
Contents

<i>List of figures</i>	vi
1 Introducing voice and visibility in gender and organization studies	1
2 Women's voices: a surface state of absence and neglect	10
3 Deep conceptualizations of voice: silencing within and through discourse	23
4 Visibility: a surface state of exclusion and difference	37
5 Deep conceptualizations of invisibility	50
6 Exploring masculinity studies through voice and visibility	64
7 Overview and an application of the framework to female entrepreneurship	80
<i>References</i>	92
<i>Index</i>	100

1

Introducing voice and visibility in gender and organization studies

Introduction

This book is about gender and organizations. However, in a departure from other work in the area, we adopt an approach to the study of gender which draws on two interrelated concepts: voice and visibility. These concepts have been used in different ways in the gender/organization literature as well as in the wider social sciences. However, we argue that their potential as analytic principles has not been fully realized and we accordingly draw on these concepts to analyse developments in the field. In so doing we present a 'framework' based on 'surface' and 'deep' conceptualizations which forms the organizing principle of the book. In applying this distinction, and by exploring contradictions and areas of commonality, we critically assess the different theoretical perspectives and throw new light on the growing and increasingly diverse field of gender and organization studies (GOS).

In this respect, the book does two things. First it brings together the somewhat fragmented ways in which voice and visibility have been used in the gender and organization literature to present a comprehensive account of their explanatory potential. Secondly, we consolidate this potential within our framework, which we argue can be used not only as an organizing principle but as a basis for exploring specific phenomena and for highlighting gaps in interpretation within the field. In so doing, we both draw on and move outside the three feminist perspectives (liberal, radical and post-structuralist) dominant within GOS and through which the manifestation of gender in organizations has been conventionally read. While previous work has tended to treat

these perspectives on gender as analytically and conceptually distinct, we suggest that through voice and visibility we can usefully explore overlaps and interconnections as well as contradictions between them.

Voice and visibility in gender and organization studies

The concepts of voice and visibility have been widely used in the social sciences. In both politics (Hirschman, 1970) and employment studies (Turnley & Feldman, 1999; Bowen & Blackmon, 2003; Edmonson, 2003) the concept of voice has been used, for example, to analyse how citizens articulate their critical opinions as well as how employees react to perceived injustices or wrong doing in the employment relationship. Drawing on some of the above work, voice and visibility have been used in gender and organization studies to analyse inequality and exclusion and to explore the absence of women from organizational research. Hearn (1994), Morgan (1992) and Gherardi (1995), for example, have challenged the 'gender neutral' stance of early work in organization studies, which failed to recognize that organizational practices and processes could be seen as gendered, and which consequently rendered gender differences invisible. The growth of GOS is therefore a welcome addition to the field of organizational behaviour in that it has given voice to women's experiences and has made visible the gendered nature of organizational practices.

Here, voice and visibility have been common themes. In terms of the former, what has become known as 'women's voice' literature has sought to redress the absence and neglect of women in organizational theorizing, to hear their accounts of work experiences and to incorporate their values. This has included a focus on the qualities that women bring to the organizational context as well as the challenges they face. Such work has explored how leadership styles of women differ from, and are often seen as more effective than, those of men (e.g. Rosener, 1990; Ferrario, 1991) as well as gender differences in career orientation (Nicholson & West, 1988; Burke & McKeen, 1994) and the barriers women face at work (Marshall, 1984; Coe, 1992; Ibarra, 1993; Burke et al., 1995; Oakley, 2000; Powell, 2000). Through this literature, women's voices have thus been included in organizational theory and research.

The concept of visibility has also been drawn on extensively. Kanter (1977), in one of the earliest work on women in organizations, explored the visibility of 'token' women working in male-dominated occupations and the implications of this visibility for their relationships at work and experiences as managers. As Kanter suggests, women are often disadvantaged by their token status – forced

into a narrow set of stereotypical roles and largely excluded from the dominant group culture. Visibility emerged in her study as a ‘burden’ for women who often responded by trying to become invisible – avoiding conflict, for example, by not being too successful in work assignments.

