

PART | INTRODUCING GENDER

	Introducing Gender: Overview	3
	<i>Joyce K. Fletcher and Robin J. Ely</i>	
1	Making Change: A Framework for Promoting Gender Equity in Organizations	10
	<i>Deborah Kolb, Joyce K. Fletcher, Debra E. Meyerson, Deborah Merrill-Sands, and Robin J. Ely</i>	
2	The Managerial Woman	16
	<i>Margaret Hennig and Anne Jardim</i>	
3	The Female Advantage	26
	<i>Sally Helgesen</i>	
4	Men and Women of the Corporation	34
	<i>Rosabeth Moss Kanter</i>	
5	Hierarchies, Jobs, Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organizations	49
	<i>Joan Acker</i>	
6	Doing Gender	62
	<i>Candace West and Don H. Zimmerman</i>	
7	Breaking the Silence: On Men, Masculinities, and Managements	75
	<i>David L. Collinson and Jeff Hearn</i>	
8	Complicating Gender: The Simultaneity of Race, Gender, and Class in Organization Change(ing)	87
	<i>Evangelina Holvino</i>	

INTRODUCING GENDER: OVERVIEW

JOYCE K. FLETCHER AND ROBIN J. ELY

For most of us, thinking about gender and management immediately brings to mind what are commonly thought of as “women’s issues”: sexual harassment, sex discrimination, work–family policies and, of course, the glass ceiling. In other words, thinking about gender usually gets us thinking about how doing business as usual creates problems for women. What kinds of problems, why, and what might be done to address them, has been the subject of much debate among scholars and practitioners alike. In this book, we use these debates as a way to explore conventional scholarly wisdom on the role of gender at work and for explicating an alternative point of view – one that a number of us at the Center for Gender in Organizations have been developing in collaboration with others for the past 10 years.¹ From this point of view, we move away from the notion of gender as primarily a women’s issue and instead see gender as a central organizing feature of social life, with implications for women, men, and how we get work done.

In particular, we find it useful to conceptualize gender as having two interrelated parts (Ely, 1999). There is an individual component, called gender identity, which is the sense one makes of the fact that one is male or female – the story that a woman, for example, tells herself about what it means to be female, how being female shapes who she is and what happens to her. And there is a structural component, called gender relations, which is the way the social world is built, in part, by making distinctions between men and women, thus shaping differentially the material conditions of our lives – for example, the power and status women as a group have relative to men as a group, or the roles in a society that men and women play. Gender identity has no inherent content outside of gender relations: gender relations are the structural arrangements that give meaning to the categories male and female and shape people’s experiences as members of those groups. They are influenced in part by all other social relations, including race, ethnicity, class, nationality, religion, and sexual identity. Although the nature of gender relations is culture-specific and has changed over time, it appears from what we know currently that they have been more or less relations of power: “gender relations have been (more) defined and (imperfectly) controlled by one of their interrelated

aspects – the man” (Flax, 1990: 45). Thus power is a core element of gender as we know it. This more expansive view of gender positions organizations as central to shaping the meaning of gender, enabling us to reflect more critically on current organizational life and how it could be different.

This book is a collective effort. Different faculty at, or affiliated with, the Center have taken responsibility for moving this perspective on gender forward as it relates to their specific areas of expertise – leadership, negotiation, organizational change, diversity, human resources management, and globalization – all traditional topics in organizational behavior. In this way, we hope to broaden not only our understanding of gender, but also our understanding of these topics. We have selected readings that, to varying degrees, illustrate the range of approaches previous scholars have taken to understanding how gender relates to the topic at hand. Each of us then moves the discussion of her topic onto new terrain in some way related to the more expansive view of gender we have been developing. In Part I, we present several foundational readings on which we draw in our subsequent treatment of these topics.²

THE FOUR FRAMES

We capture the conventional scholarly wisdom about gender in three traditional approaches to gender in the workplace. We conceptualize each approach as a “frame” for understanding what gender is and why inequities exist between men and women at work. These three frames are rooted in the common tendency to think of gender as an individual characteristic, and gender issues as stemming primarily from differences between men and women, either in the traits and skills they possess or in the ways they are treated. Each frame implies a vision of gender equity and an approach for achieving that vision. While interventions derived from these approaches, such as training and executive development, affirmative action, and work–family policies, have achieved significant equity gains for women, their impact has been limited. We argue that this is due in large part to their limited conceptions of gender. To augment these efforts, we depart from these more traditional approaches and introduce a fourth frame for understanding and addressing the problem.

