Gender and management: New directions in research and continuing patterns in practice

Introduction

Management and managing are characteristically gendered in many respects. Over the last thirty years there has been a major international growth of studies on gender relations in organisations in general and in management in particular. This applies in both empirical research and more general theoretical analyses. The area of gender, organisations and management is now recognised in at least some quarters *outside of itself* as a legitimate, even an important area. This is to be seen in the current market in publications, in the activities of mainstream international publishers, in journals,[1] in courses within degree programmes, and in research groups, networks, and conferences and conference streams.

Nevertheless, the field of activity is still somewhat precarious, in some ways very precarious. The vast majority of mainstream work on organisations and management has no gender analysis whatsoever or if it does it is very simple and crude. In business schools and university departments the position of gender-explicit work is very far from established. Even Critical Management Studies (CMS), which may be concerned with, for example, power, class, labour process, resistance, discourse, deconstruction, does not necessarily take gender into account.

Furthermore, many of the initiatives, gains, insights and forms of organising that have been achieved around research on gender and management are not secure. Many do not have long-term 'base' funding in the form of, say, core courses within degree programmes. Much depends on the activities of enthusiastic and committed individuals, often employed to do 'other things', and working in relative isolation, so that if they leave their job the teaching or the research goes with them. Also, publishing outlets are by no means secure; they depend on publishers' willingness to back an area, reader interest, and academics as writers and editors working long hours often for little direct monetary reward. Thus, scholarship on gender and management tends to be scattered and dispersed; in most countries there are rather few well-established groups of researchers working together on these issues in a long-term secure programme of research.

There are also uncertainties and variations in the interests of students; one year a course is the 'great new thing', while a few years later the 'topic' is 'passé'; then interest may revive a few years later. Some students and academics seem to think that most of the problems around gender have been solved and it is now up to (non-gendered) individuals. Some academics now seem to see studies on gender as old fashioned, as something that was important in the past, and is not so interesting now.

Recent research and literature on the gendering of management has been strongly influenced, though sometimes indirectly, by debates in and around feminism and critical studies on gender, and on recognising women and women's situations, experiences and voices in organisations and management. The range of topics and issues that have been

studied internationally is vast: gender relations in organisational and management groups, cultures and communication; gender divisions of labour; gender divisions of hierarchy, power, authority and leadership in organisations and management; gendered markets; gender imagery, symbols and advertising; gender and information technology; sexuality, harassment, bullying and violence in organisations; home-work relations; as well as theoretically-orientated studies of management. There are also key issues of gender power relations in academic organisations and academic management themselves, which need urgent attention. Though all these areas have been researched to some extent, much remains to be done. This special issue does not reproduce the emphases of earlier work but rather addresses *new directions* in research on gender and management, albeit within the context of some continuing and persistent patterns, both in organisations and managements studied, and within the academic research field itself.

What is 'gender'?

Before going further in this introduction, it may be useful to discuss briefly what is meant by the concept of gender. Gender and gendered power relations are major defining features of most organisations and managements. Organisations and managements are not just structured by gender but pervaded and constituted by and through gender; at the same time, organisational and managerial realities construct and sometimes subvert dominant gender relations. When gender is referred to it is usual to think of 'men and women' and 'relations between them'; these are certainly part of gender, but only a part. Gender is just as relevant in relations between women and between men, for example, in gendered

hierarchies within genders. Gender has also taken on other more complex meanings. Such wider understandings of gender are both contested and central to analysing management and organisations.

Sex and sex differences are still often naturalised as fixed, or almost fixed, in biology. The distinction between sex and gender was recognised in the 1960s in feminist and other critical accounts of women's and men's positions in society. These highlighted how what was often thought of as natural and biological was also social, cultural, historical and political (e.g. see Stoller, 1968). Oakley (1972) was among the first to distinguish 'sex' as biological sex differences from 'gender' as socio-cultural constructions of sex differences.[2] This has linked with much research on sex/gender differences, and indeed their relative absence (Jacklin and Maccoby, 1975; Durkin, 1978), psychological scales measuring 'masculinity-femininity', sex/gender roles and gender socialisation. There are, however, many problems with these approaches (Eichler, 1980), including their cultural specificity, and relative lack of attention to power, change and social structures. Paradoxically, the sex/gender approach can easily take us back to biology.

Even with such difficulties, the sex/gender model has prompted path-breaking work on gender relations, some attending to attitudes, self-concepts and identity, others focusing on social categories and structural relations. In this, gender has often been understood as a way of recognising socio-cultural relations and as relatively autonomous from biology. Such approaches articulate structural concepts of gender relations, as in sex/gender classes, patriarchy, gender systems, and gender orders. However, about the same time as

sex role approaches were being criticised, there were also, in the late 1970s and early 1980s, critiques of the concept of patriarchy and of relatively fixed 'categorical' approaches to gender (Rowbotham, 1979; Connell, 1985).

The outcome of these simultaneous, if somewhat separate, critiques of, first, social psychological concepts of sex role and, second, overly structuralist or societal concepts of gender as determined within patriarchy, has been a movement to more differentiated, more pluralised approaches to gender. In these, power issues remain central, as encapsulated in the notion of gendered power relations. This reformulation of gender fits closely with conceptual revisions of patriarchy/ies as historical, multiple structures (Walby, 1986, 1990; Hearn, 1987, 1992), and with moves to poststructuralism and some versions of postmodernism. In recent years, there has been increasing attention to gendered practices, processes and discourses; multiple/composite masculinities and femininities; interrelations of gendered unities and differences; life stories and subjectivities; and the social construction of sexualities. Construction of difference, such as by age, class, ethnicity, occupation, assists in reproducing gendered asymmetrical power between men and women, between men and between women, as such differences often carry gendered meanings and reinforce gender inequalities.