More recently, work on gender in organizations has drawn on concepts of silence and invisibility (the antitheses of voice and visibility) to highlight the gendered nature of organizations and organizational processes. Here the focus is more on men and masculinity rather than women’s experiences and values. Drawing on voice, recent work has highlighted how discourses of masculinity silence competing meanings. The concept of discourse captures how we see the world and make sense of reality. Discourse influences and shapes behaviour by helping to produce and constitute identities and interests. By setting limits and creating a system of ‘exclusion, interdiction and prohibition’ (Gordon, 2002), discourse defines the norms of acceptable behaviour and reasoning. Masculine discourses thus refer to ways of interpreting reality which draw on and reflect values and attitudes culturally associated with masculinity and which silence other competing discourses based on alternative values such as emotions, empathy and care.

At the same time, men and masculinity are often rendered ‘invisible’ because men are seen to stand for humanity in general and their experiences are consequently ‘universalized’. Following from Foucault, work on the link between normativity and in(visibility) suggests that men in particular have maintained their position of power partly because they represent the normative standard case. We cannot question or interrogate what we take for granted and is hidden from view. As a result men, masculinity and their attendant privileges, hidden within the norm, are invisible and evade scrutiny. Therefore, while women have been ‘hidden from history’ (Mills, 2002) and, until recently, from theorizing around organizational practices and processes, men have also been invisible. However, the invisibility that men experience signifies not an absence or a ‘weak presence’ as in the case of women, but a ‘strong presence’ in that invisibility emanates from the transparency that accompanies the norm. This has rendered invisible the strong presence and salience of gender and gendered practices in organizations.

Surface and deep conceptualizations of voice and visibility

The above work suggests we need to ‘unpick’ the concepts of voice and visibility in order to incorporate and explore their respective ‘opposites’: silence and

invisibility. On this basis, we make use of ‘surface’ and ‘deep’ conceptualizations – where surface refers to voice/visibility and to *states* of inequality while deep incorporates silence/invisibility and underlying *processes* which maintains that silence and keeps certain issues hidden from view. We therefore distinguish between surface states of voice which describes fairly static situations of inequality and neglect and the deep, more dynamic processes of silencing that occur around different discursive regimes. Equally, we argue for a differentiation between surface, more static states of exclusion and difference that run through much of the work on visibility associated with the problems of ‘token’ status and deep processes of maintaining power through the dynamic relationship between and struggles around invisibility and the norm.

These distinctions – between surface and deep conceptualizations of voice and visibility – allow us to both frame the literature and to explore some of the dynamics that manifest at their interface. Thus, we shall position liberal feminist inspired women’s voice literature against post-structuralist accounts of discourse which seek to uncover the privileging of any voice. Similarly, we shall see how visibility and invisibility can be both a privilege and a burden – and how groups who have enjoyed the privileges of an invisible status are now seeking the benefits of being outside the norm. At the same time, we shall explore commonalities as well as differences between respective surface accounts (women’s voice and work on token status) and those at a deep level (silencing and struggles around the norm). In this respect, we draw on their location within the feminist perspectives.

‘Surface’ voice, visibility and feminist theory

The conceptualization of voice and visibility briefly mapped out above are embedded within the three feminist perspectives conventionally drawn upon within GOS. In this context feminist theory is commonly organized around the frameworks of liberal feminism, radical feminism and post-structural feminism. Each has its roots in a different tradition or theoretical orientation.

Liberal feminism and surface accounts of voice and visibility

Liberal feminism has, as the name implies, its roots in the liberal political tradition based on principles of liberty and individualism. Here, the aim is to achieve a just society, allowing individuals to exercise free will and ‘to fulfil themselves through a system of individual rights’ (Calas & Smircich, 1996) as they engage, in a fair and equitable manner, in healthy competition for scarce

resources (income, wealth, job opportunities). Equality can be achieved by freeing women from oppressive gender roles within existing and gender neutral institutional structures – through, for example, equal pay, equal opportunities, access to childcare and the elimination of gender stereotypes (Tong, 1998).

Rather than seeing a denial of difference between men and women as the only route to gender justice, as in early liberal feminism, later feminists argued that some account had to be taken of women's different circumstances – not least the fact that they bear children. Research therefore began to move away from seeing women as the same as men, to focus on difference and to make comparisons between men and women in terms of inequality and discrimination (Alvesson & Due Billing, 1997).