Understanding the four frames and how they differ from one another is critical to understanding many of the topics we cover in succeeding parts of this book. The first article in Part I, “Making change: A framework for promoting gender equity in organizations,” authored by faculty from the Center for Gender in Organizations, summarizes the frames, their contributions, and their limitations.³ (The four frames are also summarized in Table O1.1.) Three readings follow, each a classic treatment of gender in the workplace, representing the first three frames, respectively. According to the first frame, women have lagged behind men in their achievements because they lack the kinds of socialization experiences one needs in order to develop the traits and skills requisite for success. The route to sex equity, therefore, is to eradicate sex differences through education, exposure, and training. This perspective is represented in an excerpt from Margaret Hennig and Anne Jardim’s now classic *The Managerial Woman*. Although the research on which this book is based is clearly dated, and many may balk at the stereotyped

Table O1.1 Understanding the four frames on gender

	Definition of gender	Problem definition	Vision of gender equity	Approach to change	Benefits	Limitations
Frame 1 Fix the women	Socialized sex differences	Women lack skills, know-how to “play the game”	No differences between men and women; just like men	Develop women’s skills through training, mentoring, etc.	Helps individual women succeed; creates role models when they succeed	Leaves system and male standards intact; blames women as source of problem
Frame 2 Celebrate differences	Socialized sex differences; separate spheres of activity	Women’s skills not valued or recognized	Differences recognized, valued, preserved	Diversity training; reward and celebrate differences, “women’s ways”	Legitimizes differences; “feminine” approach valued; tied to broader diversity initiatives	Reinforces stereotypes; leaves processes in place that produce differences
Frame 3 Create equal opportunities	Sex differences in treatment, access, opportunity	Differential structures of power and opportunity yield less access, fewer resources for women	Create level playing field by reducing structural barriers, biases	Policies to compensate for structural barriers, e.g., affirmative action, work–family benefits	Helps with recruiting, retaining, advancing women; eases work–family stress	Has minimal impact on organizational culture; backlash; work–family remains “woman’s problem”
Frame 4 Revise work culture	A central organizing feature of social life embedded within belief systems, knowledge systems, and social practices	Social practices designed by and for white, heterosexual, class-privileged men appear neutral but uphold differences	Process of identifying and revising oppressive social practices; gender no longer an axis of power	Emergent, localized process of incremental change involving critique, new narratives, and experimentation	Exposes apparent neutrality of practices as oppressive; more likely to change organization culture; continuous process of learning	Resistance to deep change; difficult to sustain

characterizations of men and women, its perspective still pervades much of the common parlance on gender in organizational life today.

The second frame is nearly the opposite of the first. Its proponents argue that socialized differences between men and women should not be eliminated, but celebrated. In this frame, it is precisely “women’s difference” from men, in particular, their “relationship orientation,” that organizations need. Recognizing sex differences and the unique value women bring to the table is central to this frame’s approach to achieving gender equity. We include an excerpt from Sally Helgesen’s *The Female Advantage* to represent this point of view.

The third frame focuses on structural barriers to women’s recruitment and advancement. From this perspective, gender is still framed as differences between men and women, but they result from differential structures of opportunity and power that block women’s access and advancement, rather than from socialization processes. This frame advocates policies designed to create equal opportunities for men and women. Excerpts from Rosabeth Moss Kanter’s classic book, *Men and Women of the Corporation*, represent this perspective.

