’Neill, 2003) where power is still mostly in the hands of men. The organisation contains some, if at the time vague, elements of NPM including internal formal and informal power structures and webs that are similar than the ones met by the ancient machiavellian Prince. The Parliamentary administration is a working organisation within an institution containing a strong and unique organisational culture including multiple, particular and tangled relationships between the political and Political parts of the House. The result is a web of intersectional structures and processes both informal and formal defining the Parliamentary administration as a workplace as well as colouring the experience of working there.

This has been a very long road across the institutional landscape and one with many unexpected twists and turns. It has changed many things in me and perhaps in some small way in the organisation as well. The main contribution of this work is to offer new kind of information on the working life inside this elite institution. The pleasures and the struggles of working and managing in this particular public sector elite organisation are illustrated here to offer a view, a glimpse into the experience of managing and working in this House.

The aim of this work has been to explore and problematize how managing and working is done inside an institution that both largely fulfills the characteristics of a bureaucracy and also has added special features that seem to be rather far removed from the clear structures of bureaucracies. This combination of features thus further complicates the experience of
working and managing there. What is perhaps most interesting and also the key dynamic throughout this work is that whilst this institution is supposed to work as the main solver or resolver of the societal dilemma between the individual and the collective will it, perhaps understandably and even fittingly in terms of the logics of these dialectics, still very much internally struggles with these, perhaps unresolvable, very questions. The ongoing tension between the individual and the collective will is present through all the phases of fieldwork and the theoretical and conceptual positionings. The institution is thus marked by the constant tension and dialectics between the individual will and the collective will, and this materialises simultaneously and in differing ways on multiple levels.

The most immediate conceptual pairings arising from the data are the general individual will versus collective will, the focus on micro-versus macro-related matters, and the everyday office life versus the more continuous operationalization of the democracy. All these three pairings work simultaneously and have an impact on each other as well, as reproducing each other over and over again, thus continuously opening new dialectical pairings and tensions as time moves on. The general will continues through and materialises in the everyday, indeed the ethnographic. The most important work done in the Parliament is making sure that the collective will of Finnish people is materialising in the decisions made in the House, yet this stress on the collective will is continuously complicated, interrupted and sometimes hindered by the internal organisational lack of attention towards the individual will, or rather the continuously uneasy marriage of the two that is displayed within the formal and informal structures of the House. The dialectics, the tension between these two logics, can also be seen as a common good (in the same Aristotelian sense of ‘good’ as was used in chapter one). On the one hand, the friction is ‘good’ as it can provide room for improvement. However, the current balance between the two wills within this institution seems to have potential to be harmful for some individuals, and thus perhaps it would be more beneficial in the long run for the institution and those working there if there was greater attention to the well-being of the individual and individual wills within the more general aim towards the materialisation of the common will. This in turn could, ideally, then lead towards wider and beneficial societal consequences.
A comprehensive appreciation of working in this public sector organisation is mostly beyond the full grasp of most of the existing conceptual frameworks that might otherwise apply, including those around public administration, organisational culture and Political culture. This work, although in a very modest manner, continues in the footsteps of previous research on organisational, managerial and public sector elites by attempting to illustrate the special character and characteristics of this institution, as well as problematizing the special characteristics and experiences of working and managing within this glorious golden cage.
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Appendix A:

An evaluation report on the impacts of the existing human resource strategy 2002-2006 in the Parliamentary administration

The Office Commission of the Finnish Parliament decided 15.2.2007 to maintain the existing HR strategy and to continue with it during the period of 2007-2009. Simultaneously the Office Commission decided that the impacts of the HR strategy between 2002-2006 will be evaluated by an outsider evaluator. This report goes through the results of the evaluation conducted during spring and summer 2007.

Summary

The impact of the HR strategy within the Parliamentary administration has been mapped out before by conducting a survey research. The existing HR strategy document is based on one such survey research. Thus a survey research seemed like a natural way of conducting the evaluation of the successfulness of the existing HR strategy, however, to complete the survey results interviews were also conducted. The previous research within the Parliamentary administration had used similar type methods and it had been successful.

Prior conducting the survey a series of pilot interviews were conducted within the Parliamentary administration. The themes of the survey research were then picked based on these pilot interviews as this way the themes of the survey would reflect the HR themes that were topical in the organisation at the time.

The actual questions selected for the survey were all then directly drawn from the HR question bank provided by the Finnish State Treasury. This was seen as the most suitable way of constructing the survey as this way it would not only reflect the existing HR themes in the Parliamentary administration but also make it possible to compare the results of this survey with other government departments as well as with the previous surveys conducted in the Parliament (also using the HR question bank). (Moilanen, 2001)

The survey was conducted in the Parliamentary administration during spring of 2007. In the end of the survey there was a separate part where the equality situation in the Parliamentary administration was mapped. The two surveys were combined in order to avoid sending out too many questionnaires and the staff was informed that the survey in fact consisted of two separate surveys. To support and further complete the survey results 17 interviews were also conducted with the managers of the Parliamentary administration during summer of 2007 (see appendix 2. for the interview questionnaire). The survey was sent to everybody working in the Parliamentary administration, roughly 490 people and with 229 responses, roughly 50% of the personnel responded. The survey was available both on-line and as a paper copy and it was also possible to answer the questions in Finnish or Swedish. (See appendix 1. The questionnaire with the introduction)

The general impression, based on the survey results and the interviews, is that the HR strategy of the Parliamentary administration during 2002-2006 has not been as effective as it could have been. The strategy document is a carefully drafted and well formulated document and the contents of it were not criticised in the survey answers nor in the interviews. The only possible addition to the strategy document, suggested in some of the responses, was to add some more concrete policies relating to potential crisis situations.

Thus the reasons behind the lack of affectivity of the Parliamentary administrations HR strategy would seem to relate to the lack of practical implementing of the strategy.
programme. The reasons for the lack of practical implementation that have come up in this evaluation are amongst other things: general lack of commitment to the strategy, the general organisational (geographic and task related) disparity and separateness, the nature of the work done in the House and the special requirements it sets, that is the working culture within the Parliamentary administration that, understandably and for pressing reasons, puts the legislative work and the directly related tasks first thus giving all HR management diminished attention.

The Parliamentary administration has, according to different types of research conducted in the House, been troubled by similar types of HR strategy related problems at least since 1992 (the tight schedule of this evaluation made it impossible to go further back in history). It also should be pointed out that the reasons behind the problems are manifold but that one of the main reasons, based on this results of this research too, is the relatively fast growth of the organisation. The Parliamentary administration has grown rather quickly and the organisatory policies have not always followed the pace as well as they could have. The present size of the organisation demands a very different type of strategic approach than the previous small and cohesive administration. The existing HR strategy document will not become effective unless it is taken into effect by making the policies it includes both binding and concrete for the entire staff from the top to bottom of the hierarchy.

The end result of the evaluation of the impact of HR strategies within the Finnish Parliamentary Offices is simply put that there is nothing wrong with the HR strategy documents of the Parliamentary Offices. The strategy document has opened new discussions and given rise to themes that, according to the personnel, were really not discussed before the strategy document was written. The reasons behind the fact that the document has not had as much impact as it could have are to do solely with the actual implementation of the HR policies and practices. The policies have not been applied to the extent they could have and this in turn has most probably to do with the relatively quick growth of the organization. Large and dispersed organisations are very difficult places for trying to create common policies and more importantly trying to make sure that everybody follows them. Making this happen requires systematic, long term work and more than anything it requires strict coordination between the different parts of the given organisation.
Johdanto

Eduskunnan kanslian henkilöstöpolitiikkaa on aikaisemminkin kartoitettu kyselytutkimuksella muun muassa ennen nyt arvioitavana olevan henkilöstöstrategian kirjoittamista, strategiatyön pohjaksi. Aiemmassa kyselytutkimuksessa selvitettiin virkamiesten työhön, johtamiseen ja arvoihin liittyviä käsitöksiä ja asenteita. Kyselytutkimuksen ulkopuolelle jäivät kansanedustajat, heidän avustajansa sekä eduskunnan alaiset virastot ja laitokset.

Tämä arviointitutkimus on pyrinnyt mahdollisimman pitkälle noudattamaan edellisen selvityksen linjoja ja muutenkin hyödyntämään kansliasta ja sen toiminnasta aiemmin kerättyä tietoa. Nämä ollen tämänkin tutkimuksen ulkopuolelle jäivät kansanedustajat, heidän avustajansa sekä eduskunnan alaiset virastot ja laitokset. Osana taustatyötään tutkija on myös keskustellut edellisen tutkimuksen suorittaneen tutkijan Timo Moilasen kanssa.

Arvioinnin toteutus


Kyselyn lähetettiin kaikille eduskunnan kansliann tai työntekijöille, eli noin 490 henkilölle ja siihen vastasi 229 henkilöä eli lähempän 50 % kansliann työntekijöistä. Kysely oli saatavilla sekä netti- että paperiversiona ja siihen oli mahdollista vastata sekä suomeksi että ruotsiksi. (Liite 1. kyselylomake esittelyineen)

Taustatiedot


Kysyttäessä vastaajien esimiesten sukupuolta 57,2% ilmoitti lähimmän esimiehensä olevan mies ja 42,8% nainen. Vastaajat jakautuvat eri yksiköiden kesken siten, että heistä 18,3% (42) on keskuskansliasta (pöytäkirja-, asiakirja- ja ruotsin kielen toimisto, sihteeristö), 13,1% (30) valiokuntasiihteeristöstä (suuri valiokunta, erityisvaliokunnat, EU- sihteeristö), 38,9% (89) hallinto-osastolta (hallinto-, kiinteistö-, tili- ja tieto hallintotoimistot), 21% (48) tieto- ja viestintäyksiköstä (eduskunnan kirjasto, sisäinen tietopalvelu, eduskuntatiedotus), 3,9% (9) kansainvälisten asiain yksiköstä ja 4,8% (11) virkavastuuskirjaston.

Vastaajista 10,9% ilmoitti toimivansa johto- ja esimiestehtävissä (esim. osasto-, toimisto- ja jaostopäällikkö), 30,1% vaativissa asiantuntijatehtävissä (esim. valiokunta- ja tieto- ja toimistosihteerit, virallisuusvalvojat, sivistystöjä).

Kun näitä lukuja vertaa strategian pohjaksi tehdyn aikaisemman kyselytutkimuksen vastausprosentteihin ovat vastaajien jaot miltei identtiset. Vuonna 2001 tehdyssä kyselytutkimuksessa vastauksista 10% tuli johto- ja esimiestehtävissä olevilta henkilöiltä, 27% asiantuntijatehtävissä olevilta henkilöiltä ja 63% muissa tehtävissä olevilta henkilöiltä.

Peruskoulutuksen osalta eduskunnan kansliann koulutuksia suurin osa eli yli 70% on yliopillaita. Suorittettujen tutkintojen osalta vastaajien koulutusta on kuitenkin varsin kahtiajakautunut. Noin puolet (47,6%) vastaajista ilmoitti suorittaneensa korkeakoulututkinnon ja lopuilla on eritasoisia ammattia- ja opistotutkintoja, 12,2% ilmoitti ettei ole suorittanut minkäänlaista tutkintoa.

Eduskunnalle tyypilliset pitkät virkakaudet näkyvät selkeästi virkakauden pituutta koskevan kysymyksen vastauksissa. Enemmistö vastaajista on työskennellyt eduskunnan kansliassa yli kymmenen vuotta (45%). Alle vuoden eduskunnassa työskennelleitä on selkeä vähenemistö (7,9%).

Kyselyssä olivat taustatiedojen jälkeen vain yksi “pakollinen” kysymys (vastaaja ei pääse etenemään ellei vastaa), jota sekin oli pakollinen vastaan, jotta esimiehet ja henkilöstö ohjautuisivat vastaamaan omiin oikeisiin kysymyksisiin (nk. hyyppäyskysely) joka jakaa vastaajat oikeille poluille. Tästä johtuen kaikki vastaajat eivät alun jälkeen ole välttämättä vastanneet kaikkiin kysymyksiin.
Yleistä arvoista ja henkilöstöpolitiikasta


Vastauksista käy ilmi, että pilottihasaattelujen antamat viitteet siitä, ettei kyseinen dokumentti ole kovinkaan tunnettu, pitivät paikkansa. Henkilöstö oli kyllä suurimman osin tietoinen, että kyseinen dokumentti on olemassa, mutta eivät välttämättä tunne sen sisältöä. Kaikista vastaajista hyvin yli kolmannella osana 35,1 % vastasi tietävänä suurin piirtein mistä on kyse, vajaa kolmannelle 29,4 % tiesi, että ne ovat olemassa, 11,3 % ei osannut sanoa mitään, vain 17,7 % tiesi mitä kyse on, ja keskimäärin 5,2 % ei ollut kuulutkana koko asiakirjasta.

Yksikkökohtaisten vastausten keskiarvot

Keskuskanslia ka 4,6
Valiokuntasuhteiteristö ka 4,3
Hallinto-osasto ka 4,3
Tieto- ja viestintäosasto ka 4,4
Kansainvälisten asiain yksikkö ka 4,2
Turvayksikkö ka 4,1

Vastaajien tietotason kartoitus jatkui edelleen kysymyskolla: Jos, tunnet henkilöstöstrategian ja henkilöstöpolitiikan ohjelman näkyvätko nämä asiat työssäsi tai työyhteydessäsi jo tenkin? Onko vuoden 2002 jälkeen tullut merkittäviä muutoksia?

Kaikista vastaajista 10,5 % ei vastannut kysymykseen. Noin neljäsosa, 24% vastasi eikä mitään ole muuttunut, 20,1 % vastasi, että ohjelmat näkyvät heikosti ja muutokset ovat pieniä. Vastaajista 33,2% vastasi, ettei osaa sanoa ja 9,6% vastasi, että joitain positiivisia muutoksia on tullut, 2,6% vastasi ohjelmien näkyvän selvästi ja tuoneen erittäin positiivisia vaikutuksia.

Yksikkökohtaisten vastausten keskiarvot

Keskuskanslia ka 3,1
Valiokuntasuhteiteristö ka 3,0
Hallinto-osasto ka 2,9
Tieto- ja viestintäosasto ka 3,4
Kansainvälisten asiain yksikkö ka 3,2
Turvayksikkö ka 3,2

Huonoiten henkilöstöstrategia ja henkilöstöpolitiiksishin ohjelma näkyvät hallintosastolla ja valiokuntasuhteiteristössä ja parhaiten tieto- ja viestintäyksikössä, kansainvälisten asiain yksikössä ja turvayksikössä.

Eduskunnan kanslian arvot on kirjattu henkilöstöstrategiaan ja vastaajien tehtävänä kyselyssä oli valita annetuista arvoista ne, joiden osalta kanslialla olisi eniten paranettavaa. Kolme arvoa, joiden kohdalta kanslian pitäisi kyselyn perusteella eniten korjata käytänteitäan ovat oikeudenmukaisuus, avoimuus ja tasa-arvo.
Avoimuus sai korkeimmat prosentit myös vuonna 2001 tehdystä selvityksessä, silloin 73% vastaajista katsoi, että avoimuuden osalta on eniten parannettavaa, 50% valitsi silloin yhteistyöhakuisuuden ja 44 % ennakoivuuden.

oikeudenmukaisuus 67,9%
avoimuus 67,9%
luotettavuus 20,1%
palveluhenkisyys 11,6%
tasa-arvo 40,6%
tuloksellisuus 18,3%

Yksikkökohtaiset vastaukset arvojen osalta heijastavat tätä hyvin, puoleto yksiköstä: keskuskanslia, hallinto-osasto ja turvayksikkö valitsivat arvoksi, jonka osalta on eniten parannettavaa oikeudenmukaisuuden. Valiokuntasuhteeristö, tieto- ja viestintäosasto ja kansainvälisten asiain yksikkö valitsivat avoimuuden arvoksi, jonka osalta on kansliailla on eniten parannettavaa.

Kysymyksen siitä ovatko eduskunnan kanslian virkamiesten arvot muuttuneet viimeisten viiden vuoden aikana lievä enemmistö vastasi, ettei osaa samon 36,8%. Vastaajista 32% oli sitä mieltä, etteivät arvot ole muuttuneet ja 28,9% sitä mieltä, että virkamiesten arvot olivat jonkin verran muuttuneet. 0,4% vastaajista katsoi arvojen täysin muuttuneen ja 1,8% oli sitä mieltä että arvot olivat suurelta osin muuttuneet.

Yksiköittäin vastaukset paljastavat ettei arvojen juuriakaan katsota muuttuneen, asteikko oli jälleen 1-5 ja 1 = eivät ja 5 = täysin. Kaikkien yksiköiden vastaukset olivat selkeästi keskiarvoon alapuolella, ainoastaan turvayksikössä oltiin hieman lähempänä keskiarvoa.

Keskuskanslia ka 2,0
Valiokuntasuhteeristö ka 2,1
Hallinto-osasto ka 2,0
Tieto- ja viestintäosasto ka 2,1
Kansainvälisten asiain yksikkö ka 2,1
Turvayksikkö ka 2,6

Vuonna 2001 kolmasosa kanslian henkilöstöstä katsoi, etteivät kanslian arvot ole muuttuneet viimeisen 10 vuoden aikana. Silloin vastaajista puole to matka niiden muuttuneen jonkin verran ja vain joka kysymen vastaaja pitä muutosta voimakkaana.

Työn organisointi ja työilmapiiri

Tämän osion ensimmäisessä kysymyksessä vastaajia pyydettiin arvioimaan eduskunnan kansliaa työpaikkana arvioimalla erilaisia väittämää yhdestä viiteen asteikolla siten, että 1 on täysin eri mieltä ja 5 täysin samaa mieltä. Ensimmäisessä väittämässä todetaan eduskunnan olevan esimerkillinen työnantaja hyvän henkilöstöpoliitikan osalta. Vastaajista hieman alle puolet on eri mieltä, reilu neljännnes ei osaa sanoa, 14,5 % on täysin eri mieltä ja noin 15 % on samaa mieltä tai täysin samaa mieltä. Kun laskee yhteen ne vastaajat, jotka ovat täysin eri mieltä ja eri mieltä saadaan tulokseksi 57,7 % vastaajista kun taas asteikon yläosan samaa mieltä ja täysin samaa mieltä vastauksista tulee yhteensä 15 %. Kuna tätä samaa ensimmäistä väittämää tarkastellaan yksikkötasolla nähdään, ettei niiden vastauksissa ole juuri eroa yleiseen tulokseen verrattuna.

Keskuskanslia ka 2,1
Valiokuntasihteeristö ka 2,2
Hallinto-osasto ka 2,3
Tieto- ja viestintäosasto ka 2,9
Kansainvälisten asiain yksikkö ka 2,5
Turvayksikkö ka 2,2

Ainoastaan tieto- ja viestintäyksikössä ollaan lähellä keskiarvoa, kaikki muut yksiköt ovat selkeästi sen alapuolella.

Seuraava väittämä koskee kanslian toiminnan arvolähtöisyyttä ja eettisesti korkea tasoa. Kun asteikon alaosan erimieliset vastaukset lasketaan yhteen, on tulos miltei puolet vastauksista eli 48,4 %, yläosan samaa mieltä vastaukset 21,1 % ja keskelle en osaa sanoa osioon jää suhteellisen korkea 30,4 %. Jostain syystä henkilökunta ei osaa tässäkin kysymyksessä sanoa, 15 % arvot toteutuvat kanslian toiminnassa. Arvojen suhteen vastauksissa onkin yleisesti näkyvissä selkeää epätietoisuutta ks. aiempi arvokysymys alun kartoittavassa osiossa.

Yksiköitten tässäkin väittämässä ollaan melko yksimielisiä. Ainoastaan kansainvälisten asiain yksikössä päästään keskiarvoon ja tieto- ja viestintäyksikössä lähelle keskiarvoa.

Keskuskanslia ka 2,3
Valiokuntasihteeristö ka 2,5
Hallinto-osasto ka 2,6
Tieto- ja viestintäosasto ka 2,8
Kansainvälisten asiain yksikkö ka 3,0
Turvayksikkö ka 2,6

Yksiköitten vastaukset lähes kaikkien tämän kysymyksen väittämien osalta jakautuvat kysymyksen kahdessa ensimmäisessä väittämässä nähtävä trendi seuraten. Yleisesti ottaen tyytyväimöimiä ollaan keskuskansliassa ja hallinto-osastolla ja tyytyväisimiä tieto- ja viestintäyksikössä ja turvayksikössä.