This focus on gender difference has informed much of women's voice research as well as work on the effects of visibility associated with numerical disadvantage. These surface conceptualizations focus on states of inequality: one demands that we listen to women and hear their accounts and experiences while the other explores material consequences of numerical imbalance. Both make explicit or implicit comparisons with men and focus, as with liberal feminism, on creating a level playing field for women through equal opportunity initiatives within what are seen as gender neutral organizational structures. According to this view, equality initiatives would allow women's voices to be heard and their experiences and needs to be incorporated into the organization. Equally, problems of visibility would dissipate with increased female participation so that women were no longer minorities in the organization. Surface accounts of voice and visibility, therefore, can be seen to have been informed by the liberal feminist tradition.

Radical feminism and surface accounts of voice and visibility

While liberal feminism ignores the maleness of the standard point of reference so that women are compared with the 'male' norm and often deemed deficient as a result, radical feminism is based on a rejection of the male standpoint and on the positive construction of feminist alternatives. Moreover, while liberal feminists attempt to reduce the impact of difference (e.g. by encouraging policies to allow women to compete on the same terms as men), radical feminists foreground and celebrate that difference and privilege female voices and experiences. The first and fundamental theme of radical feminism is that women as a group are oppressed by men as a group and that patriarchy is the oppressing structure of male domination (e.g. Firestone, 1970; Walby, 1997). Radical feminism therefore seeks to make visible male control as it is exercised in every sphere of women's lives.

Rather than calling for the *reformation* of existing institutions and structures, as under liberal feminism, radical feminism promotes their *transformation* on the grounds that they represent, irrespective of any equal opportunity policies and procedures, systems of male domination. Patriarchy, the domination of women by men, underpins all institutions and structures and societies are structured by the hierarchical differences between men and women. As Ferguson (1984) argues, women should mould their own structures according to feminine principles based, for example, on cooperation and friendships – the basis of a new order which does not subordinate women or their interests.

While we have identified women's voice literature as mainly liberal feminist in orientation, other aspects contain influences from radical feminism. This can be seen in some of the work on leadership (e.g. Rosener, 1990), a key strand of women's voice literature to be discussed in the next chapter, which contains radical feminist influences through a shared valorization and privileging of the feminine. Work on female-oriented leadership styles, for example, present, along the lines argued by Rosener (1990) and Ferguson (1984), women's skills and attributes (of facilitation, cooperation, team-working) as 'superior' to those of men (often based on hierarchical notions of 'command and control'). However, the strength of this influence may be modified by the fact that such research seeks to promote women's 'ways of doing' within *existing* (rather than transformed) organizational structures and so can be seen in this respect to be adhering more to reformist than radical principles.

Women's voice literature thus combines liberal feminism, with its focus on equality of opportunity, with some radical feminist principles through the privileging of the feminine in some leadership research. Work on visibility by contrast is more fundamentally liberal feminist in orientation. These accounts assume, along the lines of liberal feminism, neutral organizational structures in that an increase in numbers of women would, it is argued, eventually reduce female disadvantage. For radical feminists, these structures are fundamentally patriarchal – an increase in numbers would not in any way alter the patriarchal 'map' of the organization.

'Deep' voice, visibility and feminist theory: post-structuralist accounts

While women's voice literature, work on 'token' status and liberal feminist perspectives in general seek to show that women are different from men and have different experiences, they do not question the privileging and invisibility of the norm against which women are often measured or the influence of

discursive practices which can eliminate issues from speech and sound. This is largely (but not exclusively) the province of post-structuralism and is concerned with our 'deep' conceptualization of voice and visibility.

Radical feminism goes some way to consider these deeper issues by looking beneath the surface at patriarchal power relations and challenging the supposed gender neutrality of organizational structures and processes. Ferguson (1984), for example, uses the concept of discourse to demonstrate how male thinking, attitudes and behaviours are written into organizations so that they seem acceptable and rendered invisible as 'normal' – an argument that has an alignment with our 'deep' understanding of voice and visibility in organizations. Post-structuralists also use discourse to uncover patriarchal power relations and to focus on deeper phenomenon than 'surface states' of exclusion, difference or neglect but go further by conceptualizing power as dispersed within discourse – powerful because they define our views of the world – and by exploring how discursive regimes are drawn upon in the formation of (gender) identity.