Many complications remain in conceptualising gender, particularly within positivist paradigms. A pervasive constraint is the persistence of dualisms and dichotomies, such as female/male; woman/man; feminine/masculine; femininity/masculinity; girls/boys. While these are clearly important differentiations, they only speak to part of the possibilities of

what gender is or might be in different situations and societies (Edwards, 1989). Perhaps the greatest challenges to a simple, dualist view of gender come from sexuality studies and queer theory (see Richardson *et al.*, 2006; Richardson, 2007). Gender and sexuality are intimately connected with each other; 'without a concept of gender there could be, quite simply, no concept of homo- or hetero- sexuality.' (Sedgwick, 1991: 31).

Other difficulties lie in the very distinction between 'sex' and 'gender'. Bondi (1998) has clarified the problems with the sex-gender distinction:

- as not necessarily carrying liberatory potential; just because it is socially constructed does not mean that it can be changed any more easily than sex;
- as closely linked to other dichotomies, such as nature-culture and body-mind. If gender corresponds, one might ask why a concept of gender is necessary; if gender involves the transcendence of mind over body, then the question remains why should this 'unsexed' mind correspond to gender if it is wholly disconnected from sex. It can thus be argued that the sex-gender distinction reinforces dichotomies, even repositions male/masculinity as the norm;
- as implying that sex and biology are pre-social or free of the social, though biology is itself constituted in the social.

Butler (1990) has argued that the sex-gender distinction is a socio-cultural construction: gender is not the cultural arrangement of *given* sex difference; instead, the sex/gender difference is itself a cultural arrangement, dominantly constructed in terms of the

heterosexual matrix. This highlights the socio-cultural construction of the culturally sexed body. However, there are dangers in this shift that the material, biological body may be lost in inscription and performativity. Thus, a measured movement may be made towards recognising and relating the socio-cultural formation of the gendered body and its material, biological existence. Gender is not one 'thing'; it is contested, complex, differentiated. Moreover, while our focus is on gender, gender should not be isolated from other social divisions and oppressions, such as class or race, in relation to which gender is formed. The intersection of gender and other social divisions and differences is now a well-established theoretical and empirical question, or set of questions.

Overall, what is particularly interesting is that the area of gender, organisations and management has become more established at the very time that the notion of gender has itself become more problematic, and much less clearly easily defined or circumscribed.

Management in the context of gendered organisations

Debates about the meaning of gender have continued at the very time that the field of gender, organisations and management has expanded greatly and become more established. In identifying organisations and management as gendered, a number of assumptions and emphases are made. First, and obviously, there is some kind of focus on gender. Social relations between and amongst genders, interpersonal and structural, material and discursive, are understood as significant. Gendering occurs in both

distributions of gendered people and gendered practices, and applies even when organisations and managements comprise only men or indeed only women.

While management can be gendered in many ways, typical patterns include:

- *The valuing of organisations and management themselves over work in the private domains.* This is frequently gendered in valuing men's work over women's (e.g. Grimshaw and Rubery, 2007).

- *Gendered divisions of labour in management.* Women and men, through inclusions and exclusions, specialise in particular types of formal and informal labour, with vertical and horizontal divisions in organisations and management (e.g. Legge, 1987).

- *Gendered divisions of authority in management*, both formal and informal. Women and men may be valued differentially in terms of both formal authority, by virtue of their post and position, and informal authority, from their status and standing in the organisation (e.g. Marshall, 1984). Moreover, organisations are dominated by masculine values and behaviour (Hopkins, 2000; Jones, 2000; Kimmel, 2004).

- *Gendered processes between the centre and margins.* These may be literally or metaphorically spatial in the distribution of power and activity between the centre and margins of organisations and management. 'Front-line' activities are often staffed by women, 'central' activities more often performed by men. The 'main aim' of organisations tends to be dominantly defined by men (Cockburn, 1991).

- *The gendered relations of organisational participants to domestic and related responsibilities.* Women typically continue to carry the double burden of childcare

- *Gendered processes in sexuality*, including the dominance of various forms of sexuality over others (e.g. Hearn and Parkin, 1987, 1995; Parker, 2002; Skidmore, 2004). Most organisations and managements reproduce dominant heterosexual norms, ideology and practices. Indeed (hetero)sexual arrangements in private domains generally provide the base infrastructure for organisations and managements, principally through women's associated unpaid reproductive labour.

- *Gendered processes in violence*, including harassment, bullying and physical violence (e.g. Hearn and Parkin, 2001; Hunt *et al*., 2007).

- *Gendered processes in interactions between individuals, and individuals' internal mental work* (e.g. Acker, 1992).

- *Gendered symbols, images and forms of consciousness*, for example, in media, advertising, publicity materials and corporate logos (e.g. Dunn-Jensen and Stroh, 2007).

In specific organisations and managements these elements interact, often reinforcing, sometimes contradicting each other. Many organisations and managements are characterised by definite gendered patterns of hierarchy, occupational segregation, sexuality and family responsibilities, defined by and reproducing social relations of age,

class, disability and ethnicity. Gendered processes and their interrelations are not monolithic, but often paradoxical and open to multiple interpretations.

The development of the field

During the 1970s and 1980s, the two dominant sets of literature on gender and management came from, first, studies of gendered labour markets, including that influenced by studies of political economy and by Marxist and socialist feminist work; and writings on "women in management". In the late 1970s the field was opened up significantly by Rosabeth Moss Kanter's (1977) extended case study of a large US corporation in the book *Men and Women of the Corporation*. In some ways this brought together political, economic and managerial(ist) approaches. It was, and still is, an important text that translated the agendered management and bureaucracy into something that was intensely gendered in practice. However, Kanter stopped short of presenting a fully gendered account of power, arguing (interestingly following her first citation of Karl Marx) that organisational position and activities rather than gender determines power. This is even though she noted that a preference for men equals a preference for power (pp. 197 ff.) (see Collinson and Hearn, 1995).