Valtion uusimmassa saatavilla olevassa henkilöstötilinpäätöksessä (2005) todetaan, että kritiikin arvo tämänkaltaisissa skalaatutkimuksissa on valtionhallinnon osalta 3 (en osaa sanoa) ja sen alle tyytyväisyys ei saisi miltään osin laskea. Tässä kysymyksessä eduskunnan kanslia on viiden yleistilannetta koskevan väittämän osalta alle kolmen keskiarvolutkemassa. Ensimmäinen näistä koskee johtamista ja erityisesti henkilöstöjohtamista: eduskunnan kanslia on esimerkillinen työnantaja hyvän henkilöstöpolitiikan toteuttamisessa ja henkilöstön kohtelussa (nämä alueet todettiin monin tavoin


“…järjestetty pari tilaisuutta, joissa on keskusteltu kyseisen ohjelman sisällöstä. Täytäntöönpano ja sen toteuttaminen seuranta sen sijaan on unohtunut…”

Yleisen arviointiosuuden lopuku kysyttiin avokysymyksillä mitä eduskunnan ylin johto, lähiesimies ja työntekijä itse ovat tehneet parantamiseen työyhteisön henkeä ja mitä näimikä kaikki voisivat tehdä hengen parantamiseksi? Enemmistö vastaajista ilmoitti, ettei osaa sanottaa mitä ylin johto on tehnyt tai ettei mitään tohto tehty. Osa vastaajista totesi, että keskustelutuliasuuksia on järjestetty ja ohjelmia on laadittu, mutta konkreettiset parannukset ovat vähissä. Pääsihteerin aamukahvitilaisuus uusille virkamiehille nostettiin esiin myönteisenä kehityksenä ja vastaanantoista henkilöstöryhmien ja hierarkian rajoja ylittävää toimintaa toivottiin lisää.

Muita toimenpiteitä, joita eduskunnan ylin johto voisi vastaajien mielestä toteuttaa työympäristöparantamiseksi, ovat esimiesten henkilöstöjohtamiskoulutus, kaikenlainen avoimuuden lisääminen, kaikkien osastojen työn tasapainottaminen ja vertailu toiminnan strategisen suunnittelun lisääminen sekä selkeyden parantamista puutteeseen. Yksikkökohtaiset toimistojen viikkopalaverit nostettiin esiin myönteisenä kehityksenä ja vastaanantoista henkilöstöryhmien ja hierarkian rajoja ylittävää toimintaa toivottiin lisää.

„…tukea sitä työntohtoaa, joka on työntekijöiden kanssa selvittelemässä tilanteita. Johdon yhteiset tapaamiset ovat tärkeitä työyksikköjen välisen tiedon jakamiseen. Lähiesimisten keskinäinen verkostoituminen ja vertaistuki ovat näin osissa organisaa-tiossa tärkeitä, siihen on kannustettava enemmän…”


Ilmapiiriä koskevissa avokysymyksissä olivat viimeinen käsittely henkilöstöä ja itsekin tekemisiä ilmapiirin parantamiseksi. Vastaajat kertoivat pyrkineensä työpaikallaan...
avoimuuteen, ystävällisyteen, juorulun välttämiseen, joustavuuteen, kohteliaaseen käytökseen, positiivisen palautteen antamiseen kollegoihne, yhteishengen luomiseen kahvihetkien ja muiden vastaavien avulla, ongelmien avoimeen käsittelyyn ja yleiseen riihuleteen. Vastaajat kokivat tämän kysymyksen hyväksi ja katsoivat että työyhteisön henki on kaikkien asia ja yhteisen työn tulos.

**Tiedonkulku**


Kun verrataan vuonna 2001 tehdyn kyselyn tuloksien (siellä oli sama kysymys) olisi ollut onmalta esimieheltä ja työtoverieltä saavutettu tiedon määrä hieman osittain 20% vastaajasta, 60% osittain tyytyväinen ja 20% osittain epäluuloista vastaajista. Keskuskanslia ka 2,6 Valiokuntasihteeristö ka 2,4 Hallinto-osasto ka 2,5 Tieto- ja viestintäosasto ka 2,8 Kansainvälisten asiain yksikkö ka 3,2 Turvayksikkö ka 1,6

Yksiköittäiset vastaukset kysymykseen:

**Oletko tyytyväinen eduskunnan kansliain sisäiseen tiedonkulkuun?**

Keskuskanslia ka 2,6 Valiokuntasihteeristö ka 2,4 Hallinto-osasto ka 2,5 Tieto- ja viestintäosasto ka 2,8 Kansainvälisten asiain yksikkö ka 3,2 Turvayksikkö ka 1,6

Yksiköittäin tarkasteltuna haasteet tiedonkululle jakautuivat siten, että enemmistö vastaajista keskuskansliassa (32,5%) katsoi tahallisen tiedon pahtaanamisen suurimmaksi haasteeksi sisääseen tiedonkululle, valiokuntasihteeristössä mielipiteit jakautuivat kahtia siten, että 30,4% katsoi tiedon tahallisen pahtaanamisen suurimmaksi haasteeksi sisääseen tiedonkululle ja 30,4% katsoi asioiden tarpeettoman monimutkaisen käsittelyn suurimmaksi haasteeksi sisääseen tiedonkululle. Hallinto-osaston vastaajista 26,3% arvioi välinpitämättömyyden suurimmaksi haasteeksi sisääseen tiedonkululle, tieto- ja viestintäosastolla 30,6% katsoi suurimmaksi haasteeksi tiedon tahallisen pant-
taamisen ja niin myös kansainvälisten asiain yksikössä jossa 35,7% vastaajista oli samaa mieltä. Turvayksikössä 28,6% katsoi asioiden tarpeettoman monimutkaisen käsittelyn suurimmaksi haasteeksi sisäiselle tiedonkululle.

Avovastauksissa enemmistö niistä vastaajista, jotka olivat vastanneet tiedon lähteekseen muu lähde, ilmoitti muuksi lähetteksi juorut ja puskaradion. Ne vastaajat, jotka ilmoittivat olevansa tyytyväisiä tiedonkulkuun, kertoivat se johtuvan mm. hyvistä sisäisistä tiedotusvälineistä. Informaatiota todettiin olevan saatavilla paljon, mutta joskus sen löytäminen koettiin vaikeaksi. Suurin osa vastaajista suhtautui ainakin jonkin verran kriittisesti tiedonkulkuun, organisaationlaajuisen tiedottamispolitiikan katsottui ongelmaksi ja seurauksena on arvailua, huhuja ja tipoittaista tiedonkulua. Tämän ei katsottu johtuvan tiedotusyksikön toimista vaan ”talon hengestä”; asioida ei kerrota ennen kuin ne on päätetty. Eniten esitetyt toivomukset olivat, että asioida tiedotettaisiin liian aiemmassa vaiheessa. Moni vastaaja ilmoitti lukevansa eduskunnan kansliaa koskevia tietoja tiedotusvälineistä.

“meidän talon henkilöstölehti on Helsingin Sanomat…”

Johtaminen/henkilöstö

Johtamisesta oli kyselyssä henkilöstölle ja esimiehille oltiin osan. Jakokysymyksen kussakin yksikössä: Onko teillä välittömiä alaisia eli henkilöitä, joiden työn ohjaamisesta ja valvonnasta olette itse esimiehenä? 83,4% vastaajista ilmoitti ei ja jatkoi siis eteenpäin henkilöstön osioon ja 16,6% vastasi kyllä jatkaen esimiehen osioon.

Lähiesimiehille annetaan vastauksissa paikoitellen erittäinkin hyvää palautetta siten, että suurin osa vastaavista on joko kolmosen yläpuolella tai en osaa sanoa. Kysyttäessä yleisesti yksikön johtamisesta ja johtamisen oikeudenmukaisuudesta omaa yksikköä ajatellen 47,4% vastaavista on keskiarvolla alapuolella eli eri mieltä ja vajaa 30% samaa mieltä. Lähiesimiehet saavat kautta linjan hyvät arvosanat kannustuksena ja tasa-arvoisuudesta kohtelulta saavuttaen ja jopa ylittäen valtionhallinnon keskiarvon. Oikeudenmukaisuuden, innovatiivisuuden tukemisen, luottamuksellisen vuorovaikutuksen ja yhteistyön osalta heidän saamaansa arvosanat jäävät kuitenkin alle valtionhallinnon keskiarvon.

Lähiesismiesten taitoja ja tietoja arvioitaessa vastaukset jakautuvat siten, että 6,8% vastaajista toteaa lähiesimiehen taitojen ja tietojen vastaan avustavan hänen tehtäviään huonosti, 14,1% melko huonosti, 24,1% ei osaa sanoa, 40,8% melko hyvin ja 14,1% erittäin hyvin. Tässäkin yksityiskohtaisesti jos laskee yhteis koko keskiarvon 5,9% vastaajista oli sitä mieltä että lähiesimiehen taidot vastaavat huonosti hänen tehtäviään ja 54,9% sitä mieltä, että lähiesimiehen taidot vastaavat hyvin hänen tehtäviään.

Esimiehet saavat hyviä arvosanoja myös muissa tehtävissä vastaukset jakautuvat siten, että 6,8% vastaajista toteaa lähiesimihensä taitojen ja tietojen vastaan avustavan hänen tehtäviään huonosti, 14,1% melko huonosti, 24,1% ei osaa sanoa, 40,8% melko hyvin ja 14,1% erittäin hyvin. Tässäkin yksityiskohtaisesti jos laske yhteis koko keskiarvon 5,9% vastaajista oli sitä mieltä että lähiesimiehen taidot vastaavat huonosti hänen tehtäviään ja 54,9% sitä mieltä, että lähiesimiehen taidot vastaavat hyvin hänen tehtäviään.

Esimiehet saavat hyviä arvosanoja myös muissa tehtävissä vastaukset jakautuvat siten, että 6,8% vastaajista toteaa lähiesimihensä taitojen ja tietojen vastaan avustavan hänen tehtäviään huonosti, 14,1% melko huonosti, 24,1% ei osaa sanoa, 40,8% melko hyvin ja 14,1% erittäin hyvin. Tässäkin yksityiskohtaisesti jos laske yhteis koko keskiarvon 5,9% vastaajista oli sitä mieltä että lähiesimiehen taidot vastaavat huonosti hänen tehtäviään ja 54,9% sitä mieltä, että lähiesimiehen taidot vastaavat hyvin hänen tehtäviään.

Esimiehet saavat hyviä arvosanoja myös muissa tehtävissä vastaukset jakautuvat siten, että 6,8% vastaajista toteaa lähiesimihensä taitojen ja tietojen vastaan avustavan hänen tehtäviään huonosti, 14,1% melko huonosti, 24,1% ei osaa sanoa, 40,8% melko hyvin ja 14,1% erittäin hyvin. Tässäkin yksityiskohtaisesti jos laske yhteis koko keskiarvon 5,9% vastaajista oli sitä mieltä että lähiesimiehen taidot vastaavat huonosti hänen tehtäviään ja 54,9% sitä mieltä, että lähiesimiehen taidot vastaavat hyvin hänen tehtäviään.

Esimiehet saavat hyviä arvosanoja myös muissa tehtävissä vastaukset jakautuvat siten, että 6,8% vastaajista toteaa lähiesimihensä taitojen ja tietojen vastaan avustavan hänen tehtäviään huonosti, 14,1% melko huonosti, 24,1% ei osaa sanoa, 40,8% melko hyvin ja 14,1% erittäin hyvin. Tässäkin yksityiskohtaisesti jos laske yhteis koko keskiarvon 5,9% vastaajista oli sitä mieltä että lähiesimiehen taidot vastaavat huonosti hänen tehtäviään ja 54,9% sitä mieltä, että lähiesimiehen taidot vastaavat hyvin hänen tehtäviään.

Esimiehet saavat hyviä arvosanoja myös muissa tehtävissä vastaukset jakautuvat siten, että 6,8% vastaajista toteaa lähiesimihensä taitojen ja tietojen vastaan avustavan hänen tehtäviään huonosti, 14,1% melko huonosti, 24,1% ei osaa sanoa, 40,8% melko hyvin ja 14,1% erittäin hyvin. Tässäkin yksityiskohtaisesti jos laske yhteis koko keskiarvon 5,9% vastaajista oli sitä mieltä että lähiesimiehen taidot vastaavat huonosti hänen tehtäviään ja 54,9% sitä mieltä, että lähiesimiehen taidot vastaavat hyvin hänen tehtäviään.

Esimiehet saavat hyviä arvosanoja myös muissa tehtävissä vastaukset jakautuvat siten, että 6,8% vastaajista toteaa lähiesimihensä taitojen ja tietojen vastaan avustavan hänen tehtäviään huonosti, 14,1% melko huonosti, 24,1% ei osaa sanoa, 40,8% melko hyvin ja 14,1% erittäin hyvin. Tässäkin yksityiskohtaisesti jos laske yhteis koko keskiarvon 5,9% vastaajista oli sitä mieltä että lähiesimiehen taidot vastaavat huonosti hänen tehtäviään ja 54,9% sitä mieltä, että lähiesimiehen taidot vastaavat hyvin hänen tehtäviään.
korjattavaa, sillä myönteistä palautetta raportoi saavansa 37,4%, vastaajista 27,4% ei osaa sanoa ja 35,2% vastaajista ei koe saavansa palautetta. Vastaajista 18,9% ei saa kielteistä palautetta, 33,2% ei osaa sanoa ja 47,9% saa kielteistä palautetta. Tässä on siis korjaamisen varaa (myös avovastauksissa mainittiin yhtenä ongelmana kaikenlaisen palautteen puute).

Kun tulokset verrataan vuonna 2001 strategian pohjaksi tehdyn kyselyn tuloksiin (samoja kysymyksiä) voidaan nähdä, että kansli tai tulokset ovat kautaaltaan hieman pudonneet. Vuonna 2001 83% oli samaa mieltä väärtävän kanssa, jossa todetaan, että työn tulokset ovat saavutettavissa 37,4%, vastaajista 27,4% ei osaa sanoa ja 35,2% vastaajista ei saa palautetta. Vastaajista 18,9% ei saa kielteistä palautetta, 33,2% ei osaa sanoa ja 47,9% saa kielteistä palautetta. Tässä on siis korjaamisen varaa (myös avovastauksissa mainittiin yhtenä ongelmana kaikenlaisen palautteen puute).

Kun tulokset verrataan vuonna 2001 strategian pohjaksi tehdyn kyselyn tuloksiin (samoja kysymyksiä) voidaan nähdä, että kansli tai tulokset ovat kautaaltaan hieman pudonneet. Vuonna 2001 83% oli samaa mieltä väärtävän kanssa, jossa todetaan, että työn tulokset ovat saavutettavissa 37,4%, vastaajista 27,4% ei osaa sanoa ja 35,2% vastaajista ei saa palautetta. Vastaajista 18,9% ei saa kielteistä palautetta, 33,2% ei osaa sanoa ja 47,9% saa kielteistä palautetta. Tässä on siis korjaamisen varaa (myös avovastauksissa mainittiin yhtenä ongelmana kaikenlaisen palautteen puute).

Kun tulokset verrataan vuonna 2001 strategian pohjaksi tehdyn kyselyn tuloksiin (samoja kysymyksiä) voidaan nähdä, että kansli tai tulokset ovat kautaaltaan hieman pudonneet. Vuonna 2001 83% oli samaa mieltä väärtävän kanssa, jossa todetaan, että työn tulokset ovat saavutettavissa 37,4%, vastaajista 27,4% ei osaa sanoa ja 35,2% vastaajista ei saa palautetta. Vastaajista 18,9% ei saa kielteistä palautetta, 33,2% ei osaa sanoa ja 47,9% saa kielteistä palautetta. Tässä on siis korjaamisen varaa (myös avovastauksissa mainittiin yhtenä ongelmana kaikenlaisen palautteen puute).

Vastaajista yli 60% totesi yksikköä kaipaa vähentämistä tai poistamista yhteisen arvoperustan vahvistamista, samaten yli 60% toivoi henkilöstön ikääntymiseen varautumista, lähes 90% kai- pasi henkilöstön osaamisen kehittämistä ja yli 50% katsoi urasuunnitelmien kehittä- men olevan tarpeen.

Vastaajista yli 60% totesi yksikköä kaipaa vähentämistä tai poistamista yhteisen arvoperustan vahvistamista, samaten yli 60% toivoi henkilöstön ikääntymiseen varautumista, lähes 90% kai- pasi henkilöstön osaamisen kehittämistä ja yli 50% katsoi urasuunnitelmien kehittä- men olevan tarpeen.

Kysytessä oman esimiehen tehtävien ja vaikutuspyynnön suhdetta sellaisiin omamyydyinä kohtuutena kuten palkka, siirrot työtehtäviin välillä, koulutus, loma-asiat ja virkavapaudet vastasi yli 60 % henkilöstöistä, että valta tulisi säilyttää ennaltaan kaikissa muissa tapauksissa paitais palkkauksessa. Palkkauksen osalta lähis pukeutu vastaajista kat- soi, että esimiehen valta tulisi säilyttää ennaltaan ja hieman alle 40 % oli sitä mieltä, että sitä tulisi lisätä, noin 15 % vastaajista katsoi, että esimiehen valtaa tulisi vähentää palkkauksen osalta. Kyselyssä kartoitettiin myös miten yksiköissä käydään tulos- ja kehityskeskusteluja. Vastaajista 9,9% vastasi, ettei niitä käydä, 57,6% vastasi, että keskusteluja käydään ja 29,3% vastasi, että kehityskeskusteluja käydään tunnettuina. Yksiköittäin vastaukset jakautuvat seuraavalla tavalla:

Keskuskanslia: 60% kyllä, 26,3% satunnaisesti, 5,3% ei
Valiokuntasihteeristö: 61,9% kyllä, 28,6% satunnaisesti, 9,5% ei
Hallintooasosto: 47,4% kyllä, 36,8% satunnaisesti, 11,8% ei
Tieto- ja viestintäosasto: 90% kyllä, 7,5% satunnaisesti, 2,5% ei
Kansainvälisten asiain yksikkö: 16,7% kyllä, 83,3% satunnaisesti, 0% ei
Turvayksikkö: 10% kyllä, 40% satunnaisesti, 50% ei

Johtamisosion lopussa kysytettiin vaikuttaa eduskunnan ylimmän johdon toiminta työhöin kannustavasti ja pitääkö se yllä mielikuvaa yhteisistä tavoitteista ja toimintata- voista. Vastausten keskiarvo on jälleen alle keskiarvon (2,8). Vastaajista 5,2% vastasi kyllä, 40,3% vastasi ei, 31,9% toisinaan, 17,3% harvoin ja 5,2% useinmitten. Avokysymysten vastauksissa käy myös selkeästi ilmi, että ylimmällä johdolta kaivataan määrä- tietoisempaa ja näkyvämpää otetta koko organisaatioon.

"Selkeää johtamista, ei pelkkää asioiden hoitoa."
Johtamnet/esimiehet

Kysymyksen onko yksikössäsi osallistuttu esimiehille/päälliköille suunnattuihin koulutus- ja valmennusohjelmiin viimeisen viiden vuoden aikana jätti vastaamatta 15,8% esimiehistä, 18,4% vastasi kaikkien esimiesten osallistuneen, 23,7% useiden esimiesten osallistuneen, 26,3% yksittäisten esimiesten osallistuneen ja 15,8% vastasi, ettei kukaan ole osallistunut.

Eduskunnan kansliassa on laadittu henkilökohtaisia johtamissopimuksia esimiesten kanssa todella vähän (6,1%). Vastaajista 87,9% vastasi ettei kyseisiä sopimuksia ole laadittu ja 6,1%, että asia on suunnitteleilla. Kysyttäessä palautteesta esimiehet vastasivat seuraavalla tavalla: 15,8% ei vastannut ollenkaan, 2,6% vastasi ettei saa ollenkaan palautetta, 23,7% saavansa liian vähän palautetta, 5,3% ei osannut sanoa, 26,3% saa jonkin verran palautetta ja 26,3% saa riittävästi palautetta.

Johtamisen kehittämistä koskevien kysymysten osalta esimiesten mielipiteet jakautuivat pitkälti kahtia. Noin puolet oli samaa ja puolet eri mieltä, 43,8% eri mieltä ja 43,8% samaa mieltä ja 12,5% ei osannut sanoa. Sen sijaan melkein 90% vastanneista esimiehistä oli sitä mieltä, että henkilöstojohtamiseen liittyviin asioihin ei ole kiinnitetty eduskunnassa liikaa huomioa ja melkein 70% sitä mieltä, että johtajien henkilöstöjohtamisen tuloksellisuuden arviointia tulisi lisätä. Ylimmän johdon tehtävien muuttaminen määraaikaiseksi jakoi mielipiteet siten, että esimiehistä 36,4% oli eri mieltä, 18,2% ei osannut sanoa ja 45,4% oli samaa mieltä. Johtajien palkitseminen onnistuneestä henkilöjohtamisesta jakoi mielipiteitä siten, että 24,3% oli eri mieltä, 24,2% ei osannut sanoa ja 51,6% oli samaa mieltä.