The fourth frame offers a conceptual leap from thinking about gender as an individual characteristic to thinking about it as a systemic factor, influencing not only men and women, but also the very knowledge that underlies our beliefs about what makes for good workers, good work, and successful organizations (chapter 17, this volume). For example, when we think of management – an ostensibly gender-neutral activity – whose image comes to mind? Research suggests that, for most of us, it is still the image of a man – and more than likely, a white, middle- or upper-middle-class, heterosexual-appearing man. Why does this image persist even at a time when US census figures show that a full 46 percent of managers are women? One reason is that “management” evokes power, and *senior* managers – those with the real power – are still largely white men. But also at play is a far more subtle and insidious fact of organizational life, a fact that we believe lies at the heart of many of the divisions and disparities we see in the workplace today: the very model for organizing that has evolved in the Western world was created by and for a certain subset of men – white, middle-class professionals. Because these men were the architects of early industrialized efforts to systematize the workplace, the basic organizing principles that govern workplace practice – indeed, many of the implicit rules for success that influence individual and organizational action – are closely aligned with idealized masculine interests, attributes, and life situations. We believe that this history has far-reaching implications today, not only for women’s ability to progress but for many men’s as well (Rapoport, Rapoport, & Strelitz, 1977), and for our very sense of what organizations can be and can accomplish. We refer to our concerns for both equity and organizational functioning as the “dual agenda” (Fletcher, 1999; 2001), and devote much of this book to exploring these implications.

Thus, Frame 4 follows on Frame 3, emphasizing power as a central dimension of gender, but is grounded in a somewhat different set of theoretical and epistemological positions. From this perspective, gender is neither an individual characteristic nor simply a basis for categorization and discrimination. Rather, it is a complex set of social relations enacted across a range of social and institutional practices that exist both within and outside of formal organizations. Excerpts from the classic article by Joan Acker, “Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: A theory of gendered organizations,” explore how these practices in organizations create idealized images

of work, workers, and success, indirectly maintaining gender segregation and gender inequity while at the same time appearing to be gender-neutral.

The next reading, excerpts from “Doing gender,” by Candace West and Don H. Zimmerman, highlights the microprocesses by which the macrogendering of organizations is achieved. It starts from the basic premise that, to some degree, we enact our identity in all of our interactions with others. Since gender is a major part of identity, we end up “doing gender” whenever we “do” anything else, including “doing business,” “doing competence,” or even “doing nice.” Introducing this concept allows for a discussion of what it means to “do masculinity” or “do femininity” in the workplace and sets the stage for further discussions about how “doing masculinity” and “doing work” are often conflated (Fletcher, 1999; 2001). This article also introduces the notion, central to the fourth frame, that the body matters: perceptions of behavior are not gender-neutral. In perceiving and interpreting our actions and interactions, others wittingly or unwittingly take our sex into account. We all know this, of course. A man who raises his voice in a meeting to make a point is perceived quite differently from a woman who does the same thing. Nonetheless, this commonsense truism is often ignored in the management literature and, as a result, much of the managerial advice women receive is less than useful.

It is easy to see how gendered work practices and notions of ideal workers would be a problem for women who are either unable or unwilling to conform to these idealized images. More difficult to see is that relying on these images as workplace ideals is also a problem for many men who do not fit the image either, whether in personal attributes or life situations. In other words, the gendered nature of the workplace – although an especially important issue for women – also affects men. The reading by David Collinson and Jeff Hearn includes excerpts from two of their articles, “Breaking the silence: On men, masculinities, and managements,” and “Naming men as men: Implications for work, organization and management.” Together the excerpts contribute to an explanation of how organizations are gendered and help to broaden our view beyond the notion of gender as a “women’s issue.”