By the late 1970s and early 1980s most relevant work was on gender divisions of labour and gender divisions of authority and hierarchy, and, to a much lesser extent, sexuality in and around management and organisations (Hearn and Parkin, 1983). These three processes have some parallel with the more general social processes of

production/work/labour relations, power, and cathexis respectively, that make up gender orders and gender regimes (Connell, 1987).

An important part of feminist and gender critiques has necessarily been the recognition of the neglect of gender in mainstream or malestream management studies. Other aspects of critique of the mainstream have addressed 'classics'. One example is the critique of bureaucracy, as partially initiated by Kanter, and continued in a more thoroughgoing way by Kathy Ferguson's (1984) *The Feminist Case Against Bureaucracy*. This has itself become a classic text in this debate that has in turn been subject to further feminist critique by Due Billing (1994). Another is work by Aupperle (2001, also see 2007) that has made a close comparison between the insights, on metaphors, of the work of Mary Parker Follett (e.g. 1918) and that of Gareth Morgan (1986), with the elevation of the latter and the forgetting and non-citation of the much earlier former.

Having said this, in much of the relevant literature of the 1970s and 1980s there were various inadequacies. These can be characterised through a number of tendencies:

- to consider gender, if at all, in rather simple, dualist ways, most obviously in the use of sex/gender role models of gender relations that have since been subject to overwhelming critique (e.g. Eichler, 1980; Carrigan *et al.*, 1985; Connell, 1987);
- to focus primarily, often exclusively, on the division of labour;
- to consider organisations out of the context of their societal relations, including the domestic relations of organisational members; and
- to neglect or ignore sexuality and violence (Hearn and Parkin, 1987, 1995, 2001).

Joan Acker (1992) performed a very valuable synthesising analysis when she set out

major *gendered processes* in organisations: the production of gender divisions; the

creation of gendered symbols, images and forms of consciousness; interactions between

individuals (women and men, men and men, women and women); and the internal mental

work of individuals. In addition, these gendered *processes* intertwine with organisational

culture(s), organisation sexuality and organisation violations of various kinds.

Since the late 1980s there have been increasing numbers of feminist, profeminist and

critical studies on gender and gendered divisions of labour and authority, along with

attention to sexuality and identity, in organisations and management (e.g., Marshall,

1984; Walby, 1990; Cockburn, 1991; Mills and Tancred, 1992; Savage and Witz, 1992;

Davidson and Burke, 1994, 2000; Reskin and Padavic, 1994; MacEwen Scott, 1994; Due

Billing and Alvesson, 1994; Itzin and Newman, 1995; F. Wilson, 1995, 2003; Collinson

and Hearn, 1996; Oerton, 1996; Rantalaiho and Heiskanen, 1997; Alvesson and Due

Billing, 1997; E. Wilson, 2000; Halford and Leonard, 2001; Aaltio and Mills, 2002; Ely

et al., 2003; Powell and Graves, 2003; Thomas *et al.*, 2004). In the 1990s another key

feature has been increasing methodological development and divergent pluralism in

feminist and critical gender research - hence the move to 'feminisms'. Calás and

Smircich (1996, 2006) have provided major and differently organised overviews of

diverse feminist approaches and interpretations.

Further trends and emphasises since the early 1990s have included growing recognition of the specific gendering of men in organisations and management (Collinson and Hearn, 1994, 1996). Although men's dominance is profound, it is not un-resisted (Cockburn, 1991; Thomas *et al.*, 2004); it has to be continually re-established and can be challenged, subverted and destabilised. There has also been moves to emphasise the centrality of gendered practices and 'doing gender' in organisations (Rantalaiho and Heiskanen, 1997); and the ambiguous, contradictory and paradoxical nature of gendered selves and identities in organisations and management (Kondo, 1990).

Another strand of development is interest in women, and sometimes men, in international management and management internationally (e.g. Adler and Izraeli, 1988, 1994). Most recently, there have been various moves from a focus on the nationally based, single organisation to that on transnational, multi-organisations. Key debates here are the gendering of managements in the contexts of postcolonialism, intersectionalities, globalisation/glocalisation, cross-cultural management, the growth of multinational and transnational corporations, development studies, and information and communication technologies (ICTs). All of these moves have, in different ways, highlighted the need for more research on the intersections of 'gender', 'diversity' and 'diversity management' (Konrad *et al.*, 2006). Such shifts can be seen as compatible with increasing attention on multiple social divisions and oppressions; whether these are conceptualised within poststructuralist, postmodernist and deconstructive approaches, on the one hand, or increasing complex materialist epistemologies, on the other.

Throughout all these shifts and changes the "women in management" strand has remained rather consistently strong, in both popular management texts and in research. Most recently, Diana Bilimoria and Sandy Kristin Piderit (2007) co-edited the *Handbook on Women in Business and Management*.