Esimiehistä 45,4% oli samaa mieltä, että heidän yksikkönsä johtaminen on muuttunut merkittävästi viimeisen viiden vuoden aikana, 27,3% ei osannut sanoa ja 27,3% oli eri mieltä. Väittämään, että yksikössä käsitellään usein henkilöstojohtamiseen liittyviä kysymyksiä 48,5% vastasi olevansa samaa mieltä, 21,2% ei osannut sanoa ja 30,3% oli eri mieltä. Kanslian johtoryhmässä henkilöstojohtamiseen liittyviä asioita käsitellään 18,8% mielestä usein, 59,4% ei osaa sanoa ja 21,9% oli eri mieltä. Rekrytointimahdollisuuksien suhteen esimiehet olivat toiveikkaat, 68,8% oli sitä mieltä, että heidän yksikössä rekrytointimahdollisuudet ovat hyvät, 18,8% ei osannut sanoa ja vain 12,5% oli eri mieltä. Eläköitymisen suhteen esimiesten näkemys on positiivinen, yli 70% ei näe esimiesten ja pääälliköiden eläköitymistä uhkana yksikkönsä palvelukyvylle, 9,1% ei osaa sanoa ja vain 15,2% on sitä mieltä, että se muodostaa uhan.


Haastatteluista ja avokysymyksistä nouseita teemoja

Sekä virkamiesjohdon kanssa tehdyistä 17 haastattelusta että kyselyn avovastauksista nousevat esiin samat teemat joskin ehkä vähäisin sävy eroin. Eduskunnan kansliassa kaivataan strategisempaa johtamista, henkilöstöjohtamista, nopeampaa kriseihin puuttumista, avoimempaa ja nopeampaa tiedotuspolitiikkaa, osallistuvampaa ylintä johtoa, koko organisaation kattavia käytänteitä, jotka loistivat kaikille saman säännönstön ja sitä kautta luottamukseen ilmapiirin niin kutsutun ”junailukulttuurin” sijasta. Kun verrataan vuoden 2001 kyselyyn, jossa keskeiset avovastauksista esittäneet teemat olivat johtaminen, palikkaus, osaaminen, yhteishenki, työajat ja avoimuus nähdään, että teemat ovat ennallaan.
Strategia ja sen sisältämät arvot ja ajatukset itsessään koetaan yleisesti hyvänä, mutta niiden jalkauttaminen ei ole oikein onnistunut. Tutkija ei voi välttää ajatusta siitä, että voisi kopioida vuoden 2001 tutkimuksen tiivistelmän avokysymysten osalta ja se vastaisi vuoden 2007 tilannetta erittäin hyvin. Strategian vaikuttavuutta arvioitaessa on todettava, että eduskunnan kanslian henkilöstöstrategia on hyvin tehty ja kattava dokumentti. Se voisi ehkä osittain olla vielä konkreettisempi esimerkiksi erilaisten käytänteiden osalta mutta strategiaan liittyvät ongelmat eivät piile henkilöstöstrategia dokumentissa vaan niiden toimeenpanossa. Strategian sisältämiä periaatteita käytännön toteutus ei ole tähän saakka ollut kovin onnistunut ja sitä kautta henkilöstöstrategiaa ei ole saavuttanut sellaista vaikuttavuutta kuin siltä olisi sisällön perusteella voinut odottaa.

“...strategia on hyvä dokumentti mutta se on toistaiseksi jäänyt pelkäksi kuolleeksi kirjameksi...”

Eduskunnan virkamiesjohdon kanssa tehdyissä haastatteluissa nousivat esiin pitkälti samat teemat kuin kyselytutkimuksen avovastauksissa. Henkilöstöstrategia koettiin yleisesti hyväksi ja tärkeitä arvoja sisältäväksi dokumentiksi myös johdon parissa. Monet totesivat saaneensa siitä apua johtamisyöylenne mutta samaan aikaan kaikki haastattellut totesivat, että käytännön toteutuksessa ei ole päästystä haluttuihin tuloksiin.

Henkilöstöstrategiin arvo johtajien kannalta nähtiin nimenomaan johtamistyökaluna ja johtamista tukevana dokumenttina joka erityisesti hankalassa tilanteessa tarjoaa erilaisia toimintamalleja, tätä aspektia toivoitettiin vielä vahvistettavan. Haastatteluissa nousi esiin myös systemaattisen strategisen johtamistyön lisäämiseen tarve. Erityisesti johtoryhmä kohtaa toivottua strategian hyväksi ja toivoivat lisää vastaavanlaisia toimenpiteitä, yhtenäistä, strategista johtamista.


Yksi haastattelun osa oli SWOT-analyysi. Se tehtiin kaikkien vastanneiden kanssa ja siinäkin merkillepantavaa on vastausten yhdenmukaisuus. Haastateltavat olivat lahes pitkälle yhtä mietiä ja vastaivat samalla tavoin haastattelun kysymyksiin. Tämän voisi ajatella helpottavan yhteisen strategian luomista ja luovan mahdollisuuksia aktiivisemman johtamisyhteistyön (lähes kaikkien vastaajien toive) luomiseksi.
Virkamiesjohdon kanssa tehdyn SWOT-analyysin tulokset

**Kanslian nykyiset vahvuudet:**
Mielenkintoinen, pysyvä, turvallinen, arvostettu, arvokas työpaikka kansakunnan kaakin päällä, hyvät työsuhde-edut, palkat korkeammat, työkaverit valtionhallinnon kermass, taloudellisesti riippumaton instituutio, osaava ja sitoutunut henkilökunta, hyvät resurssit ja tekniset puutteet, kannustetaan kouluautomaan, työ on mienkiintoina eikä aina helppoa mutta haastavaa.

**Kanslian tulevaisuuden mahdollisuuksia:**
Henkilöstöstrategia ja henkilöstöpolitiikka ovat käytännössä mahdollisuusia, niiden asianmukaisella hoitamisella voidaan päästä vaikka mihin, henkilöstön sitoutumisessa, osaavuus ja organisation resurssit ovat niitä käytännössä mahdollisuutta, niitä voisi hyödyntää vielä paljon enemmän, yhteisten pelisääntöjen puuttuminen, tarpeettoman hierarkian purku ja demokratian lisääminen on pääkaikin käytännössä uudelleen organisoinnilla aktiivisempaa tehtäväväestoa ja selkeämpää sääntöä, joustavampia tehtäväväkiä, johtoyhdistys voi käyttää luomattavasti enemmän työkaluna organisation järjestelyissä.

**Kanslian nykyiset heikkoudet:**
Henkilöstön määrän rajan kasvu heikentänyt ennen tiukkaa koheesiota, iso organisaatio hajallaan, erillisiä ja erilaisia virastoja, entisestä heikentä heksosia, pirstaleista, ei strategiaa, epäselvaisia hoitajuusmääriyteen ovatko pomoja politiikat tai virkamiehet, hallinnon epämääryisyys ja erilainen soveltaminen, eri säännöt eri puolilla, oman edun tavoitteleja ja poliittiset pelit, johtoryhmän työskentely vajavaihto, johtamistaidot huonot, sisältöjohtamista ei henkilöstöjohtamista, työkulttuurit jähmettyneitä, koko organisaatio jossain määrin jäähdistynyt 70-luvulle...

**Bibliografia:**

Eduskunnan kanslian henkilöstöstrategia 2002-2006 ja eduskunnan kanslian henkilöstöpolitiikan ohjelma


Liite 1.

ARVOISA EDUSKUNNAN KANSLIAN VIRKAMIES / KANSANEDUSTAJAN AVUSTAJA


Arviointitutkimuksen lisäksi tehdään samalla myös tasa-arvoselvitys jonka avulla pyritään kartoittamaan, miten eduskunnan virkamiehet ja kansanedustajien avustajat kokevat tasa-arvon toteutumisen jokapäiväisessä työssään. Tasa-arvo ymmärretään tässä tapauksessa miesten ja naisten välistä tasa-arvoksi sekä yhdenvertaisuuslain mukaisesti tasa-arvoksi tästä, etnisestä taustasta, vammaisuudesta, seksuaalisesta suuntautumisesta ja muista henkilöiden ominaisuuksien eroista riippumatta.

Arvioinnin ja molempien kyselyiden vastausten analysoinnin suorittaa tutkija Hertta Niemi Svenska handelshögskolanista (Hanken) ja koko tutkimus suoritetaan kaikkia Suomen Akatemian ja EU:n eettisiä tutkimusohjeita noudattaen. Kaikkiiin tutkimuksessa saatuihin tietoihin suhtaudutaan ehdottoman luottamuksellisesti, yksittäisiä vastaajia koskevia tietoja ei raportoida ja aineisto on ainoastaan tutkijan käytössä.

Kaikki virkamiesten ja avustajien toivotaan vastaavan kyselyyn viimeistään 11.6.2007 mennessä. Linkki kyselyyn löytyy tästä sähköpostista.


Vastauksianne odotellen,
Hertta Niemi

Puhelin: 4973
GSM 040 - 820 11 46
hertta.niemi@eduskunta.fi
TAUSTATIEDOT

Sukupuoleni  1 nainen  2 mies

Ikäni      vuotta

Peruskoulutukseni

1  kansakoulu
2  keskikoulu, peruskoulu tai osa oppikoulu
3  ylioppilas

Korkein suorittamani tutkinto on

1  ei ammattikurssia eikä tutkintoa
2  ammattikurssi (vähintään 4 kk)
3  ammattikoulututkinto
4  opistotutkinto
5  korkeakoulututkinto

Kuinka pitkään olette työskennelleet eduskunnan palveluksessa?

1 Alle vuoden
2 1-3 vuotta
3 4-6 vuotta
4 7-10
5 Yli kymmenen vuotta

Osasto jossa työskentelen

1 keskusanslia (pöytäkirja-, asiakirja-, ja ruotsin kielen toimistot, sihteeristö)
2 valiokuntasihteeristö (suuri valiokunta, erityisvaliokunnat, EU-sihteeristö)
3 hallinto-osasto (hallinto-, kiinteistö-, tili- ja tietohallintotoimistot)
4 tieto- ja viestintäyksikkö (eduskunnan kirjasto, sisäinen tietopalvelu, eduskuntatiedotus)
5 kansainvälisten asiain yksikkö
6 turvayksikkö
7 kansanedustajan avustaja

Nykyinen virka-asemani

1 johto- ja esimiestehtävät (esim. osasto-, toimisto- ja jaostopäällikkö)
2 vaativat asiantuntijatehtävät (esim. valiokuntaneuvos, eduskuntasihteeri, kielenkääntäjä, tietoasiantuntija)
3 muut tehtävät (esim. virastomestarit ja –avustajat, osasto- ja toimistosihteerit, siivoojat, sovellusneuvojat)
Onko teillä välttömiä alaisia eli henkilöitä, joiden työn ohjaamisesta ja valvonnasta te olette itse esimiesvastuuessa?

1 ei
2 on, yhteensä __ henkilöä (huom. alaisenanne olevan alemman esimiehen omia alaisia ei lueta mukaan)

Lähimmän esimiehen sukupuoli

1 Mies
2 Nainen

YLEISTÄ ARVOISTA JA HENKILÖSTÖPOLITIIKASTA

Tiedätkö mitä eduskunnan kanslian henkilöstöstrategia ja henkilöstöpoliittinen ohjelma sisältävät?

1 En ole kuullutkaan niistä
2 Olen kuullut että ne ovat olemassa
3 En osaa sanoa
4 Tiedän suurin piirtein mistä on kyse
5 Tiedän mitä ohjelmat sisältävät

Jos niin näkyvätkö nämä asiat työssäsi tai työyhteisössäsi jotkin? Onko vuoden 2002 jälkeen tullut merkittäviä muutoksia?

1 Eivät näy, mikään ei ole muuttunut
2 Näkyvät heikosti ja muutokset ovat pieniä
3 En osaa sanoa
4 Näkyvät jonkin verran, joitain positiivisia muutoksia on tullut
5 Näkyvät selvästi ja ovat vaikuttaneet erittäin positiivisesti

Jos muutoksia on tullut kuvaille mikä on muuttunut?

__________________________________________

Eduskunnan kanslian arvot löytyvät alta. Valitse (ympyröi) arvoista ne joiden osalta kanslian pitäisi eniten parantaa suoritustaan

1. oikeudenmukaisuus
2. avoimuus
3. luotettavuus
4. palveluhenkisyys
5. tasa-arvoisuus
6. tuloksellisuus
Ovatko eduskunnan kansliamiehen arvot muuttuneet mielestäsi viimeisten viiden vuoden aikana?

1. eivät
2. jonkin verran
3. en osaa sanoa
4. suurelta osin
5. täysin

Jos niin miten tai mitkä arvot ovat muuttuneet?

TYÖNORGANISOINTI JA TYÖILMAPIIRI

Vastatkaa seuraaviin yleisesti eduskunnan kansliasta työpaikkana koskeviin väittämiin
(1= Täysin eri mieltä, 2= Eri mieltä, 3= Ei samaa eikä erimieltyä, 4= Samaa mieltä 5= Täysin samaa mieltä.)

Eduskunnan kanslia on esimerkikin työnantaja hyvän henkilöstöpolitiikan toteuttamisessa ja henkilöstön kohtelussa
Täysin eri mieltä 1 2 3 4 5 Täysin samaa mieltä

Eduskunnan kansliamiehen toiminta on arvolähtöistä ja eettisesti korkeatasoista
Täysin eri mieltä 1 2 3 4 5 Täysin samaa mieltä

Eduskunnan kansliassa on riittävästi henkilöstöä
Täysin eri mieltä 1 2 3 4 5 Täysin samaa mieltä

Eduskunnan kansliamiehen tehtävät voitaisiin hoitaa oleellisesti pienemmällä henkilöstöllä
Täysin eri mieltä 1 2 3 4 5 Täysin samaa mieltä

Yksikköjen välistä henkilöstön käytössä voisi olla enemmän
Täysin eri mieltä 1 2 3 4 5 Täysin samaa mieltä

Aikataulullista joustoa vaativien tehtävien hoidossa voitaisiin siirtyä vuorotyöhön
Täysin eri mieltä 1 2 3 4 5 Täysin samaa mieltä

Työtehtävien hoitaminen yksikössämme olisi mahdollista järjestellä nykyistä sujuvammin
Täysin eri mieltä 1 2 3 4 5 Täysin samaa mieltä

Eduskunnan kansliamiehen henkilöstö on osaava
Täysin eri mieltä 1 2 3 4 5 Täysin samaa mieltä

Eduskunnan kansliamiehen henkilöstö on sitoutunutta
Täysin eri mieltä 1 2 3 4 5 Täysin samaa mieltä
Palkkaus on kannustavaa ja toiminnan tavoitteita tukevaa
Täysin eri mieltä 1 2 3 4 5 Täysin samaa mieltä

Palvelusuhteen ehdot ovat kilpailukykyisiä
Täysin eri mieltä 1 2 3 4 5 Täysin samaa mieltä

Mitä eduskunnan kanslian ylin johto on tehnyt parantaukeen työyhteisön
henkeä? (Anna esimerkki)

Mitä eduskunnan kanslian ylin johto voisi tehdä parantaukeen työyhteisön
henkeä? (Anna esimerkki)

Mitä lähiesimiehesi on tehnyt parantaukeen lähityöyhteisösi henkeä? (Anna
esimerkki)

Mitä lähiesimiehesi voisi tehdä parantaukeen lähityöyhteisösi henkeä? (Anna
esimerkki)

Mitä olet itse tehnyt parantaukset lähityöyhteisösi henkeä? (Anna esimerkki)

TIEDONKULKU

Kuinka riittävästi saat tietoa itseäsi koskevista henkilöstöasioidista kuten
palkkausksesta, lomista, työterveyshuollosta taiavoimista viroista seuraavilta
tahoilta? (ympyröi oikea numero)
(1= Aivan liian vähän, 2= Liian vähän, 3= Vaikea sanoa, 4= Lähes riittävästi, 5=
Aivan riittävästi)

Oma esimes 1 2 3 4 5
Työtoverit 1 2 3 4 5
Henkilöstöyhdistys 1 2 3 4 5
Henkilöstölehti Info 1 2 3 4 5
Hallinto-osaston tiedotteet 1 2 3 4 5
Hallinto- ja tili FORWARD henkilöstö 1 2 3 4 5
Eduskunnan intranet-tietoverkko Fakta 1 2 3 4 5
Muu lähde 1 2 3 4 5

Jos vastasit muu lähde, mikä?
Oletko tyytyväinen eduskunnan kansliaan sisäiseen tiedonkulkuun?

en
olen osittain tyytymätön
en osaa sanoa
olen osittain tyytyväinen
olen

Jos olet niin miksi?

Jos et niin miksi et?

Mikä tai mitkä asiat sinusta asettavat suurimmankaa haasteen sisäiselle tiedonkululle? (rastita yksi tai useampi vaihtoehto)
Tarpeettoman vaikea virkapiilien käyttö
Tiedon tähallinen panttaaminen
Tarpeettoman monimutkainen asian käsittely
Välipitämättömyys
Tietämättömyys
Muut syt

Jos vastasit muut syyt, mikä/mitkä?

Mitä toivoisit tehtävän sisäisen tiedonkulun parantamiseksi?

Onko teillä välittömästi alaisia eli henkilöitä, joiden työn ohjaamisesta ja valvomisesta olette itse esimiesvastuuassa?
1 ei
2 on

JOHTAMINEN (henkilöstölle)

Arvioi miten seuraavat luonnehdiinnat kuvaavat johtamista (kyse on lähimmästä esimiehestäsi) yksikössäsi? (1=Täysin eri mieltä, 2=Eri mieltä, 3=Ei samaa eikä eri mieltä, 4= Samaa mieltä, 5= Täysin samaa mieltä)

Esimieheni kannustaa minua 1 2 3 4 5
Esimieheni kohtelee miehiä ja naisia tasa-arvoisesti 1 2 3 4 5
Työpaikkani johtamistapa on oikeudenmukainen 1 2 3 4 5
Yksikköni johtaminen tukee innovatiivisuutta 1 2 3 4 5
Yksikköni johtaminen perustuu luottamukselliseen vuorovaikutukseen ja yhteistyöhön 1 2 3 4 5

Vastaavatko oman lähiesimiehesi tiedot ja taidot tehtävän hänelle asettamia vaatimuksia? (valitse rastiittamalla yksi vaihtoehto)

Erittäin huonosti
Melko huonosti
Vaikea sanoa
Melko hyvin
Erittäin hyvin

Kuinka hyvin seuraavat työtä ja johtamista yksikössänne koskevat väittämät pitävät mielestänne paikkansa? (1=Täysin eri mieltä, 2=Eri mieltä, 3=Ei samaa eikä eri mieltä, 4=Samaa mieltä, 5=Täysin samaa mieltä)

Kun esimieheni kanssa on sovittu työni tavoitteesta, saan toteuttaa ne itsenäisesti 1 2 3 4 5

Esimieheni ei ole kiinnostunut työni tuloksista 1 2 3 4 5

Esimieheni kanssa sovittat asiat eivät useimmiten johda mihinkään konkreettiseen vaan jäävät puheksi 1 2 3 4 5

Työtoverini vaikuttavat enemmän työni tavoitteiden sisältöön kuin oma esimieheni 1 2 3 4 5

Esimieheni järjestää riittävästi aikaa keskustelulle jos yritän puhua hänen kanssaan tärkeistä työasioista 1 2 3 4 5

Esimieheni on niin heikko että hän voi pyytää alaisiltaan vain sitä mitä nämä haluavat 1 2 3 4 5

Esimieheni seuraa työni tavoitteiden toteutumista säännöllisesti 1 2 3 4 5

Eri esimiehet asettavat työlleni keskenään ristiriittaisia tavoitteita 1 2 3 4 5

Kuinka hyvin seuraavat työtä ja johtamista yksikössänne koskevat väittämät pitävät mielestäsi paikkansa?
(1=Täysin eri mieltä, 2=Eri mieltä, 3=Ei samaa eikä eri mieltä,
4=Samaa mieltä, 5=Täysin samaa mieltä)

Olen hyvin perillä siitä, mitkä ovat oman työni tavoitteet 1 2 3 4 5

Oman työni tavoitteet ovat sopivan haasteellisia 1 2 3 4 5
Oman työni tavoitteet on sovittu yhdessä esimieheni kanssa 1 2 3 4 5

Se, miten työni tuloksia tallä hetkellä mitataan auttaa, minua kehittämään työttöni 1 2 3 4 5

Asetan käytännössä itse omat tavoitteeni, esimieheni ei niihin juuri paneudu 1 2 3 4 5

Jos teen työni hyvin saan esimiehetäni myönteistä palautetta 1 2 3 4 5

Jos teen työni huonosti saan esimiehetäni kielteistä palautetta 1 2 3 4 5

Arvioi seuraavien osa-alueiden merkitystä oman yksikkösi toiminnan kannalta

(1= Ei lainkaan tärkeä, 2= Ei kovin tärkeä, 3= Ei tärkeä, mutta ei merkityksetönkään, 4= Tärkeä, 5= Erittäin tärkeä)