For post-structuralists, ideologies and discourses of gender take precedence over structural implications of numbers or equality of opportunity. As we have seen, the concept of discourse captures the significance of signs, labels, expressions and rhetoric that serve to shape our thinking, attitudes and behaviour and through which we construct meanings. Therefore, rather than supporting the possibility of a universal objective knowledge (such as stable understandings of masculinity and femininity supported by liberal and radical feminism), post-structuralists point to the unstable nature of knowledge and its openness to a plurality of often conflicting interpretations. Moreover, the power relations embedded in such claims mean that some interpretations can be privileged over others, reflecting and supporting the interests of dominant groups.

Further, in contrast to both liberal and radical feminism for which gender is a solid fact related to biology, gender identity for post-structuralists is contingent, fluid and fragmentary. In other words gender identity has no solid, material reality but needs to be reproduced on an ongoing basis. Gender is dynamic in that it is actively produced in day-to-day interactions in specific contexts. Gender identity and how it is experienced at a subjective level (how it feels to be a man, how it feels to be a woman) is made up of a variety of different discourses and so will vary in different contexts and different institutions. Therefore, rather than having unitary definitions of masculinity and femininity, post-structuralism recognizes that there are a number of different masculinities and femininities which are produced in different contexts, with some being more dominant or privileged than others. This perspective

accordingly has a particular focus on masculinity as a privileged discourse, how it silences and cross-cuts other discourses and how it can be hidden, and hence evade scrutiny and interrogation, within the norm. These fundamental issues are captured in ‘deep’ understandings of visibility and voice.

The influence of radical feminism

Surface conceptualizations of voice and visibility are thus heavily influenced by liberal feminism while ‘deep’ conceptualizations have roots in post-structuralism. At both levels we have seen the influence of radical feminism. Radical feminism can be understood as a bridge between these two perspectives, influencing both and linking surface and deep.

From the discussion above, this influence can be seen in two ways. First, while early liberal feminism sought to gain equal status and *similarity* with men based on an unproblematic male norm, later work influenced by the radical feminist valorization of the feminine over the masculine, focused on ways in which women were *different from* men. One key impact of radical feminism therefore has been through the central place that has now been given to difference in considerations of gender that can be seen within both liberal and post-structuralist accounts.

Secondly, the influence of radical feminism can be seen in its recognition of the power of male discourse, developed by Ferguson (1984), to silence women’s voices – an issue developed further by post-structuralists as they consider how discursive regimes define organizational arenas. Both see the difficulties encountered by women as part of a gendering of organizations that circumscribe or marginalize feminine discourse in favour of the masculine and where gender and gender issues are rendered invisible through the overwhelming presence of masculinity. However, as we have seen, post-structuralism has moved far from some of these initial roots. While radical feminism conceptualizes a single source of power in the form of patriarchy, for post-structuralists power is dispersed within discourse. It is not about the privileging of the male voice, as under radical feminism, but rather the dynamics that underpin the privileging of any voice – male or female. Therefore, while it is possible to identify the ‘seed corn’ of radical feminism within post-structuralist accounts, there is considerable divergence in understandings of gender and power.

Overall, while radical feminism is drawn on less extensively than either liberal feminism or post-structuralism, it has to a greater or lesser extent influenced both perspectives. This influence is highlighted in our reading of GOS through the ‘lenses’ of surface and deep conceptualizations of visibility and voice.

The structure of the book

In the following chapters we build up our framework of voice and visibility briefly outlined above. In the next chapter (Chapter 2) we present a surface conceptualization of voice, based on the need to redress the state of absence and neglect of women's voices and to bring in their voices and experiences. In Chapter 3 we go beneath surface accounts of voice to consider the power of discourse in suppressing and silencing competing meanings. Chapter 4 considers surface accounts of visibility as states of exclusion and difference and outlines the work on men and women as 'tokens' within their organizations. Chapter 5 concerns the privileges and invisibility that accompanies the norm, men's quest for visibility and its association with backlash discourses. In Chapter 6 we explore masculinity studies through 'surface' and 'deep' conceptualizations of voice and visibility and go some way to 'bring masculinity studies in' to a more generalized account of gender. Our concluding chapter (Chapter 7) draws together the different strands of theorizing into our framework and examines contradictions and paradox as a way of highlighting voice and visibility's explanatory potential.