In this brief review of the development of the field it is vital to mention that there is great unevenness within management studies, and its various research specialisms, in terms of attention to gender and gendering. Thus, there has been considerably more gendered research on and in Organisational Behaviour, Organisation Theory, Industrial Relations, Human Resource Management, and Leadership than there has been on and in Marketing, Finance, Accounting, International Business and Production Management. This applies to both the study of those functions in organisations and managements researched by empirical or other methods, and in their reflexive application to their own academic fields and sub-fields themselves, typically overwhelmingly dominated by men without (pro)feminist awareness or orientation, or gender expertise. There is interestingly signs of a significant expansion of research interest in gender in studies of Entrepreneurship (e.g., Fielden and Davidson, 2005; Brush *et al.*, 2006). There is immense scope for far greater attention to gender relations in international studies, be they international HRM, international business-to-business activity, alliances, mergers and acquisitions, partnerships, supply chains, financial dependencies and other inter-corporate relations – formal or informal, and often involving men at the high levels (Hearn *et al.*, 2006). Further, with changing demographics and the growth of 'Generation Y' and their

distinguishing characteristics, there is increasing scope to expand research on 'whole life' concerns (e.g. Piderit, 2007; Las Haras and Hall, 2007).

Gendered managements

Management remains gendered in many specific ways. While women's occupation of managerial positions has vastly improved since 1974 when it was just two per cent in the UK (Equal Opportunities Commission, 2006) to the present where it is around 32 per cent across the EU [and 34.5 per cent in the UK] (Eurostat, 2006), nonetheless there remains continued dominance of men in management. Furthermore, this is particularly noticeable in the senior, policy making and highest paid positions (Linehan, 2002; Singh and Vinnicombe, 2004, 2005, 2006; Equal Opportunities Commission, 2006, 2007). While there is evidence of some increases in women's representation in middle management, small business ownership, and management in total (Davidson and Burke, 2000; Vinnicombe, 2000), at CEO and the highest executive levels the very low numbers of women may be static, increasing very slowly or even reducing (Institute of Management, 1995; Veikkola *et al.*, 1997; Institute of Management / Remuneration Economics, 1998; Singh and Vinnicombe, 2006). In 2006 women accounted for just four per cent of executive directorships in the FTSE 250 companies, and just 77 of the FTSE 100 companies (a slight *decrease* from the previous year) had at least one woman director (Singh and Vinnicombe, 2006). Furthermore, only 53 of the FTSE 100 companies have *any* women at all on their executive teams (Singh and Vinnicombe, 2006). The situation is similar elsewhere. Only 10 per cent of members of the boards and just three per cent of

CEOs of the larger EU enterprises are women (European Commission, 2006), while in the US women account for less than eight per cent of top managers (Economist, 2005): hence claims that the glass ceiling remains (Meyerson, and Fletcher, 2000).

Although women managers have high levels of education and a desire to progress in their careers, few achieve the same status or salary as their male counterparts; men managers are more likely than women managers to be better paid, to be in more secure employment, to be on higher grades, to be less stressed, to be older at each responsibility level, and to have not experienced prejudice and sexual discrimination (Davidson and Cooper, 1984; Institute of Management, 1995; Institute of Management / Remuneration Economics, 1998; Fielden and Cooper, 2002; Chênevert and Tremblay, 2002; Calás and Smircich, 2006; Gatrell and Cooper, 2007).

In many organisations management has been, and continues to be, represented as gender-neutral, whether as part of supposedly non-gendered bureaucracy or taken-for-granted managerial imperative. Management often involves homosocial practices (e.g. Kanter, 1977; Schneider, 1987; Byrne and Neuman, 1992; Ibarra, 1992; Liff and Cameron, 1997; Pelled *et al.*, 1999), with men's preference for men and men's company, and the use of masculine models, stereotypes and symbols in management, often from sport, the military and evolution, such as the "law of the jungle". Male homosociality that combines emotional detachment, competitiveness, viewing women as sexual objects as well as ostracising and undermining them, and perpetuates hegemonic masculinity, also suppresses subordinate masculinities and reproduces a pecking order among men.

Management, and especially what is often understood as effective business management, has often been assumed to be consistent with characteristics traditionally valued in men (Marshall, 1991; Alimo-Metcalfe, 1993; Heilman, 2001; Schein, 2001; Powell *et al.*, 2002). There have been significant historical transformations of management, from male near-monopoly, to dominant traditional managerial masculinities, and to more modern forms of gendering (Kerfoot and Knights, 1993; Roper, 1994; Collinson and Hearn, 1996). For both management and employees, management contributes to processes of gendered identity formation.

Within management strong gender specialisations persist, often underwritten by gender divisions in education and training, for example, men's domination of most engineering and technology sectors. Though men have been very prominent in the institutional development of personnel management (Trudinger, 2004), in many countries human resource management (HRM) has tended to be an area of management in which women are relatively more represented (Legge, 1987). Management is subject to and contributes to workplace gender power relations within and across hierarchical levels, in recruitment, selection, appraisal, promotion, and so on. Those parts of managerial practice that involve corporate management-labour relations can be rethought in terms of gender relations, often meaning co-operations and conflicts between groups dominated by men. Many studies on gender in management, especially HRM, have focused on recruitment, appointments, promotion, team-building, communication, power, authority, equal opportunities policy and sexual harassment (Adler and Izraeli, 1988, 1994; Powell, 1993;

Davidson and Burke, 1994, 2000; F. Wilson, 1995, 2003; E. Wilson, 2000; Ely *et al.*, 2003; Powell and Graves, 2003).