Yhteisen arvoperustan vahvistaminen
Ei lainkaan tärkeä 1 2 3 4 5 Erittäin tärkeä

Henkilöstön ikääntymiseen varautuminen
Ei lainkaan tärkeä 1 2 3 4 5 Erittäin tärkeä

Henkilöstön osaamisen kehittäminen
Ei lainkaan tärkeä 1 2 3 4 5 Erittäin tärkeä

Urasuunnittelun kehittäminen
Ei lainkaan tärkeä 1 2 3 4 5 Erittäin tärkeä

Pitäisikö oman esimiehesi vaikutusvaltaa vähentää, säilyttää ennallaan vai lisätä seuraavissa työtäsi koskevissa asioissa? (1=Vähentää, 2=Säilyttää ennallaan, 3=Lisätä)

Oma palkkani 1 2 3
Siirrot työtehtävästä toiseen 1 2 3
Koulutus 1 2 3
Loma-asiat 1 2 3
VirkavapauDET 1 2 3

Käydäänkö yksikössäsi tulos- ja kehityskeskustelua?
1 ei
2 kyllä
3 satunnaisesti

Vaikuttaako eduskunnan ylimmän johdon toiminta työhösi kannustavasti?
Pitääkö se yllä mielikuva yhteisistä tavoitteista ja standardeista? (rastita yksi vaihtoehto)

Kyllä
Ei
Toisinaan
Harvoin
Useimmiten

JOHTAMINEN (esimiehille ja päälliköille)

Oletko osallistunut esimiehille/päälliköille suunnattuihin koulutus- ja
valmennusohjelmiin viimeisen viiden vuoden aikana? (rastita yksi vaihtoehdo)

Kaikki esimiehet ovat osallistuneet
Useat esimiehet ovat osallistuneet
Yksittäiset esimiehet ovat osallistuneet
Kukaan ei ole osallistunut

Laaditaanko esimiesten kanssa henkilökohtaiset johtamissopimukset?
(rastita yksi vaihtoehdo)
Kaikkien kanssa
Vain osan kanssa
Ei
Suunnitteilla

Onko yksikkönne esimiestehtäviin rekrytoitu viimeisen kolmen vuoden aikana
uusia henkilöitä?
(rastita yksi vaihtoehdo)

Kyllä
Ei
Rekryointiprosessi on käynnissä

Saatko mielestäsi riittävästi palautetta omasta esimiestyöstäsi?
(rastita yksi vaihtoehdo)

En saa ollenkaan palautetta
Saan liian vähän palautetta
En osaa sanoa
Saan jonkin verran palautetta
Saan riittävästi palautetta

Vastaa seuraaviin johtamisen kehittämistyöä koskeviin väittämiin
(1=Täysin eri mieltä, 2=Eri mieltä, 3=Ei samaa eikä eri mieltä,
4=Samaa mieltä, 5=Täysin samaa mieltä)

Eduskunnan johtamisen kehittämistyö on ollut merkittävää
ja tarpeellista oman työni kannalta 1 2 3 4 5

Henkilöstöjohtamiseen liittyvien asioihin on
kiinnitetty eduskunnassa liikaa huomiota 1 2 3 4 5

Johtajien tuloksellisuuden (eli tässä kohtaa onnistuneen henkilöstöjohtamisen)
systemaattista arviointia tulisi lisätä 1 2 3 4 5

Ylimmän johdon tehtävät tulisi muuttaa määräaikaisiksi 1 2 3 4 5
Johtajia pitäisi palkita toiminnan tuloksellisuuden (onnistuneen henkilöstöjohtamisen) perusteella 1 2 3 4 5

**Vastaa seuraaviin väittämiin**
(1= Täysin eri mieltä, 2= Erä mieltä, 3= Ei samaa eikä erimieltyä, 4= Samaa mieltä, 5= Täysin samaa mieltä).

Oman yksikköni johtaminen on muuttunut merkillävästi viimeisen viiden vuoden aikana
Täysin eri mieltä 1 2 3 4 5 Täysin samaa mieltä

Omassa yksikössäni käsitellään usein henkilöstöjohtamiseen liittyviä kysymyksiä
Täysin eri mieltä 1 2 3 4 5 Täysin samaa mieltä

Eduskunnan kanslian johtoryhmässä käsitellään usein henkilöstöjohtamiseen liittyviä kysymyksiä
Täysin eri mieltä 1 2 3 4 5 Täysin samaa mieltä

Yksikkömme mahdollisuudet rekrytoida päteviä henkilöitä avautuviin johto- ja esimiestehtäviin ovat hyvät
Täysin eri mieltä 1 2 3 4 5 Täysin samaa mieltä

Yksikkömme esimiesten eläköityminen aiheuttaa vakavan uhan yksikkömme palvelukyvyylle tulevaisuudessa
Täysin eri mieltä 1 2 3 4 5 Täysin samaa mieltä

**Pitäisikö seuraavissa alaisianne koskevissa asioissa päätösvaltanne vähentää, säilyttää ennallaan vai lisätä?**
(1= Vähentää, 2= Säilyttää ennallaan, 3= Lisätä)

Palkka-asiat 1 2 3
Siirrot työtehtävästä toiseen 1 2 3
Koulutus 1 2 3
Loma-asiat 1 2 3
Virkavapaudet 1 2 3
Uuden henkilöstön valinta 1 2 3
Henkilöstön irtisanominen 1 2 3
Liite 2.

Suomi/EK/

Nimi:
Ikä:
Ammatti:
Koulutustausta:
Työtehtävät:
Montako vuotta esimieskokemusta:
Aiemmat työpaikat:
Koodi:

Olette saaneet seuraavat kysymykset etukäteen, käymme ne nyt yhdessä läpi. Ensin tarkastellaan nykytilannetta, kanslian sisäisiä vahvuksia ja heikkouksia. Sitten tarkastellaan henkilöstöpolitiikan tulevaisuutta, ympäristöä kumpuavia mahdollisuuksia ja uhkatekijöitä. Esille nouseeista asioista ja haastatteluista laaditaan sitten yhteenveto.

Nykyltilanne (1-2)

1. Mitkä ovat eduskunnan kanslian vahvuudet työnantajana ja työyhteisönä?

2. Mitkä ovat kanslian heikkoudet työnantajana ja työyhteisönä?

Tulevaisuus (3-4)

3. Mitä käytämisättömiä mahdollisuuksia kanslian henkilöstöpolitiikassa on?

4. Mitä uhkia eduskunnan henkilöstöpolitiikkaan kohdistuu nyt ja lähitulevaisuudessa?
5. Miten eduskunnan henkilöstöstrategia ja henkilöstöpolitiikka ovat vaikuttaneet työhösi?

6. Miten niiden olisi mielestäsi pitänyt vaikuttaa työhösi?

7. Minkälaisia haasteita UPJ tuo tullessaan sinun työhösi?

8. Miten UPJ:hin siirtymistä voitaisin parhaiten tukea/avustaa? (minkälaisilla henkilöstöpoliittisilla ja -strategisilla suunnitelmilla tms.?)

9. Mitä johtaminen/esimiestyö/pääällikkyyys mielestäsi on?

10. Kuinka johtaminen/johtajuus toimii/tehdään tällä verrattuna muihin organisaatioihin jotka tunnet? (erityisesti jos ollut töissä muualla...?)

11. Miten kuvailisit itseäsi esimiehenä/pääällikkönä/johtajana?

12. Miten vertaisit johtamistyylisi talon muihin esimiehiin/pääälliköihin?
   a) oletko samankaltainen (miten?)
   b) erilainen (miten?)

13. Mitä muuta haluaisit lisätä? (jotain positiivista siitä miten sinua voitaisiin tukea työssäsi parhaiten, auttaa tekemään työsi paremmin tms.)
Appendix B:

An Equality evaluation for the Finnish Parliamentary administration 2007

Summary

The equality plan for the Finnish Parliamentary administration will be updated during autumn of 2007. To make sure that the update of the plan will reflect the concrete equality related questions present in the Parliamentary administration an equality survey was conducted. In the beginning of the survey there was a definition of equality where equality was defined as equality between men and women as well as general equality (as stated in the law) where a person should be treated equally despite of their age, ethnic background, disability, sexual orientation or other personal quality. The goal was to conduct a survey that would offer the best possible general view to the equality situation in the Parliamentary administration.

The survey was sent to all the employees of the Parliamentary administration as well as to the assistants of the MPs. All and all 680 people received the survey questionnaire and 320 people responded. The questionnaire was available both as a paper version and on-line. It was possible to answer the survey in Finnish or Swedish. The answers have been analysed on the level of the entire organisation as well as looking at the different departments and the differences between men and women. The analysis of this evaluation report, however, remains on the general level and the answers from the different departments have not been further divided to men and women. This way it was possible to guarantee confidentiality and the anonymity of the respondents as well as offering as wide and general and yet department specific picture of the equality situation in the Finnish Parliamentary administration.

Based on this evaluation it seems that the Finnish Parliamentary administration is a very typical Finnish work place when it comes to equality related atmosphere and attitudes. Finnish work places generally report that the equality situation is good if there are no outrageous gender related discrimination cases (Mustakallio & Saari, 2002). The equality situation in the Finnish Parliamentary administration is generally seen as fairly good and large part of the respondents argues that this is because there is no or almost no harassment. Simultaneously part of the female respondents report that they experience largely verbal harassment. A large part of the female respondents also had an experience that they do not have as much control over the amount or content of their work as they would like to. They also reported lack of information on new tasks and organisational changes. This is symptomatic of structural equality problems in an organisation, these type of structural problems are hard to locate and thus hard to fix.

The most central problems related to the gender equality situation within the parliamentary office based on this evaluation were not crude cases of harassment based on gender but rather would seem to be structural and unequal policies and ways of doing things that tend to favour mostly men and have very long traditions. A problem when it comes to this kind of structural inequality are particularly different forms of action and thinking that are not even seen nor thought as creating inequality between men and women. To shed light to these types of procedures and to question them the organisation needs systematic, long term, practice-orientated equality work.

Particularly women but also men respondents reported that there were equality problems particularly when it came to having control over one's own work, position and salary related questions. Also areas like ability to develop at work and via that ability to
improve one’s position in the organisation were areas that in the survey were listed as areas where the Parliamentary administration could improve the situation particularly for women but for men too. Over half of the respondents also felt that they could not use their full capacity at work.

Generally it was clear that men were clearly more satisfied when it came to the equality situation in their departments but also in the Parliamentary administration in general. Their responses were, in almost every question, closer to the upper end of the scale (1-5). Women’s responses were more varying but also more clearly dissatisfied. Their responses were mainly in the middle of the scale or just below it (disagree = under 3). In general the responses have a lot in common with the survey conducted in 1997. The survey conducted then included slightly less questions and they were perhaps more straight forward but even then the responses showed a difference in satisfaction levels between men and women, men were then too generally more satisfied.

**Johdanto**


Tasa-arvo ymmärtetään tässä selvityksessä miesten ja naisten väliseksi tasa-arvoksi sekä yhdenvertaisuuslaisun mukaisesti tasa-arvoksi iästä, etnisestä taustasta, vammaisuudesta, seksuaalisesta suuntautumisesta ja muista henkilöiden ominaisuuksien eroista riippumatta. Selvityksen tavoitteena on tarjota tasa-arvotyyöryhmälle mahdollisimman hyvää yleiskuva eduskunnan kanslian tasa-arvotilanteesta, jotta se voisi puolestaan laatia suunnitelman joka turvaisi eduskunnan kansliaan mahdollisimman oikeudenmukaisen ja tasa-arvoisen työympäristön.

Tämän selvityksen perusteella näyttää siltä, että eduskunta on tasa-arvoasenellamiipiirsä puolesta monin tavoin melko tyyppilinen suomalainen työpaikka. Suomalaissilla työpaikoilla tasa-arvotilannetta pidetään tyyppillisesti hyvänä, mikäli yksittäisiä sukupuolesta, hoitoturvalle tai syrjintätapauksia ei esiinny (Mustakallio & Saari 2002). Eduskunnan kansliassa tasa-arvotilannetta pidetään myös yleisesti hyvänä ja iso osa vastaajista näkee tämän johtuvan juuri siitä ettei häiriintä juurikaan esiinny. Samaan aikaan osa naisvastaajista raportoi ettei pysty vaikuttamaan työmääräihin tai työnkuvauksiin haluamallaan tavalla, eikä saa mielestään riittävästi tietoa uusista tehtävistä ja organisaation sisäisistä muutoksista. Tämä kertoo rakenteellisista tasa-arvoon liittyvistä epäonnistumisista joita on vaikeampi paikantaa ja siten myös korjata kuin selkeitä häiriintötapauksia.

Selvityksen toteutus


Taustatiedot

Kaikilta kyselyyn osallistuneilta kysyttiin aluksi heidän sukupuolensa, ikäänsä, koulutuksensa, kuinka kauan he olivat työskennelleet eduskunnassa ja osasto jolla he työskentelevät. Vastaukset jakautuivat osastoittain siten, että kyselyyn vastanneista 11,3% työskentelee keskuskansliassa, 9,4% valiokuntasitteeristössä, 28,8% hallintosastolla, 15,2% tieto- ja viestintäyksikössä, 2,6% kansainvälisten asiain yksikössä, 3,6% turvayksikössä ja 29,1% vastaajista oli kansanedustajien avustajia.

Virka-aseman mukaan vastaukset jakautuivat siten, että 8,4% vastaajista ilmoitti olevansa johto- ja esimiestehtävissä, 24,3% vaativissa asiantuntijatehtävissä ja 67,3% muissa tehtävissä (virastomestarit ja -avustajat, osasto- ja toimistosihteerit, turvallisuusvalvojat, siivoojat, sovellusneuvojat).

Eduskunnan kanslian henkilöstön ja kansanedustajien avustajien koulutustaso on melko kahtiajakautunut. Hieman vajaa puolto vastaajista 47,9% ilmoitti suorittaneensa korkeakoulututkinnon, 24,3% opistotutkinnon, 12,6% eivät ollut suorittanut mitään kursseja eikä tutkintoa, 9,1% oli suorittanut ammattikoulututkinnon ja 6,1% ammattilikurssin.

Tarkasteltaessa naisten ja miesten välisten vastausmäärien eroja voidaan nähdä, että ne vastaavat melko hyvin naisten ja miesten määrää eduskunnan kansliassa, naisia on noin kaksi kolmannesta ja miehiä yksi kolmannes. (naisvastaajia 224, miehiä 96)

Yleiset kokemukset tasa-arvosta

Tasa-arvo-osio alkoi aiheen lyhyellä esittelyllä (Liite 1. kyselykaavake) ja ensimmäinen kysymys väittäineen kartoitti vastaajien yleisiä kokemuksia tasa-arvosta eduskunnan kansliassa. Tarkoituksena oli esittää vastaajille mitä kaikkea tasa-arvon käsitteeseen voi sisältyä. Kysymyksissä pyydettiin vastaajia arvioimaan erilaisia tasa-arvoon liittyviä kokemuksiaan eduskunnassa asteikolla 1-5 siten, että 1 on täysin eri mieltä ja 5 täysin samaa mieltä. Vastausprosentit ovat tässä selvityksessä kaikkien kysymysten osalta järjestetty siten, että ensimmäisenä on yhteensätketuna täysin samaa mieltä ja saman mieltä, sitten ei samaa, eikä eri mieltä, ja viimeisenä eri mieltä ja täysin eri mieltä.
Väittämä: Naisten ja miesten välinen tasa-arvo toteutuu yksikössäni hyvin


Vastaukset yksiköittäin:

Kun samaa väittämää yksiköiden tasa-arvotilanteesta puretaan ja tarkastellaan yksiköittäin, nähdään, että tyytymäisyys tasa-arvotilanteeseen vaihtelee yksiköittäin paljonkin. (yksiköiden vastauksissa miehet ja naiset ovat yhdessä)

Keskuskanslia
47,6% samaa mieltä tai täysin samaa mieltä
28,6% ei samaa eikä eri mieltä
23,8% eri mieltä tai täysin eri mieltä

Valiokuntasihteeristö
60% samaa mieltä tai täysin samaa mieltä
23,3% ei samaa eikä eri mieltä
16,7% eri mieltä tai täysin eri mieltä

Hallinto-osasto
48,8% samaa mieltä tai täysin samaa mieltä
21,6% ei samaa eikä eri mieltä
29,6% eri mieltä tai täysin eri mieltä

Tieto- ja viestintäyksikkö
77% samaa mieltä tai täysin samaa mieltä
18,8% ei samaa eikä eri mieltä
4,2% eri mieltä tai täysin eri mieltä

Kansainvälisten asiain yksikkö
77,8% samaa mieltä tai täysin samaa mieltä
11,1% ei samaa eikä eri mieltä
11,1% eri mieltä tai täysin eri mieltä
Turvayksikö
63,6% samaa mieltä tai täysin samaa mieltä
18,2% ei samaa eikä eri mieltä
18,2% eri mieltä tai täysin eri mieltä
Kansanedustajan avustaja
81,1% samaa mieltä tai täysin samaa mieltä
10% ei samaa eikä eri mieltä
8,9% eri mieltä tai täysin eri mieltä


Palkkaus
Palkkaus on yksi selkeimmistä teemoista, joka nousee kyselyystä esiin ongelmallisena. Palkkaus koetaan eduskunnan kansliassa yleisesti epätasa-arvoisena ja se nostetaan esiin moneen kertaan avovastauksissa. Erityisesti kansanedustajien avustajat kokevat palkkauksensa epätasa-arvoisena. Kyselyn lopussa olevien kahteen avovastaukseen, joissa pyydettiin kommentoimaan mikä eduskunnassa on hyvin ja mikä huonosti tasa-arvon osalta vastasi valtaosa sekä naisista että miehistä että mies/naista että miehistä että naisista noin 60% vastasi ei. Palkkausen kohdalla voidaan nähdä tämä samanlaista asetelma, puolestaan vastanneista naisista ja miehistä kokee palkkauksen epäoikeudenmukaisena ongelmana ja vain noin 30% vastanneista naisista ja miehistä näkee palkkauksensa oikeudenmukaisena.

### Väittämä: palkkaukseen vastaa työni vaativuutta

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Naiset</th>
<th>Miehet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2,2% jätti vastaamatta,</td>
<td>1% jätti vastaamatta,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27,7% vastasi kyllä,</td>
<td>30,2% vastasi kyllä,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58,5% vastasi ei</td>
<td>60,4% vastasi ei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11,6% vastasi ettei osaa sanoa</td>
<td>8,3% vastasi en osaa sanoa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seuraavan väittämän vastausprosentteissa voidaan nähdä tämä sama asetelma, puolet vastanneista naisista ja miehistä kokee palkkauksen epäoikeudenmukaisena ja vain noin 30% vastanneista naisista ja miehistä näkee palkkauksensa oikeudenmukaisena.
Kysymys: Mielestäni palkkaukseni on verrattuna muita samaa tai vastaavansramaista työtä tekevien ansioihin joko:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Naiset</th>
<th>Miehet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2,2% ei vastannut,</td>
<td>1% ei vastannut,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27,2% vastasi oikeudenmukainen,</td>
<td>35,4% vastasi oikeudenmukainen,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,4% vastasi epäoikeudenmukainen,</td>
<td>51% vastasi epäoikeudenmukainen,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,1% vastasi en osaa sanoa</td>
<td>12,5% vastasi ettei osaa sanoa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Huolimatta siitä, että eduskunnan palkat ovat valtionhallinnon korkeimpia, palkaus ja siihen liittyvät ongelmat ovat yksilöllisemmin selvitettyä nousevista kysymyksistä. Palkkausten oikeudenmukaisuuteen ei luoteta, se herättää paljon keskustelua ja sitä sivuaviin kysymyksiin vastataan myös selkeämmän kuin muihin, skaalan ääripäitä käyttäen kun taas muihin tämän osion kysymyksiin vastatsee hieman maltillisemmin skalaan keskiosan arvoilla. Palkkaus herätti myös eniten keskustelua avokysymyksissä.

Avokysymykseen, jossa sai kommentoida mahdollisia muita palkkaan liittyviä asioita tuli paljon vastauksia, joiden joukossa esiintyvät seuraavat aiheet:


Kansanedustajien avustajat ilmaisivat voimakkaasti haluansa päästä UPJ:n piiriin ja katsoivat, että se voisi tasapainottaa heidän palkkarakennettaan.

Avustajien palkoista tuli muutenkin avokysymyksessä paljon palautetta. Kummastusta herätti erityisesti se, etteivät koulutus tai/ja kokemus tuoneet lisää palkkaa. Eduskunnan kanslian hierarkkien rakenne ja sen tuomat ongelmat nostettiin esiin ja vastaajat kummastelivat sitä miten nykytilanteessa tittelit määrittävät palkkaa - eivät siis työn laatu, hankittu koulutus tai muut merkit.