We do not wish to overstate the framework in terms of its analytical powers. We see it more as an interpretive and heuristic device than a tool of analysis. In the following chapters we thus review and through the framework bring a measure of coherence to the diverse literatures in the field. Beyond this modest endeavour, however, we also hope to more fully exploit the potential of voice and visibility as explanatory concepts and, through their deployment, to reinvigorate some literatures in terms of their current significance, uncover specific relationships and point to interpretive gaps within some feminist research. Thus, we highlight in Chapter 2 the special contribution of women's voice literature (easily dismissed perhaps as somewhat lacking in critical rigour) on solution and resolution discourses as women make sense of the effects of difference in their life experiences; in Chapter 6 we uncover specific relationships through the concept of invisibility between masculinity, privilege and 'backlash' while in Chapter 7 we highlight possible interpretive gaps, through deep conceptualizations of voice and visibility, within work on gender and entrepreneurship. We accordingly hope to open up the potential of voice and visibility within the literature both in terms of providing a new lens through which to 'read' its diverse strands and in terms of pointing to new possibilities of inquiry.

Author index

- Acker, J., 34, 66
Alimo-Metcalf, B., 12
Alvesson, M., 5, 13, 14, 25, 30, 32, 33, 45
Anderson, T. H., 56
Ashcraft, K., 14, 15, 17, 24, 26
Ashford, S. J., 20, 60, 88
- Bagilhole, B., 40, 41, 42, 45, 47
Barrett, F., 65, 75
Belenky, M., 12, 13, 18, 24
Beynon, J., 55
Black, S., 50, 56, 57
Blackmon, K., 2
Blau, P., 39, 43, 46
Bologh, R., 29
Bowen, F., 2
Boyle, M. V., 74
Bradley, H., 46, 48
Burke, R., 2, 11, 50, 56, 57
Butler, J., 16, 26, 27
Butterfield, D. A., 13
Byrne, D., 38
- Calas, M., 4, 14, 27, 31, 35, 84, 89, 90
Cameron, D., 18, 67
Carr, P., 84
Carrigan, T., 67, 68
Carter, S., 83
Chodorow, N., 71
Clair, R., 25
Clegg, S., 27
Cliff, J., 20
Coates, D., 16, 17
Cockburn, C., 41, 45
Coe, T., 2, 11
Collinson, D., 18, 28, 31, 35, 41, 42, 51, 65, 66, 76
Collinson, M., 18, 31, 35, 41, 42
Connell, R., 24, 28, 29, 65, 66, 68, 69, 70, 73, 74, 75, 76
- Cooper, C. L., 12
Cox, E., 57
Cross, S., 40, 41, 42, 45, 47
- Dalton, M., 11, 50
Davidson, M. J., 12
Davis, D., 22
Dobson, I., 43
du Gay, P., 84
Due Billing, Y., 5, 13, 14, 45
- Eagly, A., 14
Eagly, E., 13
Edmonson, A., 2
Ely, R., 41, 44, 45, 48
- Fagenson, E. A., 12
Fairclough, N., 35
Faludi, S., 57
Feldman, D., 2
Fenstermaker, S., 26
Fenwick, T., 84
Ferguson, K., 6, 7, 8, 30, 89
Ferrario, M., 2, 12, 14
Firestone, S., 5
Fletcher, J., 14–15, 32
Fløge, L., 46, 48, 69
Fondas, N., 11, 13, 14, 26, 30, 31, 32, 34
Foucault, M., 3, 35
- Gabriel, Y., 35, 84
Gherardi, S., 2
Gilbert, J. A., 57
Gilligan, C., 11, 12, 13, 24, 90
Giroux, H. A., 54
Goffee, R., 83
Goode, W. J., 57
Gordon, N., 3
Grant, D., 24, 25