The question of remuneration and other personnel rights and benefits, fair or unfair, is another central question. A key gender issue for HR policy and outcomes is the gender pay gap. The gender pay gap in the UK is 17.2 % (National Statistics, 2006; Equal Opportunities Commission, 2007). Across EU countries, women are still paid 15 per cent less per hour than men (European Commission, 2006), on "raw" unadjusted figures.[3] There are signs of a slow narrowing of the gender gap in some European countries, but recent figures also suggest a small widening in a few EU countries. Many organisations have turned attention to include the development of gender-sensitive policies and practices, gender equality plans, equal opportunities policies, family-friendly policies, gender training, and harassment, bullying and violence policies and sometimes use these as promotional tools in their attempts to demonstrate gender neutrality. Such policies and practices may, however, often appear to be in response to legal requirements, such as alignment with EU directives or workers' actual or potential compensation claims, rather than a search for gender justice in itself. There is an added danger that equal opportunity policies based on equal treatment require women to den, or attempt to minimise differences between themselves and men (Liff and Wajcman, 1996), while a procedural approach to equality focuses on changing behaviour but leaves attitudes and beliefs relatively untouched (Liff, 1999). Thus, it is important to continue to research on the interplay of formal systems, informal relations and homosocial practices that can help to perpetuate gendered divisions in the workplace.

Developing the special issue

It was these many and various developments and considerations that prompted us to launch the call for this special issue in April 2005 under the title, 'Gender in Management'. The main body of the call read as follows:

> "Despite changes in the status of and interactions between women and men at work, power relations between men and women in management remain unequal, and especially so at high levels. Furthermore, the structures and social processes of organisations frequently continue to emanate from male-based practices, prerogatives and privileges. Employers often use human capital theory and decontextualised assessments of "competence" to explain the different achievements of women and men managers. Such perspectives have been challenged by the growing body of research on gender, organisations and management as insufficient. Rather, different, more explicitly gendered theoretical perspectives may better offer explanations for the persistence of men and women's relative positions in management hierarchies, and the gendering of management more generally. At the same time as there has been an expansion of research on gender and management, there have been major developments in theorisations of gender, including its relations to sex and sexuality.
>
> The objective of this special issue is to publish a collection of high quality papers that offer new theoretical approaches to gender and management research. It will adopt a critical analysis of the way work and management are organised and the implications this has for the nature of managerial work and management positions of power and influence. Papers submitted should address themes and concerns that inform theoretical understandings of gender and management. These might include, but not limited to, the following:
>
> - Why gendered approaches are necessary in management research
> - New developments in the theory of gender and management
> - The absence of gender in mainstream research
> - Intersections of gender and other social relations
> - New developments in social theory
> - The relevance of changing theorisations of gender and sexuality."

In the event we received 36 full papers for this special issue. These were all reviewed by at least two, and often three, reviewers, in addition to our own editorial reviewing. We are immensely grateful to all the reviewers who took on the task reviewing, some at short notice. The shortlisted papers were then all revised in the light of the reviewers' and our own comments, and in some cases re-revised again. The range of papers submitted was large covering many of the issues and questions outlined in this introduction. In the event, nine were selected; in all of these new directions in research were presented, and it is partly for this reason that several of the papers included are exploratory in nature.

We begin this special issue with Regine Bendl's attempts to move forward gendered organisational theory. Based on a re-reading of 24 texts in organisation and management studies, she presents eight forms of gender subtext that reflect the current reproduction of gender organisational discourse, concluding that organisational discourse needs to move beyond a heteronormative gender dichotomy and hierarchy and consider a third term which would allow for a re-conceptualisation of more inclusive forms of gendered accounts, and hence a more inclusive organisational discourse. Adopting a behaviour process perspective, Savita Kumra and Susan Vinnicombe report on an empirical study of promotion processes of management consultants in the hitherto under researched field of professional services. Drawing on interactions between individuals, Sharon Mavin considers gendered hierarchies within genders and focuses on a conceptual critique of solidarity behaviour and 'Queen Bee' as labels used by researchers and the popular press to explain women's behaviour in organisations. Katarzyna Kosmala's article contributes

to the gender inequality in labour debate by exploring the issue as it is represented in the visual arts. She does this through representation and deconstruction of the work of three women artists, Lucy McKenzie, Julita Wojcik and Mary Kelly. Nicolina Kamenou adds to our understandings of the complexities of the work-life balance debate by extending analysis beyond gender and childcare to those that additionally consider issues of ethnicity, culture and religion. Drawing on an empirical study that explored the ways in which gender and sexuality are enacted by lesbian managers in New Zealand, Judith Pringle demonstrates that the dominant heterosexual norms, ideologies and practices were experienced by these managers. She argues that a reframing of gender as 'heterogender' foregrounds heterosexuality and gender as intertwined, thus providing another understanding to how gender is 'done' in management. In recognising the workplace as a sexualised environment, Lynn Morgan and Lyn Davidson interrogate the interpersonal dynamics of mentoring relationships in organisations, focusing on how sexual dynamics impact on mentoring relationships in the workplace. Their critical review embraces heterosexual, gay and lesbian mentoring relationships. Employing a spatial perspective, Patricia Lewis focuses on neonatal nurses within a special care baby unit to demonstrate how the relationship between space and emotion management practices can expose how prescriptive ('masculine') emotion management can be challenged by philanthropic ('feminine') emotion management. Her findings showed that the space of the unit at night was created as a space of empowerment through the enactment of philanthropic emotion management. Finally, Nelarine Cornelius and Denise Skinner explore the careers of senior men and women in HRM utilising a capabilities theory perspective, one that advocates an enacted quality of life through the widening of

people's freedoms and choices. Their findings highlight the importance to both women

and men of the family in relation to career choices, in line with the growing research area

of 'whole life' concerns.

We trust this special issue brings some new perspectives and assists understanding of

current patterns of practice and new directions in management research and gender

research, and how these are manifest in managements and organisations.

References

Aaltio, I. and A. J. Mills (eds.) (2002). *Gender, Identity and the Culture of Organizations*.
London: Routledge.

Acker, J. (1992). 'Gendering organizational theory'. In: A. J. Mills and P. Tancred (eds.),
Gendering Organizational Analysis, pp. 248-260. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Adler, N. and D. Izraeli (eds.) (1988). *Women in Management Worldwide*. New York:
M.E. Sharpe.