Väittämä: naisten ja miesten palkkaus on oikeudenmukaista.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Naiset</th>
<th>Miehet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44,8% samaa mieltä tai täysin samaa mieltä</td>
<td>69,8% samaa mieltä tai täysin samaa mieltä</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,8% ei samaa eikä eri mieltä</td>
<td>16,7% ei samaa eikä eri mieltä</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34,4% eri mieltä tai täysin eri mieltä</td>
<td>13,5% eri mieltä tai täysin eri mieltä</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Naisten ja miesten palkkaus koetaan kyselyn perusteella melko oikeudenmukaisena mutta kuitenkin niin, että tässäkin kysymyksessä naisten tyytymättömyyys on selkeästi korkeampi (vain alle puolet 44,8% vastanneista naisista on samaa mieltä väittämän kanssa) kuin miesten. Miehistä miltei 70% on sitä mieltä että naisten ja miesten palkkaus on oikeudenmukaista.

Vastaukset yksiköittäin:
Yksiköittäin tarkasteltuna vastaukset väittämään: "naisten ja miesten palkkaus on oikeudenmukaista", paljastavat, että eri yksiköiden välillä on suuria eroja. Tyytymättömimpiä naisten ja miesten palkkaukseen ollaan hallinto-osastolla ja kansainvälisten asiain yksikössä ja tyytyväimpiä turvayksikössä ja tieto- ja viestintäosastolla. Yksiköittäin tarkasteltuna käy ilmi myös, että tässä kysymyksessä on annettu eniten asteikon alemmien osien (eri mieltä tai täysin eri mieltä) vastauksia.

Keskuskanslia
41,4% samaa mieltä tai täysin samaa mieltä
29,3% ei samaa eikä eri mieltä
29,3% eri mieltä tai täysin eri mieltä

Valiokuntasihdeeristö
53,3% samaa mieltä tai täysin samaa mieltä
16,7% ei samaa eikä eri mieltä
30% eri mieltä tai täysin eri mieltä

Hallinto-osasto
29,5% samaa mieltä tai täysin samaa mieltä
22,7% ei samaa eikä eri mieltä
47,8% eri mieltä tai täysin eri mieltä

Tieto- ja viestintäyksikö
66,6% samaa mieltä tai täysin samaa mieltä
18,8% ei samaa eikä eri mieltä
14,6% eri mieltä tai täysin eri mieltä

Kansainvälisten asiain yksikkö
44,4% samaa mieltä tai täysin samaa mieltä
11,2% ei samaa eikä eri mieltä
44,4% eri mieltä tai täysin eri mieltä

Turvayksikkö
90,9% samaa mieltä tai täysin samaa mieltä
9,1% ei samaa eikä eri mieltä
0% eri mieltä tai täysin eri mieltä

Kansanedustajan avustaja
67,8% samaa mieltä tai täysin samaa mieltä
15,6% ei samaa eikä eri mieltä
16,6% eri mieltä tai täysin eri mieltä
Eriarvoinen kohtelu ja syrjintä


Kysymys: koetko, että sinua on eduskunnassa kohdeltu eriarvoisesti tai syrjitty seuraavissa tilanteissa?

Työtehtävien jaossa:
Naiset 73,9 % ei, 26,1 % kyllä
Miehet: 84,2 % ei, 15,8 % kyllä

Urakehityksessä:
Naiset 75,6 % ei, 24,4 % kyllä
Miehet 75,8 % ei, 24,2 kyllä

Palkkauksessa:
Naiset 58,4 % ei, 41,6 % kyllä
Miehet 55,2 % ei, 44,8 % kyllä

Työtilojen tai –välineiden jaossa
Naiset 83,6 % ei, 16,4 % kyllä
Miehet 87,4 % ei, 12,6 % kyllä

Pääsyssä työnantajan järjestämään koulutukseen
Naiset 86 % ei, 14 % kyllä
Miehet 83,2 % ei, 16,8 % kyllä

Työhönottotilanteessa
Naiset 89,5 % ei, 10,5 % kyllä
Miehet 94,7 % ei, 5,3 % kyllä

Työmäärien jakautumisessa
Naiset 70,5 % ei, 29,5 % kyllä
Miehet 85,3 % ei, 14,7 % kyllä

Tiedonsaannissa uusista tehtävistä
Naiset 77,6 % ei, 22,4 % kyllä
Miehet 84,2 % ei, 15,8 % kyllä

Tässä kysymyksessä tulevat hyvin esiin kyselyssä painoa saaneet teemat ja yleiset linjat. Miehet ovat edelleen kauttaaltaan kaikkien kysymysten kohdalla hieman tyytyväisempää kuin naiset. Koulutukseen ei juurikaan koeta liittyvän minkäänlaista syrjintää (sitä koskeva kysymys saa miltei 90 % ei vastauksia) ja palkkausta koskeva kysymys
taas paljastaa siihen liittyvät ristiriidat, kyllä ja ei vastausten saadessa miltei yhtä suuret prosentit.

Rakenteellista epätasa-arvoa ajatellen kiinnostava kohta on myös työmääran jakautumiseen liittyvä kysymys jossa naisista miltei 30 % vastaa kokeneensa syrjintää työmääran jakautumisessa kun taas miesten vastaava luku on tästä vain puolet, noin 15 %.

**Syrjinnän syyt**

Vastaajia pyydettiin seuraavaksi laittamaan mahdolliseen eriarvoiseen kohteluun johtaneet syt tärkeysjärjestykseen siten, että tärkein syy on numero yksi jne. Heille annettiin myös lista vaihtoehtoja: ikä, sukupuoli, asema, mielipide, syntyperä, henkilökohtaiset ominaisuudet. Tämän kysymyksen vastauksissa käy hyvin ilmi eduskunnan organisaation monimutkaisuus ja monitasoisuus.

Kuten palkkauksenkin osalta jo kävi ilmi tasa-arvoon liittyvät ongelmat eivät ole eduskunnan kaltaisessa organisaatiossa pelkästään sukupuoleen liittyviä vaan ne liittyvät tiiviisti myös organisaation hierarkkiseen rakenteeseen. Eduskunnassa epätasa-arvoa koetaan paitsi sukupuolen myös eri yksiköiden, virka-asemien ja työtehtävien takia.

Kun vastaajia pyydettiin arvioimaan syrjinnän syitä eduskunnan kansliassa heidän vastauksensa jakautuivat seuraavalla tavalla:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Naiset:</th>
<th>Miehet:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22,1% ikä</td>
<td>18,2% ikä</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27,8% sukupuoli</td>
<td>18,9% sukupuoli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52,3% asema</td>
<td>44,4% asema</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23% mielipiteet</td>
<td>38,1% mielipiteet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,2% syntyperä</td>
<td>3,3% syntyperä</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,2% henkilökohtaiset ominaisuudet</td>
<td>19,4% henkilökohtaiset ominaisuudet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selkeästi tärkein syy eriarvoiselle kohteluulle eduskunnassa oli sekä nais- että miesvastaajille heidän asemansa organisaatiossa, tässä kohtaa kiinnostava seuraava kysymys onkin, kuinka paljon sukupuoli vaikuttaa epäsuorasti tai suoraan henkilön asemaan ja mahdollisuuksiin hankkia tietynlainen asema eduskunnan kansliassa. Sukupuoli, henkilökohtaiset ominaisuudet ja mielipiteet saavat kuitenkin nekin melko korkeat prosentit. Sukupuolen osalta tärkeä havainto on myös, että peräti 27,8 % naisista piti sukupuolta tärkeimpänä syynä kun miehistä samaa mieltä oli vain 18,9 %.Syntyperää ei nähdä tärkeänä syynä, mutta eduskunnan henkilökunta onkin varsin homogeenistä, maahanmuuttajia ei juurikaan henkilöstössä ole.

Seuraavaksi kysyttiin sukupuolen merkityksestä työssä eduskunnassa. Naisista 70,1 % vastasi ettei sukupuolelta ole ollut merkitystä työelämässä. Miehistä 77,1 % vastasi samoin. Vastanneista naisista 22,8 % totesi sukupuolesta olleen haittaa työelämässä, kun taas miehistä vain 10,4 % näki sukupuolen olleen haitallinen tekijä. Miehistä 9,4 % koki sukupuolesta olleen etua työelämässä, naisten vastaava luku on 4,9 %.
Koulutusmahdollisuudet

Koulutusmahdollisuuksien tasa-arvoisuuden osalta eduskunnan kansliassa vaikuttaisi olevan melko hyvä tilanne sekä yksiköittäin että yleisesti. Koulutukseen osallistumisen esteeksi ilmoitetaan useimmien ajoittainen kiire työssä (avovastusten ja alempana löytyvän kysymyksen identtisten vastausprosenttien valossa sekä miehillä että naisilla tuntuu olevan sama ongelma koulutuksen suhteen) mutta muutoin sekä miehet että naiset vastasivat kouluttusta koskevista kysymyksistä melko positiivisesti. Kiinnostavaa tämän osion kysymysten vastauksissa on myös se, että naisten ja miesten vastausprosentit ovat lähisidenttisiä. Koko kanslian ja avustajien vastauksista suurin osa oli reippapaasti keskikenttä poistuessaan (3) yläpuolella. Tytystyväämättömiä ovat kansanedustajien avustajat sekä turvavaltion ja kansainvälisten asiain yksikön työntekijät. Tyttystyväämättömiä ollaan keskuskansliassa ja valiokuntasihhteeristössä.

Väittämä: Naisilla ja miehillä on yhtä hyvät kouluttautumismahdollisuudet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Naisista:</th>
<th>Miehistä:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% samaa mieltä tai täysin samaa mieltä</td>
<td>80,2% samaa mieltä tai täysin samaa mieltä</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16,8% ei samaa eikä eri mieltä</td>
<td>13,5% ei samaa eikä eri mieltä</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,2% eri mieltä tai täysin eri mieltä</td>
<td>6,3% eri mieltä tai täysin eri mieltä</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vastaukset yksiköittäin:

Keskuskanslia
57,2% samaa mieltä tai täysin samaa mieltä
23,7% ei samaa eikä eri mieltä
19,1% eri mieltä tai täysin eri mieltä

Valiokuntasihhteeristö
70% samaa mieltä tai täysin samaa mieltä
26,7% ei samaa eikä eri mieltä
3,3% eri mieltä tai täysin eri mieltä

Hallinto-osasto
70,1% samaa mieltä tai täysin samaa mieltä
19,6% ei samaa eikä eri mieltä
10,3% eri mieltä tai täysin eri mieltä

Tieto- ja viestintäyksikkö
79,2% samaa mieltä tai täysin samaa mieltä
18,7% ei samaa eikä eri mieltä
2,1% eri mieltä tai täysin eri mieltä

Kansainvälisten asiain yksikkö
88,9% samaa mieltä tai täysin samaa mieltä
0% ei samaa eikä eri mieltä
11,1% eri mieltä tai täysin eri mieltä
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Turvayksikkö
91% samaa mieltä tai täysin samaa mieltä
0% ei samaa eikä eri mieltä
9% eri mieltä tai täysin eri mieltä

Kansanedustajan avustaja
89,9% samaa mieltä tai täysin samaa mieltä
6,7% ei samaa eikä eri mieltä
3,4% eri mieltä tai täysin eri mieltä

Koulutusosioon kuului myös joukko väittämiä jotka koskivat työtä, työssä kehittymistä, osaamista ja etenemismahdollisuuksia. Väittämiin oli mahdollista vastata valitsemalla joko hyvin, kohtalaisesti tai heikosti. Koulutukseen osallistuminen oli sekä nais- että miesvastaajien mielestä hyvinkin mahdollista, yli puolet vastaajista vastasi hyvin. Työssä ei koettu juurikaan olevan etenemismahdollisuuksia (sekä naiset että miehet vastasivat miltei 70% heikosti) eikä työssä kehittymismahdollisuuksia nähty kovin korkeina.

Väittämä: voin osallistua työhön liittyvään koulutukseen
Naiset: 51,1% hyvin, 36,7% kohtalaisesti ja 12,2% heikosti.
Miehet: 55,2% hyvin, 33,3% kohtalaisesti ja 11,5% heikosti.

Väittämä: voin kehittää itseäni ja osaamistani työssä
Naiset: 42,1% kohtalaisesti, 41,2% hyvin ja 16,7% heikosti.
Miehet: 51,6% kohtalaisesti, 38,9% hyvin ja 9,5% heikosti.

Väittämä: nykyisessä työssäni on etenemismahdollisuuksia
Naiset: 69,2% heikosti, 24% kohtalaisesti ja 6,8% hyvin.
Miehet: 69,5% heikosti, 21,1% kohtalaisesti ja 9,5% hyvin.

Kysymys: mitkä tekijät haittaavat koulutukseen osallistumista?
Naisista:
Tähän kysymykseen 4% jätti kokonaan vastaamatta, 16,5% ilmoitti syyksi ”ei mikään”, ”voivat osallistua koulutukseen jos haluavat”, 41,5% ilmoitti koulutukseen osallistumisen esteeksi kiireen töissä, 12,1% ilmoitti syyksi töiden kasautumisen, 18,3% ilmoitti syyksi sen, ettei sopivaa koulutusta ole ja 7,6% ilmoitti, ettei kouluttautumismahdollisuutta ole annettu.
Miehistä:
7,3% ei vastannut ollenkaan, 13,5% ilmoitti ettei mikään estä koulutukseen osallistumista, 41,7% valitsi kiireen töissä syyksi siihen ettei koulutukseen voi osallistua, 7,3% ilmoitti syyksi töiden kasautumisen, 16,7% ettei sopivaa koulutusta ole ja 13,5% ilmoitti ettei kouluttautumismahdollisuutta ole annettu.

Kysymys: työskenteletterekö osaaminanne vastaavassa tehtävässä?
Naisista 2,7% ei vastannut ollenkaan, 54,9% vastasi kyllä, 2,2% ilmoitti työskentelevänä vaativammassa tehtävässä ja 40,2% ilmoitti työskentelevänä vähemmän vaativassa tehtävässä. Miehistä 3,1% ei vastannut ollenkaan 56,3% vastasi kyllä, 2,1% ilmoitti työskentelevänä vaativammassa tehtävässä, 38,5% ilmoitti työskentelevänä vähemmän vaativassa tehtävässä. Vastaukset tähän kysymykseen antavat viitteitä siihen...
suuntaan, että työssä kehittyminen ja sitä kautta mahdollisesti organisatiotessa eteneminen ovat alueita, joilla eduskunnan kanslialla olisi vielä parannettavaa sekä naisten että miesten osalta, yli puolet vastaajista tuntui kokevan, ettei käyttänyt työssään koko kapasiteettiaan.

**Työyhteisö ja ilmapiiri**

Seikka nais- ja miesvastaajista lähes 90% ilmoitti että heidän tekemänsä työ sopii yhtä hyvin sekä miehillä että naissille. Tämän kysymyksen yhteydessä oli myös avokysymys: jos tekemäsi työ ei sovi sekä miehillä että naissille, miksi ei? Täähän kysymykseen tuli vain muutamia vastauksia ja näistä vastauksista suurimmassa osassa todettiin ettei vastaajan tekemä sihteerin työ sopisi miehillä. Seuraavaksi kysyttiin työskenteleetekö enimmäkseen miesten, naisten vai molempien kanssa. Vastaajien enemmistö ilmoitti työskentelevänä molempien kanssa, miehistä 76% ja naisista 58,9% ilmoitti työskentelevänä molempien kanssa. Kysely jatkui eteenpäin työyhteesön ilmapiirin kartoituksella. Huolimatta siitä, että työilmapiirin liittyvät ongelmat raportoitiin jonkin verran avovastauksissa, yleiset ilmapiiriä koskevat vastaukset olivat melko positiivisia. Työtovereilta saatava tukea koskevaan kysymykseen sekä nais- että miesvastaajat vastasivat lähes 90%:sesti (naiset 86,4% samaa mieltä, miehet 84% samaa mieltä) saavansa tukea työtoverieltään. Myös lähiyöhdyntäteosiin vääntämään (lähiyöhdyntäteossiin on hyvää yhteishenkki) naisista 65,7% vastasi olevansa samaa tai täysin samaa mieltä, 17,1% oli ei samaa eikä eri mieltä ja 17,2% oli eri mieltä tai täysin eri mieltä. Vastanneista miehistä 69,2% oli samaa mieltä, 10,6% ei samaa eikä mieltä ja 20,2% eri mieltä tai täysin eri mieltä.

Vastanneista naisista 72,1% oli samaa mieltä tai täysin samaa mieltä vääntämän ”minua arvostetaan lähiyöhdyntäteossani” kanssa ja vastanneista miehistä 71,2% oli samalla linjoilla. Alle 10% vastanneista naisista ja miehistä oli eri mieltä tänään vääntämän kanssa. Samassa osiossa kartoitettiin suhdetta esimieheen vääntäämälle: ”esimieheni kannustaa minua” vastanneista naisista 53% oli samaa tai täysin samaa mieltä, 23% ei samaa eikä eri mieltä ja 24% eri mieltä tai täysin eri mieltä. Miesten vastaavat luvut olivat 58,5% samaa tai täysin samaa mieltä, 24,5% ei samaa eikä eri mieltä ja 17% eri mieltä tai täysin eri mieltä. Seuraavassa väittämissä todettiin että esimieheni kohtele naisia ja miehiä tasaa-arvoisesti. Tässäkin kohtaa reilusti yli puolet vastanneista naisista ja miehistä oli samalla mieltä (naiset 65,3% ja miehet 69,2%). Työpaikkaani johtamistapa on oikeudenmukainen vääntäminen keräsi hieman enemmän erilaisia vastauksia ja jakoi vastaajia selkeämmin. Naisista 32,9% oli samaa mieltä, 28,8% ei samaa eikä eri mieltä ja 38,3% eri mieltä tai täysin eri mieltä. Miesten vastaavat arvot olivat 42,6% samaa mieltä tai täysin samaa mieltä, 24,4% ei samaa eikä eri mieltä tai täysin eri mieltä. Tässä väittämässä näkyy strategiaselvityksen puolella esiinnoussut eduskunnan kansliassa ongelman ja tämä ongelma nostetaan esiin myös tasa-arvoselvityksen avokysymyksissä. Johtamiseen liittyvää ongelmohtia ei kuitenkaan vastauksissa liitettyä näitä toimintatapoja. Tämä näyttää olevan oikeudenmukaiseksi eikä osittain selkeäksi ja tämä ongelma nostetaan esiin myös tasa-arvoselvityksen avokysymyksissä.}

"Minulla on mahdollisuus vaikuttaa työtäni koskeviin asioihin" vääntämään tulleet vastaukset kuvaavat hyvin sitä miten miehet ja naiset kokevat saman organisaatiot eri tavoin. Vastausprosentit ovat erityisen kiinnostavia rakenteellista epätasapuolisuus kasvavaksi. Miehistä jopa 70,2% kokee voivansa itse vaikuttaa töitänsä koskeviin asiioihin kun naisten vastaava luku on vain hieman yli puolet (53,4 %). Seuraava väittämä: ”saan riittävästi tietoa työpaikkaani koskevista asioista” on myös sikäli kiinnostava että se liittyy eduskunnan kansliassa ongelmalliseksi koettuun aiheeseen, tiedonkulkuun. Tähänkin vääntämään tulleet vastaukset jatkavat samoina linjoilla edellisen vääntämän vastausten kanssa. Naisista hieman alle puolet 43,5% on samaa tai täysin samaa mieltä, 26% ei
samaa eikä eri mieltä ja 30,5 % eri mieltä tai täysin eri mieltä. Miehistä hieman yli puolet 54,8 % on samaa mieltä tai täysin samaa mieltä, 20,5 % ei samaa eikä eri mieltä ja 24,7 % eri mieltä tai täysin eri mieltä.

Viimeiset kaksi väittämää koskivat mahdollisuutta suunnitella työtä itsenäisesti (voin suunnitella työtäni itsenäisesti) ja lähityöyhteisön kiisaamista (lähityöyhteisössäni ei esiinny kiisaamista). Naisista 62,6 % olisi sitä mieltä, että he voivat suunnitella työtään itsenäisesti, miisten vastaava luku oli 71,2 %. Kiisaamisen osalta vastaukset jakautuivat hieman erinemmän, naisista 56,8 % olisi sitä mieltä ettei heidän lähityöyhteisössään esiinny kiisaamista mutta 28 % olisi eri mieltä väittämän kanssa. Miehistä 64,5 % ilmoitti ettei lähityöyhteisössäni esiinny kiisaamista kun 18,3 % olisi eri mieltä väittämän kanssa. Miltei kymmenen prosentin ero naisten ja miesten vastauksissa ei välttämättä näyttäny suuremaa muita on merkityksellinen sikäli että lähes 30 % naisista kokee kiisaamista lähityöyhteisössään verrattuna miesten 20 %.