- Grey, C., 29
 Grinnel, J. P., 13
 Grise, J., 84
- Hakim, C., 20–21
 Halford, S., 89
 Harlow, E., 18, 23, 68
 Hatcher, C., 89
 Hearn, J., 2, 28, 29, 51, 64, 65, 66, 68, 72, 77
 Heikes, J., 45, 46, 47, 48, 69
 Heilman, M. E., 56
 Hines, R., 32
 Hirschman, A., 2
 Hollway, C., 71, 72
- Ibarra, H., 2, 11
 Ivancevich, J. M., 57
- Jansen, G., 22
 Johnson, B., 13
- Kanter, R., 2, 13, 30, 39, 40–48, 69–70, 83
 Karreman, D., 25, 30
 Kaufman, M., 66, 68, 76
 Kerfoot, D., 26, 27–30, 71, 76–77, 84
 Kimmel, M., 65, 68, 71
 Knights, D., 26, 27–28, 71, 76–77, 84
 Konrad, A., 45
 Kornberger, M., 28, 29
 Kusz, K. W., 52, 54, 58, 59
- Leck, J. D., 50, 57
 Lee, C., 30
 Lee-Gosselin, M., 84
 Leonard, P., 26, 89
 Lewis, A. E., 52, 53, 58, 62, 63, 83, 84
 Lewis, P., 20, 58, 60, 62, 63, 82, 83, 84, 88, 90
 Linstead, A., 31, 32, 34
 Lupton, B., 49
- Mac An Ghail, M., 66, 73
 McKeen, C., 2
 McRae, S., 22
 Maddock, S., 26, 40
 Marlow, J., 33
 Marlow, S., 83
 Marshall, J., 2, 11, 12, 40
 Martin, J., 34, 36
 Martin, P., 27
 Merrill, D., 46, 48, 69
 Metcalfe, B., 31–32, 34
- Mills, A., 3, 34
 Mills, M., 55
 Mobley, M., 56, 57
 Morgan, D., 2, 28, 29, 45, 64
 Mumby, D., 14–17, 24, 25, 26
- Nicholson, N., 2
- Oakley, J. G., 2, 11, 55, 60
 Olsson, S., 60
 Oswick, C., 25
- Parsons, T., 67
 Piderit, S. K., 20, 60, 88
 Pierce, J. L., 52
 Potter, J., 25
 Powell, G., 2, 11
 Powney, J., 40
 Puwar, N., 60, 62, 63
- Rhodes, D. L., 60
 Robinson, S., 52, 54–55, 57–59, 72, 88
 Rosener, J., 2, 6, 12, 24, 31, 67, 89, 90
 Ross-Smith, A., 19, 28, 29
 Rubin, J., 43
- Savage, M., 89
 Scase, R., 83
 Sedgwick, E., 65
 Segal, L., 66
 Sewell, W. H., 52–53
 Simpson, R., 18, 40, 46–49, 62, 70, 82, 90
 Singh, V., 14
 Smircich, L., 4, 14, 27, 31, 35, 84, 89–90
 Smithson, J., 60, 62
 Stokoe, E. H., 60, 62
- Tannen, D., 12, 13, 16, 24
 Thompson, P., 35
 Tolson, S. A., 68, 69
 Tong, R., 5
 Turnley, W., 2
- Vinkenburg, C. J., 12
 Vinnicombe, S., 14
- Walby, S., 5, 66
 Ward, J., 34, 35
 Weeks, J., 83

West, C., 16–17, 26
West, M., 2
Whitehead, S., 28, 51, 60, 65, 72, 73, 75
Whyte, W. H., 11, 50
Williams, C., 41, 45, 46, 48, 49
Wilson, F., 35
Winstanley, D., 34, 35
Witz, A., 89

Woodward, K., 53
Wray-Bliss, E., 84
Yoder, J., 45
Young, I. M., 62

Zimmer, L. E., 41, 45
Zimmerman, D., 16–17, 26

Subject index

- advantage
 - female, 55, 57
 - invisible, 58–9
 - male, 54, 62
- alienation, 55
- American Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 56
- assimilation, 41–2, 47, 48
- asymmetric groups, 46–8
- authority space, 27

- backlash, 55–8, 63, 87
- bias, masculine, 22
- binary divide, 53, 73
- binary view, 15, 16, 68
- body
 - female, 62
 - universal, 63
 - white male, 62
- Boston ambush, 37, 49