Adler, N. and D. Izraeli (eds.) (1994). *Competitive Frontiers: Women Managers in a
Global Economy*. Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell.

Alimo-Metcalfe, B. (1993). 'Women in management: organizational socialization and assessment practices that prevent career advancement', *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, **1**, pp. 68-82.

Alvesson, M. and Y. Due Billing (1997). *Understanding Gender and Organizations*. London: Sage.

Aupperle, K. (2001). Mary Parker Follett and the metaphors of Gareth Morgan. Symposium presentation, University of Akron, August.

Aupperle, K. (ed.) (2007). Special Issue on Mary Parker Follett, *International Journal of Public Administration*, **30** (4).

Bilimoria, D. and S. K. Piderit (eds.) (2007) *Handbook on Women in Business and Management*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Bondi, L. (1998). 'Sexing the city'. In: R. Fincher and J. M. Jacobs (eds.), *Cities of Difference*, pp. 177-200. New York: Guilford Press.

Brush, C. G. *et al.* (2006). *Women and Entrepreneurship: Contemporary Classics*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Burke, R. (2002). 'Career development of managerial women'. In: R. J. Burke and D. L. Nelson (eds.), *Advancing Women's Careers*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Butler, J. (1990). *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York/London: Routledge.

Byrne, D. and J. H. Neuman (1992). 'The implications of attraction research for organizational issues'. In: K. Kelley (ed.), *Issues, Theory, and Research in Industrial/Organizational Psychology*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Calás, M. B. and L. Smircich (1996). 'From 'the woman's' point of view: feminist approaches to organization studies'. In: S. R. Clegg, C. Hardy and W. R. Nord (eds.), *Handbook of Organization Studies*, pp. 218-257. London: Sage.

Calás, M. B. and L. Smircich (2006). 'From 'the woman's' point of view ten years later: towards a feminist organization studies'. In: S. R. Clegg, C. Hardy, T. B. Lawrence and W. R. Nord (eds.), *Handbook of Organization Studies. Second Edition*, pp. 284-346. London: Sage.

Carrigan, T., R. W. Connell and J. Lee (1985). 'Towards a new sociology of masculinity', *Theory and Society*, **14**, pp. 551-604.

Chênevert, D. and M. Tremblay (2002). 'Managerial career success in Canadian organizations: Is gender a determinant?', *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, **13** (6), pp. 920 – 941.

Cockburn, C. K. (1991). *In the Way of Women: Men's Resistance to Sex Equality in Organizations*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Collinson, D. L. and J. Hearn (1994). 'Naming men as men: implications for work, organizations and management. *Gender, Work and Organization*, **1** (1), pp. 2-22.

Collinson, D. L. and J. Hearn (1995). 'Men managing leadership? 'Men and Women of the Corporation' revisited', *International Review of Women and Leadership*, **1** (2), pp. 1-24.

Collinson, D. L. and J. Hearn (eds.) (1996). *Men as Managers, Managers as Men: Critical perspectives on men, masculinities and managements*. London: Sage.

Connell, R. W. (1985). 'Theorising gender', *Sociology*, **19**, pp. 260-272.

Connell, R. W. (1987). *Gender and Power*. Cambridge: Polity.

Davidson, M. J. and R. J. Burke (eds.) (1994). *Women in Management: Current Research Issues*. London: Paul Chapman.

Davidson, M. J. and R. J. Burke (eds.) (2000). *Women in Management: Current Research Issues II*. London: Sage.

Davidson, M. J., and C. L. Cooper (1984). 'Occupational stress in female managers: A comparative approach', *Journal of Management Studies*, **21**, pp. 185-205.

Due Billing, Y. (1994). Gender and bureaucracies: a critique of Ferguson's "The Feminist Case Against Bureaucracy"', *Gender, Work and Organization*, **1** (4), pp. 179-193.

Due Billing, Y. and M. Alvesson (1994). *Gender, Management and Organizations*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Dunn-Jensen, L. M. and L. K. Stroh (2007). 'Myths in media: how the news media portray women in the workforce'. In: D. Bilimoria and S. K. Piderit (eds), *Handbook on Women in Business and Management*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Durkin, J. J. (1978). 'The potential of women'. In: B. A. Stead (ed.), *Women in Management*, pp. 42-46. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Economist, The (2005). 'Special report: women in business, the conundrum of the glass ceiling', *The Economist,* 23 July, pp. 67–69.

Edwards, A. (1989). 'The sex-gender distinction: has it outlived its usefulness?', *Australian Feminist Studies*, **10**, pp. 1-12.

Eichler, M. (1980). *The Double Standard: A Feminist Critique of Feminist Social Science*. London: Croom Helm.

Ely, R. J., M. Scully and E. Foldy (eds.) (2003). *Reader in Gender, Work and Organization*. Oxford/New York: Blackwell.

Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities (2006). *Women and Men in Decision Making. A Question of Balance*. EUROPA.

Equal Opportunties Commission (2006). *Sex and Power: Who Runs Britain? 2006*. Manchester: Equal Opportunties Commission.

Equal Opportunities Commission (2007). *The Gender Agenda*. Manchester: Equal Opportunties Commission.

European Commission (2006). *Report on Equality Between Women and Men, 2006*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

Eurostat (2006). 'A statistical view of the life of women and men in the EU25', *News Release*, 29/2006, 6 March.

Ferguson, K. (1984). *The Feminist Case Against Bureaucracy*. Philadephia, PA: Temple University Press.

Fielden, S. L. and C. L. Cooper (2002). 'Managerial stress: are women more at risk?'. In: R. J. Burke and D. Nelson (eds.), *Gender, Work and Stress*. Washington DC: American Psychological Association.