**Kiire ja rasitus työssä**

Tässä osiossa kartoitettiin vastaajien kokemuksia työn henkisestä ja fyysisestä rasituksesta, kiiroista työssä ja työmäärästä. Yli 70 % vastanneista naisista ja miehistä raportoi työtä olevan määrällisesti sopivasti ja noin 23 % sekä nais- että miesvastaajista raportoi että työtä on liikaa. Kysyttäessä työtahdista vastanneista naisista suurin osa (45 %) arvioi kiireen lisääntymen ja vastanneista miehistä suurin osa (45,8 %) ettei työtä ole juuri muuttunut. Kysyttäessä työn fyysisestä rasituksesta 76,8 % vastanneista naisista ja 79,2 % miehistä ilmoittivat ettei tilanne ole muuttunut fyysisen rasituksen suhteen. Henkisen rasituksen osalta naisista 51,8 % vastasi ettei tilanne ole senkään osalta muuttunut ja 36,2 % vastasi että tilanne on muuttunut raskaammaksi. Vastanneista miehistä 60,4 % ilmoitti henkisen rasituksen pysyneen samana ja 33,3 % sen muuttuneen raskaammaksi.


**Seksuaalinen ja sukupuoleen perustuva häirintä**

 Häirintäosion vastaajamäärä on hieman pienempi kuin muiden osioiden ja vastaajien määrä vaihtelee tässä osiossa melko paljon myös kysymyskohtaisesti. Kyseisissä annet ntiin ohjeeksi siirtyy seuraavan kohtaan mikäli ei ole kokenut häirintää. Näiden lukujen
valossa voidaan ajatella, että häirintää ei esiinny kovin paljon ainakaan aivan konkreettisimmassa muodossa. On myös toki mahdollista, että kysymyksen sensitiivinen luonne pelotti vastaajia, jotka pelkäsivät anonymiteettinsä puolesta. On ensiarvoisen tärkeää muistaa, että yksikin häirintätapaus on aina liikaa ja raportoituun häirintään tulee suhtautua erittäin vakavasti.

Eduskunnan kansliassa häirintä näyttäisi esiintyvän enimmäkseen verbaalimuodossa ja se on lähes kokonaan pelkästään naisten kokemaa. Häiritsijän raportoidaan useimmissa tapauksissa olevan kansanedustaja ja tämä tulee esille selkeästi myös avokysymysten vastauksissa. Häirintäosion aluksi kartoitettiin häirinnän muotoja:

**Kysymys: Onko joku eduskunnassa viimeisen vuoden aikana esittänyt vartaloosi tai seksuaalisuuteesi kohdistuvia huomautuksia jotka olet kokenut ikäviksi?**

![Diagram](image)

**Kysymys: Puhunut kaksimielisyyksiä tai härskejä juttuja, jotka olet kokenut loukkaaviksi?**

![Diagram](image)
Kysymys: Pitänyt esillä kuvia tai muuta materiaalia, jonka olet kokenut loukkaavaksi?

Naiset
- Kyllä: 7%
- Ei: 93%

Miehet
- Kyllä: 2%
- Ei: 98%

Kysymys: Lähettänyt sinulle epäasiallista postia, sähköpostia tai soitellut tavalla jonka olet kokenut ahdistavaksi?

Naiset
- Kyllä: 12%
- Ei: 88%

Miehet
- Kyllä: 2%
- Ei: 98%

Kysymys: Lähennellyt tai kosketellut sinua tavalla jonka olet kokenut fyysisesti epämiellyttäväksi/ahdistavaksi?

Naiset
- Kyllä: 15%
- Ei: 85%

Miehet
- Kyllä: 2%
- Ei: 98%
Kysymys: Ehdottanut seksiä siten että olet kokenut sen häiritseväksi?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Naiset</th>
<th>Miehet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kyllä</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ei</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kysyttäessä kenen taholta olet kokenut tällaista häiritä viimeisen vuoden aikana naisista 8,5% ilmoittaa esimiehen, 0% alaisen, 37,5% työtoverin, 39,3% kansanedustajan, 7,1% asiakkaan ja 7,1% jonkun muun. Miesten vastaavat luvut ovat 0% esimiehen, 0% alaisen, 83,3% vastasi työtoverin, 0% kansanedustajan, 0% asiakkaan ja 16,7% jonkun muun. Seuraavassa kysymyksessä kysyttiin jatkuuko häiritä yhä ja tässä naisista 2,7% vastasi kyyllä, 63% vastasi jonkun verran ja 14,3% vastasi ei. Miehistä taas 0% vastasi kyyllä, 4,2% jonkun verran ja 10,4% ei. Näiden lukujen valossa häirintätapaukset vaikuttaisivat yksittäisiltä eikä avovastauksissaan raportoitua systemaattista häiritä vaan vastaajat valittivat enimmäkseen käytävällä tapahtuvasta "ohimenevästä" häirinnästä, hissikatselusta ja härskeistä puheista.

"yksi tasa-arvo ongelma talossa on vallitseva häirinnän hyväksyvä ilmapiiri. Häiritseviä kommentteja, hissikatseita ynnä muuta esiintyy varsinkin vanhempien miekansanedustajien taholta varsinkin nuorempia naistyöntekijöitä kohtaan...enemmän sääntö kuin poikkeus ja siitä puhuminen loppuu nopeasti...kansanedustajien tekemisiin kun ei ole tapana puuttua...."1

Työn ja yksityiselämän yhteensovittaminen


Oskin ensimmäinen kysymys oli: Joustaan työö kaikista perhetilanteen (esimerkiksi lapsien hoito, sairastuneen lapsen hoito, ikääntyneiden vanhempien tai sukulaisen hoito) vaatessa? Naisilta eniten vastauksia tuli kyyllä vaihdekahtoon, 36,2% vastasi kyyllä. Seuraavaksi suurin vastaaprosentti oli "kysymys ei ole ajankohtainen vaihtoehdolle" (32,1%) ja 14,9% ei osannut sanoa. Miesten vastausten jakautuivat siten että 36,5% vastasi kyyllä, 28,1% vastasi ettei kysymys ole ajankohtainen ja 6,3% ei osannut sanoa.

Kysymyksessä ”jos olet ollut äitiys-, isyys, tai vanhempainvapaalla, miten eduskunnassa on asiaan suhtauduttu” pyydettiin vastaajia arvioimaan sekä esimiestensä että työtovereitten suhtautumisesta. Vastanneista naisista enemmistö totesi esimiehensä suhtautuvan myönteisesti tai neutralisti (yhteen 61,8% vastauksista) ja alle 2% vastasi esimiehen suhtautuneen kielteisesti (1,8%), 36,4% vastasi ettei osaa sanoa. Työtovereitten osalta naiset vastasivat miltte saamalla tavoin, 61,1% vastauksista raportoi työtovereitten suhtautuvan joko myönteisesti tai neutralisti, jälleen alle 2% (1,9%)

1 Kaikki tekstissä esiintyvät lainaukset ovat suoria, anonymisoituja lainauksia avokysymysten vastauksista
kielteisesti ja 37% ei osannut sanoa. Miesten vastaukset samaan kysymykseen ovat lähes identtisiä, 70% miehiä vastasi että esimies suhtautuu myönteisesti tai neutraalisti, 0% kielteisesti ja 30% ei osannut sanoa. Työtovereitten osalta 65% miehistä vastasi työtovereitten suhtautuvan joko myönteisesti tai neutraalisti, 5% kielteisesti ja 30% ei osannut sanoa.

Kyselyn perusteella äitiys-, isyys-, tai vanhempainvapaiden käytöllä ei ole juurikaan ollut vaikutusta naisten eikä miesten asemana tai työtehtäväni eduskunnassa. Vapaita koskevan kysymyksen ei juurikaan vastattu ja korkein vastausprosentti naisten osalta tuli vaihtoehtoille "niillä ei ole ollut merkitystä", sen valitsi 22,5% vastanneista naisista. Miesten korkein arvo tuli vaihtoehtoille "niillä ei ole ollut merkitystä", sen valitsi 17,8% vastanneista. Noin 70% vastanneista miehistä ja naisista jätti kokonaan tähän kysymykseen.

**Työaika**

Naisten ja miesten vastaukset työaikaa koskeviin kysymyksiin ovat jälleen melko identtisiä. Ensimmäinen työaikaa kartottava kysymys oli: "oletko joutunut toistuvasti viimeksi kuluneen vuoden aikana tekemään virallisen työajan ylittävää työtä, josta olet saanut korvauksen vapaana, rahana tai molempina". Vastanneista naisista 60,3% vastasi kyllä ja 37,5% en. Vastanneista miehistä 60,4% vastasi kyllä ja 35,4% en. Seuraava kysymys oli muuten identtinen edellisen kanssa mutta siinä kysyttiin oliko vastaaja tehnyt ylätyötä ilman korvausta. Naisista 18,8% vastasi kyllä ja 79% vastasi ei. Miehistä taas 39,6% vastasi kyllä ja 58,3% en. Tämän kysymyksen osalta kiinnostavin vastausprosentti on naisten 79% ei suhteessa miesten 58,3%. Näiden vastausten valossa näyttää siltä että miehet tekevät enemmän ylätyötä ilman korvausta.

**Yleistä**

Kyselyn lopuksi kartoitettiin vielä vastaajien tietämystä eduskunnassa aiemmin tehdyistä tasa-arvosuunnitelmista ja annettiin vastaajille mahdollisuus kERTOA omin sanoin eduskunnassa kokemistaan tasa-arvo-ongelmista. Kysymykseen siitä tiesikö vastaaja että eduskunnassa on aiemminkin tehty tasa-arvosuunnitelmia vastasti naisista 43,2% kyllä ja 56,8% ei ja miehistä 56,8% kyllä ja 43,2% ei. Seuraavaksi kysyttiin onko entisillä tasa-arvosuunnitelmilla ollut vaikutusta vastaajan työhön. Tähän kysymykseen pääosa sekä nais- että miesvastaanajoista totesi, ettei niillä ole ollut mitään vaikutusta, että ne ovat olleet enimmäkseen ”pelkkää paperia” vailla mitään todellisia konkreettisia vaikutuksia. Muutamissa vastauksissa todettiin kuitenkin myös, että niissä on ollut hyviä ohjeita hankalien tilanteiden hoitamiseen. Vastauksissa todettiin myös usein, ettei kyseisellä vastaajalla ole ollut tarvetta tasa-arvosuunnitelmalle ja ettei hän siksi ole ollut niiden olemassaolosta tietoinen.

Mikä on mielestänne keskeisin tasa-arvo ongelma eduskunnassa?

Eduskunnan työpaikkakulttuuria kuvailtiin kuitenkin sekä naisten että miesten taholta melko miehiseksi. Vallitsevaa kulttuuria kutsuttiin eräänlaiseksi ”70-lukulaiseksi äijäkulttuuriksi/äijämentaliteetiksi” ja tämän mentaliteetin todettiin olevan erityisen vahva kansanedustajien parissa. Yksi vastaaja kommentoi kansliaa työpaikkana seuraavalla tavalla:

“Eduskunta on edelleen instituutio, jota miehet johtavat ja jossa tarvitaan paljon ahkeria naisia. Sellaisena se ei tietenkään poikkea monista muista.”

Toinen arvio kanslian tasa-arvoilmapiiristä:

“Eduskunnan nuorempi henkilökunta virastoavustajista ja vahtimestareista nuorempi kansanedustajien saakka on sisäistänyt tasa-arvoasiat hyvin...kunhan hallinnon vanhat pomot lähtevät eläkkeelle, eduskunnalla on kaikki edellytykset muuttaa nykyajakaisesti, sukupuolten tasa-arvoa kunnoittavaksi työpaikaksi, joka esimerkillään paimentaa myös maakuntien kansanedustajaiset tälle vuosituhannelle.”

Mikä tai mitkä tasa-arvo asiat ovat hyvin?


“Yleensäkin henkilöstökunnilla on hoidettu niin hyvin, että eduskuntaa voisi mainostaa esimerkkinä muille julkisen sektorin työpaikoille...”

Bibliografia:


Liite 1.

Tasa-arvokysely henkilöstölle
Toivomme että vastaat avoimesti ja annat myös sanallisia kommentteja. Kyselyn vastaukset käsitellään luottamuksellisesti ja yksittäisiä vastauksia ei raportoida loppuraportissa.
Kiitos jo etukäteen vastauksestasi

Arvioi tasa-arvoon liittyviä kokemuksiasi eduskunnassa
(1=Täysin eri mieltä, 2=Eri mieltä, 3=Ei samaa eikä eri mieltä, 4=Samaa mieltä, 5=Täysin samaa mieltä)

| Naisten ja miesten tasa-arvo toteutuu hyvin | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Naiset ja miehet ovat sijoituneet tasapuolisesti eri tehtäviin | | | | | |
| Naisia ja miehiä arvostetaan työntekijöinä samalla tavalla | | | | | |
| Naisten ja miesten palkkaus on oikeudenmukaista | | | | | |
| Naisilla ja miehillä on yhtäläiset mahdollisuudet edetä uralla | | | | | |
| Naisilla ja miehillä on yhtäläiset mahdollisuudet kehittyä työssä | | | | | |
| Naisilla ja miehillä on yhtä hyvät kouluttautumismahdollisuudet | | | | | |
| Naisilla ja miehillä on yhtäläiset mahdollisuudet perhevapaiden käyttöön | | | | | |
| Naiset ja miehet osallistuvat yhtäläilla päättöksentekoon | | | | | |
| Naisiin ja miehiin kohdistuu erilaisia odotuksia | | | | | |

KOULUTUS JA TYÖÖSSÄ KEHITTYYMINEN
Missä määrin koulutukseen ja itsensä kehittämiseen liittyvät asiat toteutuvat eduskunnassa?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>hyvin</th>
<th>kohtalaisesti</th>
<th>heikosti</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Voin osallistua työhön liittyvään koulutukseen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Voin kehitää itseäni ja osaamistani työssäni

3. Nykyisessä työssäni on etenemismahdollisuusia

Mitkä tekijät haittaavat koulutukseen osallistumista?
1. Ei mikään
2. Kiire työssä
3. Töiden kasaantuminen
4. Ei ole sopivaa koulutusta
5. Koulutautumismahdollisuutta ei ole annettu

Työskenteletkö osaamistasi vastaavassa tehtävässä?
1. Kyllä
2. Työskentelen vaativammassa tehtävässä
3. Työskentelen vähemmän vaativassa tehtävässä

Koetko, että sinua on eduskunnassa kohdeltu eriarvoisesti tai syrjitty seuraavissa tilanteissa?
Vastaa tähän, jos vastasit johonkin edellisen kysymyksen vaihtoehtoista
myöntävästi. Mistä arvelet eriarvoisen kohtelun johtuvan?
(laita tarvittaessa syyt järjestykseen lähtien tärkeimmästä tekijästä)
1. Lästäsi
2. Sukupuolestasi
3. Asemastasi
4. Mielipiteistäsi
5. Syntyperästäsi
6. Henkilökohtaisista ominaisuuksistasi

Miten olet kokenut oman sukupuolesi merkityksen työelämässä?
1. Sukupuolesta on ollut etua työssä/uralla etenemisessä.
2. Sukupuolesta on ollut haittaa työssä/uralla etenemisessä.

TYÖYHTEISÖ JA TYÖILMAPIIRI

Teen pääasiallisesti töitä
1. Naisten kanssa
2. Miesten kanssa
3. Molempien kanssa

Sopiiko tekemäsi työ yhtä hyvin naisille ja miehille?
1. Kyllä
2. Ei
Miksi?______________________________________________________________
### Miten seuraavat luonnehdinnat kuvaavat työskentelyilmapiiriä?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Lähityöyhteisössäni on hyvä yhteishenkki</th>
<th>Täysin eri mieltä</th>
<th>Eri mieltä</th>
<th>Ei samaa eikä eri mieltä</th>
<th>Samaa mieltä</th>
<th>Täysin samaa mieltä</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Saan apua työtovereiltani</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Minua arvostetaan lähityöyhteisössäni</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Esimieheni kannustaa minua.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Esimieheni kohteleee naisia ja miehiä tasa-arvoisesti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Työpaikkani johtamistapa on oikeudenmukainen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Minulla on mahdollisuus vaikuttaa työtäni koskeviin asioihin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Saan riittävästi tietoa työpaikkaani koskevista asioista</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Voin suunnitella työtäni itsenäisesti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Lähityöyhteisössäni ei esiinny kiusaamista</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Miten arvioit työmäärääsi?
1. Työtä on sopivasti
2. Työtä on liian vähän
3. Työtä on liikaa

### Miten arvioit työssä kokemaasi kiirettä?
1. Kiire on lisääntynyt
2. Työtahti ei ole juuri muuttunut
3. Kiire on vähentynyt

### Arvioi kokemaasi fyysistä rasitusta
1. Keventynyt
2. Ei muutoksia
3. Muuttunut raskaammaksi
Arvioi kokemaasi henkistä rasitusta
1. Keventynyt
2. Ei muutoksia
3. Muuttunut raskaammaksi

Mistä arvioit kiireeseen ja rasitukseen liittyvien mahdollisten muutosten johtuvan?

PALKKAUS

Palkkaukseni vastaa työni vaativuutta
1. Kyllä
2. Ei

Mielestäni palkkauksen on verrattuna muita samaa tai vastaavantasoista työtä tekevien ansioihin
1. Oikeudenmukainen
2. Epäoikeudenmukainen

Onko jotain muuta palkkaukseen liittyvää, jota haluaisit kommentoida?

SEKSUAALINEN JA SUKUPÜOLEEN PERUSTUVA HÄIRINTÄ

OHJE: Mikäli et ole kokenut häiritää, siirry osioon X

Onko joku eduskunnassa viimeisen vuoden aikana

1. Esittänyt vartaloosi tai seksuaalisuuteesi kohdistuvia huomautuksia, jotka olet kokenut ikäviksi? Kyllä/Ei

2. Puhunut kaksimielisyyksiä tai härskejä juttuja, jotka olet kokenut loukkaavaksi? Kyllä/Ei

3. Pitänyt esillä kuvia tai muuta materiaalia, jonka olet kokenut loukkaavaksi? Kyllä/Ei

4. Lähettänyt sinulle epäasiallista postia, sähköpostia tai soitellut tavalla, jonka olet kokenut ahdistavaksi? Kyllä/Ei

5. Lähennellyt tai kosketellut sinua tavalla, jonka olet kokenut fyysisesti epämielisyttäväksi/ahdistavaksi? Kyllä/Ei
6. Ehdottanut seksiä siten, että olet kokenut sen häiritseväksi? Kyllä/Ei

**Kenen tahoalta olet kokenut tällaista häiritäää viimeisen vuoden aikana?**
1. Esimiehen  
2. Alaisen  
3. Työtoverin  
4. Kansanedustajan  
5. Asiakkaan  
6. Jonkun muun  

**Jatkuuko kokemasi häiritää edelleen?**
1. Kyllä  
2. Ei  
3. Jonkin verran  

**TYÖN JA YKSYTISELÄMÄN YHTEENSOVITTAMINEN**

**Joustako työaikasi perhetilanteen (esimerkiksi lapsien hoito, sairastuneen lapsen hoito, ikääntyneiden vanhempien tai sukulaisten hoito) vaatiessa?**
1. Kyllä  
2. Ei  
3. En osaa sanoa  
4. Kysymys ei ole ajankohtainen  

**Jos olet ollut äitiys-, isyyys- tai vanhempainvapaalla, miten eduskunnassa on asiaan suhtauduttu?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Myönteisesti</th>
<th>Neutraalisti</th>
<th>Kielteisesti</th>
<th>En osaa sanoa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Esimies</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Työtoverit</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Onko äitiys-, isyyys- tai vanhempainvapaaiden käytöllä ollut vaikutusta asemaasi tai työtehtäväisi eduskunnassa?**
1. Ne on nähty ansioina  
2. Niillä ei ole ollut vaikutusta  
3. Ne ovat haitanneet asemaani  
4. Työtehtäväni olivat muuttuneet poissa ollessani  
5. Palatessani työtehtäviäni ei enää ollut  
6. En ole itse käyttänyt vapaita mutta työtovereiden vapaat ovat aiheuttaneet töiden kasaatumista muille  
7. En ole itse käyttänyt vapaita ja muiden käyttämät vapaat on organisoitu hyvin, työyhteisö ei ole käräinyt  

**TYÖAIKA**
Oletko joutunut toistuvasti viimeksi kuluneen vuoden aikana tekemään virallisen työajan ylittävää yltöötä, josta olet saanut korvauksen vapaana, rahana tai molempina?
1. Kyllä 2. En

Oletko joutunut toistuvasti viimeksi kuluneen vuoden aikana tekemään virallisen työajan ylittävää työtä ilman eri korvausta?
1. Kyllä 2. En

YLEISTÄ

Tiesitkö että eduskunnassa on aiemminkin tehty tasa-arvosuunnitelmia?
1 Kyllä
2 En

Jos vastasi kyllä, miten ne ovat vaikuttaneet työhösi?