- capitalism, 69
- career orientation, 2
- Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development, 30–1
- choice, 20, 21, 22
- class, 69
- communication, 12, 16, 24, 67, 69
- competing victim syndrome, 56, 57
- conceptualizations, dominant, 24, 30
- constructions of difference, women's voice, 15–17
- counter culture, 43
- Critical Discourse Analysis, 25
- Critical Studies of Men, 64
- cultural norms, 22
- culture, counter/dominant, 43

- deep conceptualizations, 4, 7, 8, 23, 67, 73–8
- deep/surface conceptualizations framework, 81–90
- difference, 19–21, 26, 38

- din, 18, 68, 73, 77, 79, 86
- disadvantage
 - female, 63
 - male, 50, 54, 55, 56, 59
- discourse, 7, 17, 23, 24, 74, 81, 87
 - dominant/hegemonic, 28–33, 35, 36, 58, 74–6, 84
 - feminine, 10, 14, 19, 20, 28, 30, 31–3
 - and identity, 27–30
 - of managerialism, 28, 29
 - masculine, 3, 8, 20, 28–9, 31–3, 75
 - merit/special contribution, 19
 - organisational, 24, 35
 - of racism/multiculturalism, 33, 87
 - sameness/difference, 19, 20, 26
 - solution/resolution, 19, 21, 22
 - surface/deep accounts, 24, 25–6
- discrimination, 5, 21, 56
- discursive practices, 27, 29, 36
- discursive regimes, 8, 26, 87
- dominant
 - centre, 61, 62, 70, 72, 88
 - conceptualizations, 24, 30
 - discourses, 28–30

- entrepreneurship, 82, 83, 85 (fig. 7.2)
- equality initiatives, 11
- exclusion, 2, 40, 56, 57, 83

- female advantage, 11–15
- feminine
 - attributes, 30, 34, 60
 - capital, 32
- femininity
 - passive, 27
 - preferred, 24
- feminism, 1, 4
 - see *also* liberal feminism, radical feminism, post-structuralism
- feminist research, 9, 22

- feminization
 - of management, 14, 31
 - of occupations, 45
- forms of signification, 27
- frameworks
 - deep/surface conceptualizations, 81–90
 - of voice and visibility, 9, 85, 86
- Freud's oedipal complex, 71, 72

- gender, 16, 17, 18, 60, 62, 85
 - bias, 45
 - binary view, 15, 16, 68
 - blindness, 20
 - construction, 24, 27
 - discursively produced, 26–7
 - as a dual structure, 52–3
 - dynamics, 22, 24, 26
 - and identity, 22, 63
 - justice, 83, 89
 - and men, 51, 54
 - and organization studies, 1, 4, 82, 85, 90
 - post-structuralist, 7, 23–4
 - and power, 8, 45, 78
 - practices, 27, 69
 - relations, 32, 66, 68
 - stable category, 23, 24
- gendering
 - of organizations, 8, 90
 - practices, 27
- 'girls on top', 10, 19, 21, 22
- group(s)
 - asymmetric, 39, 46–8
 - identity, 38
 - inter-group relations, 39
 - majority/minority members, 43, 45
 - polarization, 41
 - size/composition, 38
 - structural analysis of, 39

- hierarchy, 14, 45, 77
- homophobia, 71
- homosociability, 40, 41, 44
- homosocial enactment, 71
- hyper-feminization, 33

- identity politics, 55, 59
- ideological assumptions, 36
- Indsco (USA), 39
- inequality, 2, 4, 5, 10, 49, 81, 86
- insiders/outiders, 59
- instrumental rationality, 29
- invisibility, 7, 50, 60
 - see also visibility

- leadership styles, 2, 6, 12–13, 14, 16, 67, 89
- liberal feminism, 8, 15, 45, 81, 83, 90
 - voice and visibility, 4, 89
- literature
 - gender, 18
 - management, 11