Fielden, S. L. and M. J. Davidson (eds.) (2005). *International Handbook of Women and Small Business Entrepreneurship*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Follett, M. P. (1918). *The New State - Group Organization, the Solution for Popular Government*. New York: Longman, Green and Co. Available at: http://sunsite.utk.edu/FINS/Mary_Parker_Follett/Fins-MPF-01.html

Gatrell, C. and C. L. Cooper (2007). '(No) Cracks in the glass ceiling: women managers, stress and the barriers to success'. In: D. Bilimoria and S. K. Piderit (eds), *Handbook on Women in Business and Management*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Gordon, J. R. and K. S. Whelan-Barry (2004). 'It takes two to tango: an empirical study of perceived spousal/partner support for working women', *Women in Management Review,* **19** (5), pp. 260-273.

Grimshaw, D. and J. Rubery (2007). *Undervaluing Women's Work*. Working Paper No. 53, Manchester: Equal Opportunities Commission.

Halford, S. and P. Leonard (2001). *Gender, Organisations and Power*. London: Palgrave.

Hearn, J. (1987). *The Gender of Oppression: Men, Masculinity and the Critique of Marxism*. Brighton: Wheatsheaf; New York: St. Martin's.

Hearn, J. (1992). *Men in the Public Eye: The Construction and Deconstruction of Public Men and Public Patriarchies*. London/New York: Routledge.

Hearn, J., B. Metcalfe and R. Piekkari (2006). 'Gender in international human resource management'. In: I. Björkman and G. Stahl (eds.), *Handbook of Research on International Human Resource Management*, pp. 502-522. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Hearn, J. and P. W. Parkin (1983). 'Gender and organizations: a selective review and a critique of a neglected area', *Organization Studies*, **4** (3), pp. 219-242.

Hearn, J., and W. Parkin (1987). *'Sex' at 'Work': The Power and Paradox of Organisation Sexuality*. Brighton: Wheatsheaf; New York: St.Martin's.

Hearn, J., and W. Parkin (1995). *'Sex' at 'Work': The Power and Paradox of Organisation Sexuality*. *Revised and Updated*. Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall/Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Hearn, J. and W. Parkin (2001). *Gender, Sexuality and Violence in Organizations: The Unspoken Forces of Organization Violations*. London: Sage.

Heilman, M.E. (2001). 'Description and prescription: how gender stereotypes prevent women's ascent up the organizational ladder', *Journal of Social Issues*, **67** (4), pp. 657-674.

Hopkins, J. (2000). 'Signs of Masculinism in an "Uneasy" Place: Advertising for "Big Brothers"', *Gender, Place and Culture,* **7** (1), pp. 35-55.

Hunt, C., M. J. Davidson, S. R. Fielden and H. Hoel (2007). *Sexual Harassment in the Workplace: A Literature Review*. Working Paper No. 59, Manchester: Equal Opportunities Commission.

Ibarra, H. (1992). 'Homophily and differential returns: sex differences in network structure and access in an advertising firm', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, **37**, pp. 422-447.

Institute of Management / Remuneration Economics (1998). *UK National Management Survey*. London: Institute of Management.

Institute of Management (1995). *National Management Salary Survey*. Kingston-on-Thames: Institute of Management.

Itzin, C. and J. Newman (eds.) (1995). *Gender, Culture and Organizational Change*. London: Routledge.

Jacklin, C. N. and E. E. Maccoby (1975). 'Sex differences and their implications for management'. In: E. Gordon and M. H. Strober (eds.), *Bringing Women into Management*, pp. 23-38. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Jones, O. (2000). 'Scientific Management, Culture and Control: A First-hand Account of Taylorism in Practice', *Human Relations,* **53**: 631-653.

Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York: Basic Books. Republished 1993.

Kerfoot, D. and D. Knights (1993). 'Management masculinity and manipulation: from paternalism to corporate strategy in financial services in Britain', *Journal of Management Studies*, **30**, pp. 659-679.

Kimmel, M. (2004). *The Gendered Society*. (2nd ed) Oxford University Press, New York

Kondo, D. (1990). *Crafting Selves: Power, Gender, and Discourses of Identity in a Japanese Workplace*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Konrad, A., P. Prasad and J. Pringle (eds.) (2006). *Handbook of Workplace Diversity*. London: Sage.

Las Heras, M. and D.T. Hall (2007). 'Integration of career and life'. In: D. Bilimoria and S. K. Piderit (eds.), *Handbook on Women in Business and Management*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Legge, K. (1987). 'Women in personnel management: uphill climb or downhill slide?' In: A. Spencer and D. Podmore (eds.), *In a Man's World*. London: Tavistock.

Liff, S. (1999) 'Diversity and Equal Opportunities: Room for a Constructive Compromise?, *Human Resource Management Journal*, **9,** pp. 65-75.

Liff, S. and Wajcman, J. (1996) 'Sameness and difference Revisited: which Way Forward for Equal opportunity Initiatives, *Journal of Management Studies*, **31,** pp. 79-94.

Liff, S. and Cameron, I. (1997) 'Changing Equality Cultures to Move Beyond 'Women's' Problems', *Gender, Work and Organization*, **4**(1), pp. 35-46.

Linehan, M. (2002). 'Senior female international managers: empirical evidence from Western Europe, *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, **13** (5), pp. 802-814.

MacEwen Scott, A. (ed.). (1994). *Gender Segregation and Social Change: Men and Women in Changing Labour Markets*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Marshall, J. (1984). *Women Travellers in a Male World*. London: Wiley.

Marshall, J. (1991). 'Women managers'. In: A. Mumford (ed.), *Handbook of Management Development*. 3rd Edition, pp. 358-373. Aldershot: Gower.