Mikä on mielestäsi keskeisin tasa-arvo-ongelma eduskunnassa?


Mikä tai mitkä tasa-arvoon liittyvät asiat ovat mielestäsi hyvin eduskunnassa?


Lomake pohjautuu sivuilta: www.tasa-arvo.fi löydettävään lomakkeeseen
Alkuperäisen lomakkeen suunnittelu: Tasa-arvosta lisäärvoa -hanke
Työelämän tutkimuskeskus Tampereen yliopisto, 2005
Appendix C:

Hei,

Nimeni on Hertta Niemi, olen tohtoriopiskelija ja tutkija Svenska handelshögskolanissa (Hanken), Helsingissä. Työskentelen tämän kevään eduskunnassa tehdien teille tutkimusta, ja haluaisin esittäytyä koko henkilökunnalle näin sähköpostitse.


Teemututkimustani kaikkia Suomen Akatemian ja EU:n eettisiä tutkimusohjeita noudattaen ja näin ollen suhtaudun kaikkiin tutkimuksessa saatuihin tietoihin ehdottoman luottamuksellisesti.

Olen opiskellut politiikan tutkimusta ja kansainvälistä politiikkaa Tartossa, Glasgovissa ja Edinburghissa ja palattuani Suomeen olen työskennellyt Hankenin johtamisen ja organisaatiotutkimuksen laitoksella useissa EU:n ja Suomen Akatemian rahoittamissa tutkimusprojekteissa.

Oma väitöskirjatutkimukseni käsittelee poliittisia organisaatioita työpaikkoina ja tarkastelun kohteena ovat erityisesti Suomen ja Ruotsin parlamentit. Väitöskirjatutkimustani ovat rahoittaneet mm. Wallenbergin, Ehrnroothin ja Svenska handelshögskolanin säätiöt. Tutkimukseni ohjaajana toimii Professori Jeff Hearn.

Jos haluat lisätietoa tutkimuksestani, voit ottaa minuun yhteyttä sähköpostitse tai soittamalla. Tiedot löytyvät alta.

Antoisaa yhteistyötä odotellen,

Hertta Niemi

---

Hertta Niemi, MA, MSc
Puhelin: 4973
GSM 040 - 820 11 46
hertta.niemi@eduskunta.fi
Hej,

Jag heter Hertta Niemi och är doktorand och forskare vid Svenska handelshögskolan (Hanken) i Helsingfors. Jag kommer att jobba med forskning för riksdagen under våren 2007 och vill därför presentera mig för er via e-mail så att ni vet vem jag är och vad jag sysslar med.

Min uppgift här i riksdagen är att under vårens lopp göra en bedömning av effekten av riksdagskansliets personalpolitik under perioden 2002-2006. Arbetet kommer att utföras med hjälp av ett frågeformulär och genom intervjuer.

I min forskning följer jag alla etiska forskningsanvisningar som ställs av Finlands Akademi och EU vilket innebär att all den information jag erhåller inom ramen för min forskning behandlas strikt konfidentiellt.

Jag har studerat statsvetenskap och internationell politik i Dorpat, Glasgow och Edinburgh. Sedan min återkomst till Finland har jag jobbat vid institutionen för företagsledning och organisation på Hanken med diverse forskningsprojekt finansierade av EU och Finlands Akademi.

Min egen doktorsavhandling behandlar politiska organisationer som arbetsplatser och föremål för undersökningen är riksdagarna i Finland och i Sverige. Forskningsarbetet för min avhandling har finansierats av bl.a. Wallenbergs, Ehrnrooths och Svenska handelshögskolans stiftelser. Min avhandlingshandledare är Professor Jeff Hearn.

Om ni vill ha tilläggsinformation om min forskning kan ni kontakta mig via e-mail eller per telefon. Mina kontaktuppgifter finner ni nedan.

I väntan på ett givande samarbete,

Hertta Niemi

---

Hertta Niemi, MA, MSc  
Telefon: 4973  
Mobil: 040 - 820 11 46  
hertta.niemi@eduskunta.fi
Hello,

My name is Hertta Niemi and I am a doctoral student and researcher at Svenska handelshögskolan (Hanken), Helsinki. I will be working in the Parliament this spring conducting research for you and I would like to take this opportunity to present myself to the entire staff via email.

The Office Commission of the Finnish Parliament decided on the 15th February, 2007 to continue with the existing human resource management strategy during the strategy period 2007-2009. Simultaneously, the Office Commission decided that the effectivity of the human resource management strategy during the strategy period 2002-2006 should be evaluated by an outsider rather than an internal employee. My task in the parliament is thus to evaluate the affectivity of the human resource management strategy during the strategy period 2007-2009. I am going to do this by conducting a survey and interviews.

I will conduct this research according to all ethical codes as set by the Finnish Academy and the EU and thus all information acquired during the research will be handled with utmost confidentiality.

I have studied Politics and International Politics in Universities of Tartu, Glasgow and Edinburgh and after returning to Finland I have worked at the department of management and organisation at Hanken in several research projects funded by the EU and Finland’s Academy.

My own doctoral research is on Political organisations as workplaces and I will be examining particularly Finnish and Swedish Parliaments. My doctoral research has been funded by foundations such as Wallenberg, Ehrnrooth and the Svenska handelshögskolan foundation. My supervisor is Professor Jeff Hearn.

If You wish to find out anything more about my research You can contact me via email or ring me. My details are below.

Looking forward to fruitful cooperation,

Hertta Niemi

--
Hertta Niemi, MA, MSc
Puhelin: 4973
GSM 040 - 820 11 46
hertta.niemi@eduskunta.fi
ARVOISA EDUSKUNNAN KANSLIAN VIRKAMIES / KANSANEDUSTAJAN AVUSTAJA


Arviointitutkimuksen lisäksi tehdään samalla myös tasa-arvoselvitys jonka avulla pyritään kartottamaan, miten eduskunnan virkamiehet ja kansanedustajien avustajat kokevat tasa-arvon toteutumisen jokapäiväisessä työssään. Tasa-arvo ymmäretään tässä tapauksessa miesten ja naisten väliseksi tasa-arvoksi sekä yhdenvertaisuuslain mukaisesti tasa-arvoksi eästä, etnisestä taustasta, vammaisuudesta, seksuaalisesta suuntautumisesta ja muista henkilöiden ominaisuuksien eroista riippumatta.

Arvioinnin ja molempien kyselyiden vastausten analysoinnin suorittaa tutkija Hertta Niemi Svenska handelshögskolanista (Hanken) ja koko tutkimus suoritetaan kaikkia Suomen Akatemian ja EU:n eettisiä tutkimusohjeita noudattaen. Kaikkiin tutkimuksessa saatuihin tietoihin suhtaudutaan ehdottomasti luottamuksellisesti, yksittäisiä vastaajia koskevia tietoja ei raportoida ja aineisto on ainoastaan tutkijan käytössä.

Kaikki virkamiesten ja avustajien toivotaan vastaavan kyselyn viimeistään 11.6.2007 mennessä. Linkki kyselyyn löytyy tästä sähköpostista.


Jos haluat lisätietoa tutkimuksesta, voit ottaa minuun yhteyttä sähköpostitse tai soittamalla. Tiedot löytyvät alta.

Vastauksianne odotellen,
Hertta Niemi

Puhelin: 4973
GSM 040 - 820 11 46
hertta.niemi@eduskunta.fi

DEAR PARLIAMENTARY EMPLOYEE / MPs ASSISTANT

The Office Commission of the Finnish Parliament decided on the 15th February, 2007 to continue with the existing human resource management strategy during the strategy period 2007-2009. Simultaneously, the Office Commission decided that the effectivity of the human resource management strategy during the strategy period 2002-2006 should be evaluated by an outsider rather than an internal employee. The evaluation will be done by conducting a survey and interviews.

Simultaneously with the evaluation survey there will be an equality survey in order to map out the equality situation of the everyday work of the Parliamentary employees and MPs assistants. Equality here refers to equality between men and women as well as general equality despite of one’s age, ethnic background, disability, sexual orientation or other personal qualities.

The evaluation and analysis of the responses to both surveys will be done by researcher Hertta Niemi from Svenska handelshögskolan (Hanken) and the research will be conducted according to all the ethical guidelines of the Finnish Academy and the EU. All the information gathered during the research will be handled with utmost confidentiality, there will be no reporting on individual responses and the data will be used only by the researcher.

The responses of all of the Parliamentary employees and MPs assistants are called for at the latest by 11th of June 2007. The link to the survey can be found from this email.

Some practical advice: responding to the survey takes roughly 20-30 minutes. For the MPs assistants responding only takes 10-15 minutes as they are only to fill in the equality survey.

Should You wish to have any extra information regarding the research You can contact me via email or ring me. My details are below.

Looking forward to Your responses,
Hertta Niemi

Telephone: 4973
GSM 040 - 820 11 46
hertta.niemi@eduskunta.fi
Appendix E:

Dear Administrative Manager Kari T. Ahonen,

Please find attached the additional figures, requested by your letter dated 19.2.2008, related to the equality evaluation I conducted for the Parliamentary administration (Parliamentary Equality Evaluation 2007)

As already pointed out in the introduction to my initial evaluation report (page 3) the Parliamentary Working Group for Equality ordered this equality evaluation in order to be able to properly update the equality plan. The evaluation was meant to offer thematic information on the equality related matters experienced by the people working in the Parliamentary administration. The point of the evaluation report was (agreed together with the Equality working group) to locate different relevant equality related themes that the working group could then take into consideration whilst updating the Parliamentary equality plan. There was no agreement, at any point to produce exact statistical information. Thus the exact number of responses to different, specific parts of the survey were not reported.

After your request I have gone through the equality survey data and this report includes all the statements listed in the survey together with the related exact figures of responses. I have also included a corresponding page number (of the initial report) to all the statement/figure combinations so one can see where that part is being dealt with. All the response figures, apart from the unit based responses, of the evaluation report are listed here. To unpack the figures based on units is not ethically feasible as it would risk the anonymity of the responses.

I am asking you to take into consideration that purely figure based information on the equality survey is to be considered more as guidance. The figures on their own do not give any kind of general idea of the equality situation within the Parliament. In order to add different subjective experiences I have used the open ended answers of the survey.

Kind regards,

Hertta Niemi
Statement: Equality situation between women and men is good in my unit
(See equality evaluation page 6)
Number of responses to the survey: 320
Number of responses to this question: 318
Women: 222
Men: 96

Women’s responses: 58,1% (129 women) Agree or fully agree, 20,7% (46 women) Don’t agree nor disagree, 21,2% (47 women) Disagree or fully disagree

Men’s responses: 79,1% (76 men) Agree or fully agree, 13,6% (13 men) Don’t agree nor disagree, 7,3% (7 men) Disagree or fully disagree

Statement: My salary is in line with the demands of my work
(See equality evaluation page 8)
Number of responses to the survey: 320
Number of responses to this question: 320
Women: 224
Men: 96

Women’s responses: 27,7% (62 women) Yes, 58,5% (131 women) No, 11,6% (26 women) I don’t know, 2,2% (5 women) Did not choose a value

Men’s responses: 30,2% (29 men) Yes, 60,4% (58 men) No, 78,3% (8 men) I don’t know, 1% (1 man) Did not choose a value

Statement: I think my salary is, in comparison with others doing the same job or similar job, either:
(See equality evaluation page 9)
Number of responses to the survey: 320
Number of responses to this question: 320
Women: 224
Men: 96

Women’s responses: 27,2% (61 women) Fair, 50,4% (113 women) Unfair, 20,1% (45 women) I don’t know, 2,2% (5 women) Did not choose a value

Men’s responses: 35,4% (34 men) Fair, 51% (49 men) Unfair, 12,5% (12 men) I don’t know, 1% (1 man) Did not choose a value
Statement: The salaries/wages system for men and women is fair
(See equality evaluation page 10)
Number of responses to the survey: 320
Number of responses to this question: 317
Women: 221
Men: 96

Women’s responses: 44,8% (99 women) Agree or fully agree,
20,8% (46 women) Don’t agree nor disagree, 34,4% (76 women) Disagree or fully disagree

Men’s responses: 69,8% (67 men) Agree or fully agree, 16,7% (16 men) Don’t agree nor disagree,
13,5% (13 men) Disagree or fully disagree

Statement: Do you feel that you have been unequally treated or discriminated against in the Parliament in the following situations?
(See equality evaluation page 12)
Number of responses to the survey: 320
Number of responses to this part: 319
Women: 219-222
Men: 95-96

Distribution of work related duties:
Number of responses to this question: 317
Women: 222
Men: 95
Women’s responses: 26,1% (58 women) Yes, 73,9% (164 women) No
Men’s responses: 15,8% (15 men) Yes, 84,2% (80 men) No

Career development:
Number of responses to this question: 316
Women: 221
Men: 95
Women’s responses: 24,4% (54 women) Yes, 75,6% (167 women) No
Men’s responses: 24,2% (23 men) Yes, 75,8% (72 men) No

Wages/salary:
Number of responses to this question: 317
Women: 221
Men: 96
Women’s responses: 41,6% (92 women) Yes, 58,4% (129 women) No
Men’s responses: 44,8% (43 men) Yes, 55,2% (53 men) No

Distribution of work stations or equipment:
Number of responses to this question: 314
Women: 219
Men: 95
Women’s responses: 16,4% (36 women) Yes, 83,6% (183 women) No
Men’s responses: 12,6% (12 men) Yes, 87,4% (83 men) No
Ability to participate in training (organised by the Parliament):
Number of responses to this question: 317
Women: 222
Men: 95
Women’s responses: 14% (31 women) Yes, 86% (191 women) No
Men’s responses: 16,8% (16 men) Yes, 83,2% (79 men) No

In the recruitment situation:
Number of responses to this question: 315
Women: 220
Men: 95
Women’s responses: 10,5% (23 women) Yes, 89,5% (197 women) No
Men’s responses: 5,3% (5 men) Yes, 94,7% (90 men) No

Regarding the distribution of the amount of work:
Number of responses to this question: 315
Women: 220
Men: 95
Women’s responses: 29,5% (65 women) Yes, 70,5% (155 women) No
Men’s responses: 14,7% (14 men) Yes, 85,3% (81 men) No

Regarding information on new duties:
Number of responses to this question: 314
Women: 219
Men: 95
Women’s responses: 22,4% (49 women) Yes, 77,6% (170 women) No
Men’s responses: 15,8% (15 men) Yes, 84,2% (80 men) No

Question: Answer this question if you chose yes at any point in the previous question. What do think caused the unequal treatment?
Number of responses to the survey: 320
(See equality evaluation pages 13-14)
In this question the amount of responses is at least 198 (61,9%) of all respondents (see below the men’s and women’s responses) but the exact figure of responses is not available as the question offered many different categories thus giving them different weight. The percentage figures per choice give thus an indication of how much weight each category receives.

Women: 77-107 per category
Men: 33-45 per category

Your age
Women 22,1% (17 women)
Men 18,2% (6 men)

Your gender
Women 27,8% (22 women)
Men 18,9% (7 men)
Your position
Women 52,3% (56 women)
Men 44,4% (20 men)

Your opinions
Women 23% (17 women)
Men 38,1% (16 men)

Your origin of birth
Women 5,2% (3 women)
Men 3,3% (1 men)

Your personal qualities
Women 30,2% (26 women)
Men 19,4% (7 men)

Question: How meaningful do you think your gender is when it comes to your working life?
(See equality evaluation page 14)
Number of responses to the survey: 320
Number of responses to this question: 320
Women: 224
Men: 96

Out of women 4,9% (11 women) said that their gender has been an advantage in terms of career progress/working prospects,
22,8% (51 women) said that their gender has been a disadvantage in terms of career progress/working prospects,
70,1% (157 women) said that gender has had no part to play in terms of career progress/working prospects,
2,2% (5 women) did not choose a value

Out of men 9,4% (9 men) said that their gender has been an advantage in terms of career progress/working prospects,
10,4% (10 men) said that their gender has been a disadvantage in terms of career progress/working prospects,
77,1% (74 men) said that gender has had no part to play in terms of career progress/working prospects,
3,1% (3 men) did not choose a value

Statement: Women and men have equal possibilities for further training
(See equality evaluation page 15)

Number of responses to the survey: 320
Number of responses to this question: 316
Women: 220
Men: 96
Women's responses: 75% (165 women) Agree or fully agree, 16,8% (37 women) Don’t agree nor disagree, 8,2% (18 women) Disagree or fully disagree

Men's responses: 80,2% (77 men) Agree or fully agree, 13,5% (13 men) Don’t agree nor disagree, 6,3% (6 men) Disagree or fully disagree

**Question: To what extent do the following statements materialise in the Parliament?**
(See equality evaluation page 17)

Number of responses to the survey: 320
Number of responses to this question: 317
Women: 221
Men: 95-96

**Statement 1. My ability to participate in work related training is:**

Women: Excellent 51,1% (113 women), Satisfactory 36,7% (81 women), Weak 12,2% (27 women)
Men: Excellent 55,2% (53 men), Satisfactory 33,3% (32 men), Weak 11,5% (11 men)

**Statement 2. My ability to develop myself and my professional capabilities is**

Women: Excellent 41,2% (91 women), Satisfactory 42,1% (93 women), Weak 16,7% (37 women)
Men: Excellent 38,9% (37 men), Satisfactory 51,6% (49 men), Weak 9,5% (9 men)

**Statement 3. My present job entails career prospects**

Women: Excellent 6,8% (15 women), Satisfactory 24% (53 women), Weak 69,2% (153 women)
Men: Excellent 9,5% (9 men), Satisfactory 21,1% (20 men), Weak 69,5% (66 men)

**Question: What factors make it difficult to participate in further training?**
Number of responses to the survey: 320
Number of responses to this question: 320
Women: 224
Men: 96

Women: Nothing 16,5% (37 women), Too busy with work 41,5% (93 women), Piling up of work 12,1% (27 women), There is no appropriate training 18,3% (41 women) and has not been offered any possibility to train oneself 7,6% (17 women) and 4% (9 women) did not choose a value

Men: Nothing 13,5% (13 men), Too busy with work 41,7% (40 men), Piling up of work 7,3% (7 men), There is no appropriate training 16,7% (16 men) and has not been offered any possibility to train oneself 13,5% (13 men) and 7,3% (7 men) did not choose a value

**Question: Does your current job correlate with your abilities/knowledge?**
Number of responses to the survey: 320
Number of responses to this question: 320
Women: 224
Men: 96
Women: Yes 54,9% (123 women), No I am working in a more demanding job 2,2% (5 women), No I am working in a less demanding job 40,2% (90 women) and 2,7% (6 women) did not choose a value

Men: Yes 56,3% (54 men), No I am working in a more demanding job 2,1% (2 men), No I am working in a less demanding job 38,5% (37 men) and 3,1% (3 men) did not choose a value

**Question: Is the work you do equally suitable for men and women?**
Number of responses to the survey: 320
Number of responses to this question: 320
Women: 224
Men: 96

Women: Yes 88,8% (199 women), No 3,1% (7 women), Don’t know 7,6% (17 women), 0,4% (1 woman) did not choose a value

Men: Yes 89,6% (86 men), No 4,2% (4 men), Don’t know 6,3% (6 men), 0% did not choose a value

**Statement: I work mainly…**
(See equality evaluation page 18)
Number of responses to the survey: 320
Number of responses to this question: 320
Women: 224
Men: 96

Women: With both men and women 58,9% (132 women), With women 33,5% (75 women), With men 6,7% (15 women), 0,9% (2 women) did not choose a value

Men: With both men and women 76% (73 men), With women 16,7% (16 men), With men 7,3% (7 men), 0% did not choose a value

**Question: How well do the following statements describe the working atmosphere?**
(See equality evaluation pages 18-19)
Number of responses to the survey: 320
Number of responses to this question: 317
Women: 222-223
Men: 94-96

**Statement: My immediate working community has a good communal spirit**
Women: 222
Men: 94

Women’s responses: 65,7% (146 women) Agree or fully agree,
17,1% (38 women) Don’t agree nor disagree, 17,2% (38 women) Disagree or fully disagree

Men’s responses: 69,2% (65 men) Agree or fully agree,
10,6% (10 men) Don’t agree nor disagree, 20,2% (19 men) Disagree or fully disagree
Statement: I receive help from my colleagues
Women: 222
Men: 94

Women’s responses: 86.4% (192 women) Agree or fully agree,
9% (20 women) Don’t agree nor disagree, 4.6% (10 women) Disagree or fully disagree

Men’s responses: 84% (79 men) Agree or fully agree,
14.9% (14 men) Don’t agree nor disagree, 1.1% (1 men) Disagree or fully disagree