- macho, 41, 69
- male
 - advantage, 45, 46–8, 66
 - thinking/attitudes/behaviours, 7
- management, 11, 13, 14
 - styles, 20
- managerialism, 28–9
- manhood, essential, 77
- marginalization, 40
- masculine
 - bias, 22
 - identities, 45
- masculinity, 64, 65, 68, 72, 76, 77
 - and class, 69
 - compulsive, 29
 - frameworks, 66–7, 78
 - hegemonic, 74–6
 - organizational, 27
 - privilege and resources, 51–2, 54–5
 - studies, of, 66, 79(fig. 6.1)
 - types, 70, 74–6
- 'masculinity-in-crisis-summer', 55
- meaning, 35
- Men who Manage*, 11
- minority groups, 37, 42, 45, 88
- modernist approach, 24

- neutral bureaucracy, 22
- neutral difference, 15
- neutral organizations, 22
- normativity, 7, 23, 50, 52, 81, 87
 - and backlash, 57–8
- numerical (im)balance, 37, 38, 39, 41, 43, 44
 - and visibility, 5, 48, 87

- occupations
 - female, men in, 46, 47, 70
 - male, 57
- One, the, 54, 61
- 'one of the boys', 40, 42, 43
- ontological priority, 84
- Organization Man*, 11
- organizations
 - and discourse, 24, 35
 - dominant centre, 61, 62, 70, 72, 88

- gendered nature, 27, 45, 60, 64
- group size/composition, 38
- Other, the, 61, 62, 72
- othering, 34, 53, 84

- patriarchy, 5, 6, 31, 32, 66, 78
- pay, 53, 54, 58, 69
- performance pressure, 83
- performances of gender, 27
- performative model, 16
- performativity, 27
- phallogocentric model, 11
- pipeline theory, 43
- polarization, 40–1, 47
- post-structuralism, 6–8, 23, 73–9, 81, 89, 90
 - and discourse, 25, 36
- power, 12, 31, 33, 58, 89
 - relations, 32, 52, 64, 68, 69
- preference theory, 20
- psychic hardening, 69
- psychoanalytical approaches, 71–3, 79

- Queen Bee syndrome, 42, 43, 44

- radical feminism, 5–6, 8, 15, 23, 89, 90
- rationality, 29
- re-masculinization, 14
- research, 2, 5, 15, 17, 22, 83
- rhetoric, 31, 33, 34, 84
- role(s)
 - female, 41, 42, 43
 - leadership, 67
 - male, 47, 48, 65
 - sex, 33, 67
 - stereotypical, 14, 42
 - theory, 67, 68, 73
 - traps, 41, 44, 83

- sameness, 19–21
- seriality, 62, 63
- sex integration, 43–4
- sexism, 33
- sexual harassment, 41
- sexual identities, 34
- silence, 18, 34, 36, 77, 84
 - and discourse, 33–6, 86

- silence
 - and din, 18, 19, 23
 - and invisibility, 3, 4
- silencing, process of, 36, 49
- socialization, 68
- socializing agents, 67
- social relations perspective, 68–71, 73, 78–9
- ‘space invaders’, 60
- stereotypical roles, 14, 20, 42, 47
- stereotyping, 44, 83
- Suffragette movement, 33
- surface/deep conceptualizations, voice and visibility, 82
- surface conceptualizations, 4, 8, 10, 17, 21
 - voice and visibility, 4–5, 26, 49, 67, 78

- team-working, 31
- tipping, 53
- token status, 2, 6, 39, 41, 49
 - and high visibility, 40, 42–3, 69, 87
 - male, 46, 47, 48
- transactional leadership, 67
- transformational leadership, 12–13, 16, 22, 24, 89

- victimization, 59
- victims, 58–60, 88
- visibility, 2, 3, 37, 38, 48, 49
 - and group dynamics, 39
 - high, 40
 - men, 46
 - reduced, 44
 - and role traps, 42
- victim, 58, 88
 - see *also* voice and visibility
- voice
 - women, 15, 19, 32
 - and visibility, 2–8, 9, 22, 81, 82, 89–90

- ‘week-end warriors’, 77
- women
 - in senior positions, 13, 19, 44
 - as victims, 54
- women’s voice(s), 10, 15–17
 - perspective, 22
 - research, 5, 17
- women’s voice literature, 2, 6, 11, 17, 22, 82
 - solution/resolution, 19, 21, 22