COMPLICATING GENDER

So far, these readings have focused on gender as a central concept for understanding organizations. But gender does not exist in isolation from other dimensions of difference, such as race, ethnicity, class, sexual identity, religion, age, and nationality. We all inhabit, enact, and respond to many different social identities simultaneously. Similarly, organizations are not only gendered, they reflect and reinforce divisions along other axes of difference as well. These divisions operate simultaneously to create interlocking systems of power; gender is only one relevant strand among many (Collins, 1995). Thinking at the individual level, most scholars and practitioners interested in gender today would agree that a focus on gender alone inappropriately masks important diversity in men’s and women’s experiences at work. We know, for example, that white women and women of color experience different forms of sex discrimination (Bell & Nkomo, 2001; Hurtado, 1996); that social class influences men’s displays of masculinity (Fine, Weis, Addeleston, & Marusza, 1997); and that the idealized images of masculinity we are often expected

to emulate at work are modeled on idealized images of white, middle-class, heterosexual men (Ely & Meyerson, 2000; Rapoport, Bailyn, Fletcher, & Pruitt, 2002). Thinking at the social and institutional level, researchers increasingly recognize that a singular focus on gender occludes the role that other power relations play (Collins, 1995). For these reasons, we find that gender is incomplete as a lens for analyzing organizations: we cannot adequately understand – or challenge – gender arrangements without considering the simultaneous effects of other social and power relations as well.

Yet most research on gender in organizations ignores these effects. Race, class, and other aspects of social identity, when considered, are rarely more than add-on concerns. For example, in a survey of studies on gender and organizations published in four major academic journals between 1986 and 1995, Ely (1999) noted that only 17 percent included analyses of race or ethnicity. Without information to the contrary, it is reasonable to assume that research participants are white. Nevertheless, the results of these studies are commonly stated as if generalizable to all men and women. This practice supports the myth of men and women as monoliths. Moreover, when we describe *a* voice for women and “do not specify which women, under which specific historical circumstances, have spoken with the voice in question” (Fraser & Nicholson, 1990: 32), we invite the same charge of false generalization leveled at theories constructed by and about men. And, when we fail to specify the racial identity of white women, we obfuscate their experiences as members of the dominant racial group and position them as the norm against which other women are measured (Bell & Nkomo, 2001; Ely, 1995). To the extent that women of color deviate from this norm, they are often viewed as less effective or unfeminine, or are simply invisible altogether (Hurtado, 1989). Parallel problems exist when we ignore or leave unstated other dominant identity categories that likely influence people’s experiences in significant ways. The last reading in Part I addresses this set of issues. In this excerpt from “Complicating gender: The simultaneity of race, gender, and class in organization change(ing),” Evangelina Holvino demonstrates the limitations of the liberal feminist and functionalist paradigms that dominate the literature on gender in organizations and argues instead for addressing race, gender, and class simultaneously.

NOTES

- 1 The original core group of collaborators included Lotte Bailyn, Gill Coleman, Robin Ely, Joyce Fletcher, Deborah Kolb, Deborah Merrill-Sands, Debra Meyerson, and Rhona Rapoport.
- 2 For a primer on gender and work, which summarizes much of the most up-to-date literature in the field, we recommend Padavic and Reskin (2002).
- 3 See Ely and Meyerson (2000) for a more extensive treatment of the four frames.

REFERENCES

- Bell, E. L. J. & Nkomo, S. M. 2001. *Our separate ways: Black and white women and the struggle for professional identity*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Collins, P. H. 1995. Symposium on West and Fenstermaker’s “Doing difference.” *Gender & Society*: 9(4): 491–4.
- Ely, R. J. 1995. The role of dominant identity and experience in organizational work on diver-