Meyerson, D. and J. Fletcher (2000). 'A modest manifesto for shattering the glass ceiling', *Harvard Business Review,* **78** (1), pp.127-140.

Mills, A. and Tancred, P. (eds.) (1992). *Gendering Organizational Analysis*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Morgan, G. (1986). *Images of Organization*. London: Sage.

National Statistics (2006). *2006 Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings*. London: National Statistics.

Oakley, A. (1972). *Sex, Gender and Society*. London: Temple Smith. Revised ed. 1985. Aldershot: Gower.

OECD Employment Outlook 2002 (2002). OECD. Available at:
http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/36/7/17652667.pdf

Oerton, S. (1996). *Beyond Hierarchy: Gender, Sexuality and the Social Economy*. London: Taylor & Francis.

Parker, M. (2002). 'Queering management and organization', *Gender, Work and Organization*, **9** (2), pp. 146-166.

Pelled, L. H., G. E. Ledford and S. A. Mohrman (1999). 'Demographic dissimilarity and workplace inclusion', *Journal of Management Studies*, **36** (7), pp. 1013-1031.

Piderit, S. K. (2007). 'Balance, integration and harmonization: selected metaphors for managing the parts and the whole of living'. In D. Bilimoria and S. K. Piderit (eds.), *Handbook on Women in Business and Management*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Powell, G. N. (1993). *Women and Men in Management*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Powell, G. N. and L. M. Graves (2003). *Women and Men in Management*. 3rd edn. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Powell, G. N., D. A. Butterfield and J. Parent (2002). 'Gender and managerial stereotypes: have the times changed?', *Journal of Management*, **28** (2), pp. 177-193.

Rantalaiho, L. and T. Heiskanen (eds.) (1997). *Gendered Practices in Working Life*. London: Macmillan.

Reskin, B. and I. Padavic (1994). *Women and Men at Work*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Richardson, D. (2007). 'Patterned fluidities: (Re)imagining the relationship between gender and sexuality', *Sociology*, **41** (3), pp. 457-474.

Richardson, D., J. McLaughlin and M. Casey (eds.) (2006). *Intersections Between Feminist and Queer Theory*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Roper, M. R. (1994). *Masculinity and the British Organization Man since 1945*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rowbotham, S. (1979). 'The trouble with 'patriarchy'', *New Statesman*, **98**, p. 970.

Savage, M. and A. Witz (eds.) (1992). *Gender and Bureaucracy*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Schein, V. (2001). 'A global look at psychological barriers to women's progress in management', *Journal of Social Issues*, **57** (4), pp.675-688.

Schneider, B. (1987). 'The people make the place', *Personnel Psychology*, **40**, pp. 437-453.

Sedgwick, E. K. (1991). *The Epistemology of the Closet*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Singh, V. and S. Vinnicombe (2004). *The 2004 Female FTSE Report 2004*. Cranfield: Cranfield School of Management.

Singh, V. and S. Vinnicombe (2005). *The Female FTSE Index 2005*. Cranfield: Cranfield School of Management.

Singh, V. and Vinnicombe, S. (2006). *The Female FTSE Report 2006*. Cranfield: Cranfield School of Management.

Skidmore, P. (2004). 'A legal perspective on sexuality and organization: a lesbian and gay case stud*y*', *Gender, Work and Organization*, **11** (3), pp. 229-253.

Stoller, R. (1968). *Sex and Gender*. New York: Science House.

Thomas, R., A. J. Mills and J. Helm Mills (eds.) (2004). *Identity Politics at Work: Resisting Gender, Gendering Resistance*. London: Routledge.

Trudinger, D. (2004). *The Comfort of Men: A Critical History of Managerial and Professional Men in Post-war Modernisation, Australia 1945-1965*. PhD Thesis. Sydney: Department of History, University of Sydney.

Veikkola, E.-S., E. Hänninen-Salmelin and S. Sinkkonen (1997). 'Is the forecast or wind or calm?' In: E.-S. Veikkola (ed.), *Women and Men at the Top: A Study of Women and Men at the Top*, pp. 82-87. Gender Statistics 1997:1. Helsinki: Statistics Finland.

Vinnicombe, S. (2000). 'The position of women in Europe'. In M. J. Davidson and R. J. Burke (eds.), *Women in Management: Current Research Issues II*, pp. 9-25. London: Sage.

Walby, S. (1986). *Patriarchy at Work*. Cambridge, Polity.

Walby, S. (1990). *Theorising Patriarchy*. Cambridge: Polity.

Wilson, E. (ed.). (2000). *Organizational Behaviour Reassessed: The Impact of Gender*. London: Sage.

Wilson, F. (1995). *Organizational Behaviour and Gender*. London: McGraw-Hill.

Wilson, F. (2003). *Organizational Behaviour and Gender*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Notes

1. Among a number of relevant journals, the expansion of the area has been marked by the establishment of *Women in Management Review* in 1986 (interestingly, soon to be renamed as *Gender in Management: An International Journal*), and *Gender, Work and Organization* in 1994.

2. It should be noted that the meanings and connotations of words, such as 'sex' and 'gender', differ in different languages. For example, in Finnish there is a single word for both 'sex' and 'gender': 'sukupuoli'; and the same word for 'he' and 'she': 'hän'.

3. This is the figure unadjusted for the effects of, first, the remuneration rates by observed characteristics of jobs, and second, the whole national wage structure. If these two factors are taken into account the gender wage gap as measured is altered, for example, to a lower figure by 2-4% for the UK, and by a higher figure of up to 6% in the Netherlands (*OECD Employment Outlook*, 2002: 94-106).