Statement: I am appreciated within my immediate working community
Women: 222
Men: 94

Women’s responses: 72.1% (160 women) Agree or fully agree
21.6% (48 women) Don’t agree nor disagree, 6.4% (14 women) Disagree or fully disagree

Men’s responses: 71.2% (67 men) Agree or fully agree,
21.3% (20 men) Don’t agree nor disagree, 7.5% (7 men) Disagree or fully disagree

Statement: My immediate manager encourages me
Women: 221
Men: 94

Women’s responses: 53% (117 women) Agree or fully agree,
23.1% (51 women) Don’t agree nor disagree, 24% (53 women) Disagree or fully disagree

Men’s responses: 58.5% (55 men) Agree or fully agree,
24.5% (23 men) Don’t agree nor disagree, 24.5% (23 men) Disagree or fully disagree

Statement: My immediate manager treats women and men equally
Women: 222
Men: 94

Women’s responses: 65.3% (145 women) Agree or fully agree,
19.4% (43 women) Don’t agree nor disagree, 15.4% (34 women) Disagree or fully disagree

Men’s responses: 69.2% (65 men) Agree or fully agree, 18.1% (17 men) Don’t agree nor disagree,
12.8% (12 men) Disagree or fully disagree
Statement: The style of management at my work is equal
Women: 222
Men: 94

Women’s responses: 32,9% (73 women) Agree or fully agree, 28,8% (64 women) Don’t agree nor disagree, 38,3% (85 women) Disagree or fully disagree

Men’s responses: 42,6% (40 men) Agree or fully agree, 24,5% (23 men) Don’t agree nor disagree, 33% (31 men) Disagree or fully disagree

Statement: I can have an impact of matters related to my work
Women: 223
Men: 94

Women’s responses: 53,4% (119 women) Agree or fully agree, 24,2% (54 women) Don’t agree nor disagree, 22,4% (50 women) Disagree or fully disagree

Men’s responses: 70,2% (66 men) Agree or fully agree, 11,7% (11 men) Don’t agree nor disagree, 18,1% (17 men) Disagree or fully disagree

Statement: I get enough information on matters related to my work
Women: 223
Men: 93

Women’s responses: 43,5% (97 women) Agree or fully agree, 26% (58 women) Don’t agree nor disagree, 30,5% (68 women) Disagree or fully disagree

Men’s responses: 54,8% (51 men) Agree or fully agree, 20,5% (19 men) Don’t agree nor disagree, 24,7% (23 men) Disagree or fully disagree

Statement: I can plan my work independently
Women: 222
Men: 94

Women’s responses: 62,6% (139 women) Agree or fully agree, 20,3% (45 women) Don’t agree nor disagree, 17,1% (38 women) Disagree or fully disagree

Men’s responses: 71,2% (67 men) Agree or fully agree, 17% (16 men) Don’t agree nor disagree, 11,7% (11 men) Disagree or fully disagree

Statement: There is no bullying in my immediate working community
Women: 222
Men: 93
Women’s responses: 56.8% (126 women) Agree or fully agree, 15.8% (34 women) Don’t agree nor disagree, 28% (62 women) Disagree or fully disagree

Men’s responses: 64.5% (60 men) Agree or fully agree, 17.2% (16 men) Don’t agree nor disagree, 18.3% (17 men) Disagree or fully disagree

Question: How do you evaluate the amount of work you have?
(see equality evaluation page 20)
Number of responses to the survey: 320
Number of responses to this question: 320
Women: 224
Men: 96

Women: There is a suitable amount of work 70.5% (158 women), there is too little work 5.8% (13 women), there is too much work 23.2% (52 women), 0.4% (1 woman) did not choose a value

Men: There is a suitable amount of work 71.9% (69 men), there is too little work 4.2% (4 men), there is too much work 22.9% (22 men), 1% (1 man) did not choose a value

Question: How would you evaluate how busy you are at work?
Number of responses to the survey: 320
Number of responses to this question: 320
Women: 224
Men: 96

Women: More busy than before 45.1% (101 women), No clear change from the past 43.3% (97 women), Less busy than before 8.9% (20 women), 2.7% (6 women) did not choose a value

Men: More busy than before 42.7% (41 men), No clear change from the past 45.8% (44 men), Less busy than before 11.5% (11 men), 0% (0 men) did not choose a value

Question: Evaluate the amount of physical strain you experience at work
Number of responses to the survey: 320
Number of responses to this question: 320
Women: 224
Men: 96

Women: Lighter than before 4.5% (10 women), No changes 76.8% (172 women), Heavier than before 14.7% (33 women) and 4% (9 women) did not choose a value

Men: Lighter than before 4.2% (4 men), No changes 79.2% (76 men), Heavier than before 14.6% (14 men) and 2.1% (2 men) did not choose a value
Question: Evaluate the amount of mental strain you experience at work
Number of responses to the survey: 320
Number of responses to this question: 320

Women: 224
Men: 96

Women: Lighter than before 8,5% (19 women), No changes 51,8% (116 women), Heavier than before 36,2% (81 women) and 3,6% (8 women) did not choose a value
Men: Lighter than before 4,2% (4 men), No changes 60,4% (58 men), Heavier than before 33,3% (32 men) and 2,1% (2 men) did not choose a value

Question: Has somebody in the Parliament during the last year...
(See equality evaluation pages 21-24)
Number of responses to the survey: 320
Number of responses to this section: 145

Attention: when looking at the harassment figures it is crucial to remain within the frame of harassment research as in not to lose sight of the relativity and different potential meanings of the figures (see e.g. Gruber 1990, Mankkinen 1995 and Sexual harassment at the workplace in European Union 1999).

Made remarks related to your body or sexuality that you have experienced as unpleasant?
Number of responses to the survey: 320
Number of responses to this question: 143
Women: 100
Men: 43

Women: Yes 21 % (21 women) and no 79 % (79 women)
Men: Yes 5 % (2 men) and no 95 % (41 men)

Talked to you or around you in double meanings or told explicit stories that you have experienced as insulting?
Number of responses to the survey: 320
Number of responses to this question: 144
Women: 101
Men: 43

Women: Yes 31,7 % (32 women) and no 68,3 % (69 women)
Men: Yes 9 % (4 men) and no 91 % (39 men)

Displayed pictures of other material that you have experienced as insulting?
Number of responses to the survey: 320
Number of responses to this question: 144
Women: 101
Men: 43
Women: Yes 7% (7 women) and no 93% (93 women)
Men: Yes 2% (1 men) and no 98% (42 men)

Sent you inappropriate mail, email or called you in a way that you have experienced as disturbing?
Number of responses to the survey: 320
Number of responses to this question: 143
Women: 100
Men: 43

Women: Yes 12% (12 women) and no 88% (88 women)
Men: Yes 2,3% (1 men) and no 97,7% (42 men)

Made a pass at you, touched you in a manner that made you feel physically unpleasant or disturbing?
Number of responses to the survey: 320
Number of responses to this question: 143
Women: 100
Men: 43

Women: Yes 15% (15 women) and no 85% (85 women)
Men: Yes 2,3% (1 men) and no 97,7% (42 men)

Suggested sex in a manner that made you feel uncomfortable?
Number of responses to the survey: 320
Number of responses to this question: 143
Women: 100
Men: 43

Women: Yes 7% (7 women) and no 93% (93 women)
Men: Yes 0% (0 men) and no 100% (43 men)

Who has harassed you like this during the last year?
Number of responses to the survey: 320
Number of responses to this question: 62
Women: 56
Men: 6

Women: 8,9% (5 women) Manager, 0% (0 women) Employee, 37,5% (21 women) Colleague, 39,3% (22 women) MP, 7,1 % (4 women) Client, 7,1% (4 women) Someone else.

Men: 0% (0 men) Manager, 0% (0 men) Employee, 83,3% (5 men) Colleague, 0% (0 men) MP, 0% (0 men) Client, 16,7% (1 man) Someone else.
Does the harassing behaviour continue?
Number of responses to the survey: 320
Number of responses to this question: 320
Women: 224
Men: 96
Women: Yes 2,7% (6 women) and no 14,3% (32 women), To a degree 6,3% (14 women) and 76,8% (172 women) did not choose a value
Men: Yes 0% (0 men) and no 10,4% (10 men), To a degree 4,2% (4 men) and 85,4% (82 men) did not choose a value

Question: Do you have flexible working time if you have a necessary family situation (e.g. taking care of children, sick child, elderly parent or relatives)?
(See equality evaluation pages 24-25)
Number of responses to the survey: 320
Number of responses to this question: 320
Women: 224
Men: 96
Women: Yes 36,2% (81 women), No 8% (18 women), I don’t know 14,7% (33 women), This question is not relevant to me 32,1% (72 women) and 8,9% (20 women) did not choose a value
Men: Yes 36,5% (35 men), No 8,3% (8 men), I don’t know 6,3% (6 men), This question is not relevant to me 28,1% (27 men) and 20,8% (20 men) did not choose a value

Question: If you have been on maternity leave, paternity leave or parental leave how did you colleagues in the Parliament react? Please answer separately for managers and colleagues.
Number of responses to the survey: 320
Number of responses to this question: 75
Women: 55
Men: 20

Managers:
Women: Positively 38,2% (21 women), Neutrally 23,6% (13 women), Negatively 1,8% (1 woman), I don’t know 36,4% (20 women)
Men: Positively 35% (7 men), Neutrally 35% (7 men), Negatively 0% (0 men), I don’t know 30% (6 men)

Colleagues:
Women: Positively 38,9% (21 women), Neutrally 22,2% (12 women), Negatively 1,9% (1 woman), I don’t know 37% (20 women)
Men: Positively 40% (8 men), Neutrally 25% (5 men), Negatively 5% (1 man), I don’t know 30% (6 men)
**Question: Has your usage of your maternity/paternity or parental leaves had an impact on your position or your work within the Parliament?**

Number of responses to the survey: 320  
Number of responses to this question: 320  
Women: 224  
Men: 96

Women: 1.3% (3 women) They have been seen as merits, 11.6% (26 women) No impact, 2.2% (5 women) They harmed my position, 2.7% (6 women) When I came back my job had changed, 0.4% (1 woman) When I came back my job was gone, 2.7% (6 women) I have not myself use the leaves but the leaves my colleagues have taken have caused piling of work onto others and 69.2% (155 women) did not choose a value

Men: 0% (0 women) They have been seen as merits, 17.7% (17 men) No impact, 0% (0 men) They harmed my position, 0% (0 men) When I came back my job had changed, 0% (0 men) When I came back my job was gone, 3.1% (3 men) I have not myself use the leaves but the leaves my colleagues have taken have caused piling of work onto others and 70.8% (68 men) did not choose a value

**Question: Have you had to, repeatedly during the last year, work overtime for which you have been compensated either by receiving extra holiday, extra salary or both.**  
(see equality evaluation page 26)  
Number of responses to the survey: 320  
Number of responses to this question: 320  
Women: 224  
Men: 96

Women: Yes 60.3% (135 women), No 37.5% (84 women) and 2.2% (5 women) did not choose a value  
Men: Yes 60.4% (58 men), No 35.4% (34 men) and 4.2% (4 men) did not choose a value

**Question: Have you had to, repeatedly during the last year, work overtime without extra compensation?**  
Number of responses to the survey: 320  
Number of responses to this question: 320  
Women: 224  
Men: 96

Women: Yes 18.8% (42 women), No 79% (177 women) and 2.2% (5 women) did not choose a value  
Men: Yes 39.6% (38 men), No 58.3% (56 men) and 2.1% (2 men) did not choose a value

**Question: Do you know that the Parliament has had equality plans made before?**  
(see equality evaluation page 26)  
Number of responses to the survey: 320  
Number of responses to this question: 317  
Women: 222  
Men: 95

Women: Yes 43.2% (96 women), No 56.8% (126 women)  
Men: 56.8% (54 men), No 43.2% (41 men)
References:


Appendix F:

The two evaluation surveys conducted in the Parliamentary administration during 2007

Introduction

During 2007 two evaluation surveys were conducted in the Parliamentary administration. And evaluation of the effectiveness of the existing human resource management strategy and an equality evaluation. Here I summarise the most important themes arising from the two evaluations.

The effectiveness of the human resource management strategy in the Parliamentary administration

The impacts of the existing HR strategy between 2002-2006 was evaluated (Eduskunnan kanslian henkilöstöstrategian 2002-2006 vaikuttavuuden arviointi) by conducting a survey and interviews. Prior conducting the survey a series of pilot interviews were conducted within the Parliamentary administration. The themes of the survey research were then picked based on these pilot interviews as this way the themes of the survey would reflect the HR themes that were topical in the organisation at the time. The actual questions selected for the survey were all then directly drawn from the HR question bank provided by the Finnish State Treasury. This was seen as the most suitable way of constructing the survey as this way it would not only reflect the existing HR themes in the Parliamentary administration but also make it possible to compare the results of this survey with other government departments as well as with the previous surveys conducted in the Parliament (also using the HR question bank). (Moilanen, 2001) To support and further complete the survey results 17 interviews were also conducted with the managers of the Parliamentary administration during summer of 2007.

The general impression, based on the survey results and the interviews, is that the HR strategy of the Parliamentary administration during 2002-2006 has not been as effective as it could have been. The strategy document is a carefully drafted and well formulated document and the contents of it were not criticised in the survey answers nor in the interviews. The only possible addition to the strategy document, suggested in some of the responses, was to add some more concrete policies relating to potential crisis situations.

Thus the reasons behind the lack of effectiveness of the Parliamentary administrations HR strategy would seem to relate to the lack of practical implementing of the strategy programme. The reasons for the lack of practical implementation that have come up in this evaluation are amongst other things: general lack of commitment to the strategy, the general organisational (geographic and task related) disparity and separateness, the nature of the work done in the House and the special requirements it sets, that is the working culture within the Parliamentary administration that, understandably and for pressing reasons, puts the legislative work and the directly related tasks first thus giving all HR management diminished attention.

Parliamentary administrations equality evaluation

To make sure that the update of Parliamentary administrations equality plan will reflect the concrete equality related questions present in the Parliamentary administration an equality survey was conducted (Eduskunnan kanslian tasa-arvoselvitys 2007). The survey itself was drafted together with the Parliamentary working group on gender equality and
the idea was to give the equality working group as good and comprehensive picture as possible regarding the general equality situation in the Parliamentary administration as well as what are the most important equality related themes rising from the Parliamentary administration. The evaluation was done by conducting a survey that would offer the best possible general view to the equality situation and equality related themes topical in the Parliamentary administration.

The most central problems related to the gender equality situation within the parliamentary office based on this evaluation were not crude cases of harassment based on gender but rather would seem to be structural and unequal policies and ways of doing things that tend to favour mostly men and have very long traditions. A problem when it comes to this kind of structural inequality are particularly different forms of action and thinking that are not even seen nor thought as creating inequality between men and women.

Particularly women but also men respondents reported that there were equality problems particularly when it came to having control over one’s own work, position and salary related questions. Also areas like ability to develop at work and via that ability to improve one’s position in the organisation were areas that in the survey were listed as areas where the Parliamentary administration could improve the situation particularly for women but for men too.

Generally it was clear that men were clearly more satisfied when it came to the equality situation in their departments but also in the Parliamentary administration in general. Women’s responses were more varying but also more clearly dissatisfied. In general the responses have a lot in common with the survey conducted in 1997. The survey conducted then included slightly less questions and they were perhaps more straight forward but even then the responses showed a difference in satisfaction levels between men and women, men were then too generally more satisfied. Thus one can draw the conclusion that the equality situation has not changed much over the past ten years. The open ended answers to the survey support this conclusion.

A few observations regarding the figures of the equality evaluation

The number of harassed people that came up in the equality evaluation that I wrote for the Finnish Parliament has been discussed in the media. The section that has to do with harassment had 145 responses (as the parliament announced in their own press release) but as the original evaluation states, different questions particularly in this part of the survey have relatively large variation in terms of how many responses were received. Because of this the numbers are not simple to interpret. If one uses a rough estimate one can state that there are at least 62 harassed people (out of 320 responses the percentage is 19,4%) at most 145 harassed people (out of 320 responses the percentage is 45,3%). It was, however, decided that the original evaluation suffices with percentage figures per question as the evaluation wanted to map out the larger themes and as even the smallest number (62) is rather high when discussing this type of issue.

When interpreting harassment related figures it is important to maintain within the frame of harassment studies in order to be able to evaluate the relative significance and multiple potential meanings of the figures. (See for example Gruber 1990, Mankkinen 1995 and Sexual harassment at the workplace in the European Union 1999).

In relation to the other harassment figures the numbers of the parliamentary office are relatively high, high enough to be taken seriously. Another serious matter linked to figures that should be taken very seriously is the experience of unfair treatment by the respondents (198/320 respondents: 61,9% reported that they have been unfairly treated for different reasons). In the original evaluation this was in the form of text, not figures. The most important reason for unfair treatment for both men and women was the position of the given person in the organisation.
A few suggestions for the Committee

In the light of these surveys it can be stated that the working climate in the Parliament requires new measures and a whole new take on things. There should be more attention geared towards management and administration despite of the central role of the legislative work. The managers should for instance have more time and resources to manage their own units. Personnel management is an important part of any organisation and it should have a more central role also in the Parliament. Organisational well-being and generally satisfied personnel can be achieved via attentive management and clear, common policies and practices. The Parliamentary staff complains in their open ended answers to the survey questions that there is a definite lack of clear, common policies and instead a myriad of unclear policies and practices.

In order to question and shed light to the various existing policies and practices in the Parliament there should be a plan how to execute long term, systematic, internal value evaluating, management supported, practical equality work in the House. A concrete and simple equality plan is a crucial part of this process.

Both in terms of the equality situation and general well-being at work the general atmosphere can be best improved by supportive management as well as management by example. Clear and common organisatory policies are also an important part of this. When it comes to incidents such as harassment mere telling off/punishment or looking for the guilty parties is not enough nor helpful. The organisation should have both preventive measures and clear policies that offer guidance for all parties in difficult situations thus helping to move the incidents away from the mere personal level problems.
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Parliaments are firstly and fore mostly political institutions but they are also work places for many different professions. So far Parliaments have been mainly studied from the political perspective and not as work places and thus there is not much research of Parliaments within the management and organisation studies. There is thus a clear gap in the literature and a need for more research from this angle.

This thesis examines what kind of work places Parliaments are and what it means to work between the Political and administrative pressures and demands. The research will be executed by observing and interviewing the administrative staff of the two national Parliaments, The Finnish Parliament and the Estonian Parliament. Through this kind of analysis the research aims to examine the organisational structures and processes and the special features they hold as work places. This type of research is particularly important now that Parliaments in Europe are facing new administrative pressures due to the EU.

The research follows all ethical codes and guidelines as set by the EU and the Finnish Academy. All the people participating in the research will be anonymised. The research will not create extra costs or work for anyone working in the Parliament.

The researcher has two masters degrees (International relations and Politics) from the Universities of Glasgow and Edinburgh. She has worked in Finland for three years as a researcher at Hanken and has a solid working experience from working in different EU and Finnish Academy funded research projects. The doctoral research is supervised by Professor Jeff Hearn (hearn at hanken.fi) and Dr. Marjut Jyrkinen. The research has been funded by foundations such as the Wallenberg foundation, Hanken foundation and the Ehrnrooth foundation.
Appendix I:
Finland/The Parliament

Name:

Age:

Profession/Job:

Education:

Responsibilities/tasks and duties at work:

How many years have you been a manager:

Previous employment:

Code:

You have received some of the questions before the interview and we shall now discuss them. First we will discuss the present situation, the internal strengths and weaknesses of the Parliamentary administration. Then we will discuss the future of the human resource management/politics, the external possibilities and threats. The themes we discuss and the interviews in general will then later be summarised.

Present situation (1-2)

1. What are the strengths of the Parliamentary administration as an employer and a working community?

2. What are the weaknesses of the Parliamentary administration as an employer and a working community?
Future (3-4)

3. What kind of unused opportunities are there within the personnel politics of the Parliamentary administration?

4. What kind of threats are there in terms of the Parliamentary administrations personnel politics now and in the immediate future?

5. How have the personnel strategy and personnel politics within the Parliamentary administration affected your work?

6. How do you think they should have affected your work?

7. What kind of challenges does the NWS (New Wages System) bring in terms of your work?
8. How could the transferring to the NWS best be supported/aided? (what type of personnel politics and strategic planning?)

9. What does managing/management/working as manager mean to you?

10. How is management/managing done/practised here in comparison to other organisations that you know of? (particularly if you have been working somewhere else...?)

11. How would you describe yourself as a manager/chief/leader?

12. How would you compare your managing style with the other managers/chiefs of the house? Are you like them (how?) different (how?)

13. Is there something you would like to add? (something positive on how you would be best supported in your work, aided to do a better job etc.)
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