- sity. In Susan E. Jackson & Marion N. Ruderman (eds.), *Diversity in work teams: Research paradigms for a changing workplace*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association: 161–86.
- Ely, R. J. 1999. Feminist critiques of research on gender in organizations. *Working paper #6*. Boston, MA: Center for Gender in Organizations, Simmons School of Management.
- Ely, R. J. & Meyerson, D. E. 2000. Theories of gender in organizations: A new approach to organizational analysis and change. In B. Staw & R. Sutton (eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior*: 103–52. New York: JAI Press.
- Fine, M., Weis, L. Addeleston, J. & Marusza, J. 1997. (In) secure times: Constructing white working-class masculinities in the late 20th century. *Gender & Society*, 11(1): 52–68.
- Flax, J. 1990. Postmodernism and gender relations in feminist theory. In L. J. Nicholson (ed.), *Feminism/postmodernism*: 39–62. New York: Routledge.
- Fletcher, J. K. 1999. *Disappearing acts: Gender, power, and relational practice at work*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Fletcher, J. K. 2001. Invisible work: The disappearing of relational practice at work. *CGO Insights, Briefing Note #8*: 1–4. Boston, MA: Center for Gender in Organizations, Simmons School of Management.
- Fraser, N. & Nicholson, L. J. 1990. Social criticism without philosophy: An encounter between feminism and postmodernism. In Linda J. Nicholson (ed.), *Feminism/Postmodernism*: 19–38. New York: Routledge.
- Hurtado, A. 1989. Relating to privilege: Seduction and rejection in the subordination of white women and women of color. *Signs*, 14(4): 833–55.
- Hurtado, A. 1996. *The color of privilege: Three blasphemies on race and feminism*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Padavic, I. & Reskin, B. 2002. *Women and men at work*, 2nd edn. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Rapoport, R., Bailyn, L. Fletcher, J. K., & Pruitt, B. 2002. *Beyond work family balance: Advancing gender equity and workplace performance*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Rapoport, R., Rapoport, R. N., & Strelitz, Z. 1997. *Fathers, mothers and others: Towards new alliances*. London: Kegan Paul.

CHAPTER

1

MAKING CHANGE: A FRAMEWORK FOR PROMOTING GENDER EQUITY IN ORGANIZATIONS

DEBORAH KOLB, JOYCE K. FLETCHER, DEBRA E. MEYERSON,
DEBORAH MERRILL-SANDS, AND ROBIN J. ELY

*From CGO Insights, Briefing Note #1 (1998) Boston, MA: Center for
Gender in Organizations, Simmons School of Management*

Suppose your organization is committed to becoming more gender equitable. What kind of change initiative should it undertake? Recent research in the social sciences suggests that the answer to this question is far from simple. The problem is that there are many different theories about the role gender plays in organizational life and about the causes of gender inequity. Each theory has its own perspective on the problem and its own view of the appropriate remedy. Some remedies focus on eliminating overt discrimination in hiring and promotion practices, some focus on reducing the wage gap between men and women, and some focus on training and executive development. While many of these initiatives have achieved significant equity gains for women, each has its limitations, each focuses on a different definition and symptom of the problem, and none, on its own, has been able to address the issue comprehensively.

For organizations interested in addressing the issue of gender equity in a comprehensive and sustainable manner, we offer a comparative framework that illustrates why most approaches to gender equity are partial solutions and do not achieve lasting gains. Drawing on existing frameworks¹ that compare and contrast theoretical perspectives on gender in the workplace, we propose four frames through which to understand gender equity and organizational change. The first three are descriptions of traditional approaches. The fourth frame is an integrated perspective that acknowledges the complex role gender plays in organizational life. It offers a new category of organizational intervention as well as a way of recasting traditional equity initiatives.

FRAME 1: FIX THE WOMEN

The first, and probably most common approach to promoting gender equity rests on a liberal and individualistic vision of society and organizations. It assumes that individuals rise and fall on their own merits. Gender translates into biological sex, i.e., men and women. In this view, men and women are assumed to have equal

access to opportunities. Women's lack of achievement in organizations relative to men's is attributed to differences in experience. A basic assumption of this approach is that women have not been socialized to the world of business and, therefore, do not know the "rules of the game." They lack the requisite training and skills to compete in the workplace or assume positions of leadership.

The goal of this approach – and thus its vision of gender equity – is to minimize these differences between women and men so that women can compete as equals. Executive development programs for women represent the hallmark of this approach. Leadership programs, assertiveness training, and workshops on presentation skills and negotiation are important interventions.

Many women have learned valuable skills from these programs. They have learned to succeed at the game as well as – or better than – many men. This has helped certain women move into positions of leadership where they serve as role models for others. However, as important as these programs are, on their own, they contribute only marginally to promoting gender equity. They may help certain women play the game, but they leave in place the structures and policies of the game itself. These programs deal with the issue on an individual level, but do little to change the systemic factors within organizations that create an uneven playing field for women.

FRAME 2: CELEBRATE DIFFERENCES

The second frame shifts the focus from eliminating difference to valuing difference. This perspective conceptualizes gender as socialized differences between men and women, embodied in different masculine and feminine styles or "ways of being." Masculine and feminine identities are seen to be shaped by different life experiences and social roles. In this frame, however, the route to equity is not to eliminate or deplore these differences, but to celebrate them. From this perspective, women are disadvantaged because work styles, skills, and attributes associated with "the feminine" are not recognized or valued in the workplace.²

Framing the problem of gender inequity in this way points to corrective measures that focus on acknowledging differences and valuing them. This frame often places gender equity within a broader diversity initiative, acknowledging gender as one of many important differences among workers. Intervention strategies include consciousness-raising and diversity training to promote tolerance and understanding of difference. Other initiatives focus on demonstrating how traditionally feminine activities or styles, such as listening, collaborating, nurturing, and behind-the-scenes peacemaking, are a beneficial addition to an organization's skill set. These insights can lead to important changes in cultural norms and practices – such as changes in performance evaluation criteria – that recognize talents and contributions that women often bring to the workplace.

There is no question that interventions to value gender differences have raised awareness and created workplaces that are more tolerant and flexible. While this is an important step in expanding opportunities for women, it too has its limitations. By concentrating on differences, the approach can actually reinforce gender stereotypes rather than break them down. Also, by focusing on recognition and inclusion, there is the assumption that simply naming something as valuable will make it so. It ignores the power of the masculine image that underlies most gen-

erally accepted models of success, leadership, and managerial acumen. Women who enact a feminine style, even when its contributions are recognized and applauded, find their efforts (and often themselves) rendered invisible or valued only in the most marginal sense.³ For example, including interpersonal skills, team building, or consensus-building management styles in a performance evaluation may increase awareness that “people skills” are important in the workplace. However, it does little to challenge the way assertiveness, competition, decisiveness, and rugged individualism are assumed to be critical factors for getting organizational results. Thus, the biggest barrier to achieving gender equity in this frame is that it does not challenge the differential and hierarchical valuing of difference between the masculine and the feminine.

FRAME 3: CREATE EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

The third perspective on gender equity focuses on structural barriers. Gender in this frame is still defined in terms of differences between women and men, but it redirects attention from differences in their personal characteristics to the differential structures of opportunity that create an uneven playing field.⁴ This frame points to the gender segregation of occupations and workplaces and the many ways hiring, evaluation and promotion processes are biased against women and impede their advancement – what many refer to as the “glass ceiling.” The goal of this approach is to create equal opportunity by eliminating discriminatory structural and procedural barriers.

Interventions in this frame tend to be legalistic and policy-based. They include, for example, affirmative action initiatives, revised recruiting procedures, more transparent promotion policies designed to ensure fairness, sexual harassment guidelines, as well as the provision of work and family benefits such as child care, flexible arrangements, or alternative career track options. This approach can be thought of as reducing organizational constraints on women’s ability to achieve or providing accommodations for what are recognized as structural disadvantages.

There is no question that these structural and policy-based interventions have contributed to improving women’s opportunities. They have made it possible to recruit, retain, and promote greater numbers of women. As numbers of women increase, options for women expand and the constraints and stresses of tokenism decrease, creating an environment where women can compete on a more level playing field.⁵

These structural and policy interventions are a critical part of any gender equity initiative. Nonetheless, they too have proved insufficient in achieving lasting gains, because they have little direct effect on the informal rules and practices that govern workplace behavior. For example, applicant pools might be required to have a certain number of women candidates, but the informal selection criteria may continue to rule out those who do not fit the accepted image of the position or whose resumes have employment gaps during childbearing years. Or organizational norms may not align with the new policies. Flexible work benefits might be on the books, but using them may have negative career consequences or create backlash.⁶ In the absence of cultural change in the organization, structures and policies cannot, on their own, create equitable organization.

FRAME 4: REVISE WORK CULTURE

Gender equity in the fourth frame focuses on the underlying systemic factors in organizations that lead to workplace inequity. Gender in this frame is not so much a biologic concept as it is a social construct – an organizing principle that underlies organizational life. In other words, gender in this frame is not about women or discrimination, but is about *the organization itself*.

This frame starts from the premise that organizations are inherently gendered.⁷ Having been created largely by and for men, organizational systems, work practices, structures, and norms tend to reflect masculine experience, masculine values, and masculine life situations. As a result, everything we come to regard as normal and commonplace at work tends to privilege traits that are socially and culturally ascribed to men while devaluing or ignoring those ascribed to women. This includes, for example, cultural norms and assumptions in the workplace that value specific types of products and work processes, define competence and excellence of staff, and shape ideas about the best way to get work done. It also includes, for example, systems of reward and recognition that promote specific kinds of behavior as well as systems of communication and decision-making that bestow power and influence on some staff while excluding others.

The gender equity problem in the fourth frame is grounded in deeply held, and often unquestioned assumptions, that drive behavior and work practice in the organization. These assumptions appear neutral and inconsequential on the surface, but often have a differential impact on men and women. For example, a gendered assumption that undergirds much of organizational life is the informal rule that time spent at work, regardless of productivity, is a measure of commitment, loyalty, and organizational worth. The most valuable worker is one who is able, willing, and eager to put work first. This norm inherently gives privilege to those workers who do not have responsibilities in the private sphere of their lives that impede them from accepting unbounded work responsibilities.

Furthermore, in a situation where attributes and life situations that are socially ascribed to men and masculinity are perceived as normal and neutral, and those socially ascribed to women and femininity are perceived as different or deviant, not only do gender inequities arise, but the organization itself suffers from a narrow, conscripted view of its options for how to do its work. Displays of masculinity often get conflated with images of working, in a way that hurts many women, some men, *and the work*.⁸ To take the example above, the image of an ideal worker as someone who has no outside responsibilities to interfere with a commitment to work can result in formal and informal work norms that make it difficult not only for women to achieve, but also many men. What is rarely recognized, however, is that it may also have significant negative consequences for organizational performance as well. This kind of assumption can lead to ineffective, costly, or inefficient work practices, such as a self-perpetuating crisis mode of operating, where working through the night or holding emergency after-hours meetings becomes the norm rather than the exception.

Gender equity interventions from the fourth frame perspective engage with basic work practices and processes, and the norms that underlie them, in order to revise them in ways that are less gendered and more effective for the organization. It is important to underscore that interventions from the fourth frame are not formu-

laic or procedural. Rather they are based on an ongoing process of inquiry, experimentation, and learning. This process is not a one-time fix. Instead, it is an iterative process, much like peeling an onion, where each layer reveals yet another to be explored and examined.

What are the limitations of this approach? We see two principal challenges. First, it engages the organization in a long-term process of organizational change and learning. While this can yield significant benefits both for gender equity and organizational performance, not all organizations are ready to make this level of commitment at the beginning of their work on gender equity. Secondly, we have learned that it can be difficult to keep the goal of gender equity in the forefront. It can be easily overshadowed by the more familiar – and for some, the more compelling – goal of improving organizational effectiveness. Careful and sustained attention has to be given to ensuring that staff and managers recognize and understand the gender equity implications of changes introduced.⁹

CONCLUSION

Experience has shown that promoting gender equity in organizations is a challenging task. We need to consider the unique contributions of each frame when we make interventions. It is important to recognize, however, that the first three frames can benefit from fourth frame thinking and result in more comprehensive, integrative gender equity programs. For example, executive development programs for women are still an important way to change the leadership demographics of organizations. Adding the fourth frame perspective to these initiatives can strengthen their effect. Rather than addressing women as deficient, these efforts would help women understand the larger, *systemic* effects of gender in organizations. “Fix the women” in this sense would mean supplementing training in management skills with training in the strategies to use when women find themselves in gendered situations that inhibit their ability to be effective.

Adding a fourth frame perspective to the second frame would mean that, rather than simply valuing difference, gender equity interventions would focus on how to claim space for a different model of work practice. It would, for example, focus on developing a language of competency to name alternative strategies for success and would challenge some of the unwritten and unspoken images of ideal workers, strong leaders, and exemplary managers. The interventions would not stop at identifying difference. Instead, they would challenge the way some aspects of work are overvalued simply because of their association with masculinity, while others are devalued because of their association with femininity and not because of the relative contribution they make to the final product.

It is important to continue structural and policy interventions characteristic of the third frame. Increasing the hiring, retention, and promotion of women is critical to any gender equity initiative. But adding a fourth frame perspective would mean focusing not just on policies, but on how these policies are used in practice. For example, an intervention designed to improve the recruitment of women would go beyond developing mechanisms to “cast the net widely” in distributing job announcements. It would also review the job descriptions to see how they may preclude or prejudice consideration of women, and revise them to be more inclusive.

A pure fourth frame approach builds on interventions typical of the other three frames, but it is broader and deeper and focuses on systemic changes in work culture and practices that will benefit women, men, and the organization. We believe that this level of change is essential for creating organizations that are both effective and truly gender equitable.

NOTES

- 1 For a comprehensive comparison of the different theoretical perspectives on gender and gender equity, see Calas, M. and L. Smircich (1996). "From 'The Women's' Point of View: Feminist Approaches to Organization Studies," *Handbook of Organization Studies*, S, Clegg, C. Hardy, and W. Nord, eds. London: Sage Publications. An earlier version of this framework is presented in Kolb, D. and D. Meyerson (forthcoming) "Moving out of the 'Armchair': Initial Attempts to Apply Feminist Organization Theory into Organizations," *Organization*.
- 2 See Helgessen, S. (1990). *Female Advantage: Women's Ways of Leadership*. New York: Doubleday; Rosener, J. (1990). "Ways Women Lead," *Harvard Business Review*, November–December, 68(6): 119–125
- 3 Fletcher, J. K. (1998). "Relational Practice: A Feminist Reconstruction of Work," *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 7(2): 163–186.
- 4 See Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Men and Women in the Corporation*. New York: Basic Books; Reskin, B. (1984). *Women and Men at Work*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- 5 Ely, R. (1995). "The Power of Demography: Women's Social Construction of Gender Identity at Work." *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(3): 589–634.
- 6 Bailyn, L, J. Fletcher, and D. Kolb (1997). "Unexpected Connections: Considering Employees' Personal Lives Can Revitalize Your Business," *Sloan Management Review*, 38(4): 11–19.
- 7 See Fletcher, J. and D. Merrill-Sands (1998). "Looking Below the Surface: The Gendered Nature of Organizations," *CGO Insights*, 2, December.
- 8 Martin, P. (1998). "Men, Masculinities, and Working from (some) Women's Standpoint." Unpublished paper presented at The Center for Gender in Organizations case conference, Simmons Institute for Leadership and Change, April, 1998.
- 9 Ely, R. and D. Meyerson (2000). "Holding Gender: The Challenges of Keeping the Gender Rationale Present in the Course of an Organizational Intervention." *Organization* 74(4): 589–608.

Introducing Gender. Chapter 1. January 2008 with 2 Reads. How we measure 'reads'.
SWAHILI-SPEAKING WOMEN IN COURT
Pronouncing and Persevering: Gender and the Discourses of Disputing in an African Islamic Court. By Susan F. Hirsch. Chicago:
University of Chicago Press, 1998.