

2019

## **Intentional Invisibility: Professional Women and the Navigation of Workplace Constraints**

Swethaa Ballakrishnen

*University of California, Irvine School of Law, sballakrishnen@law.uci.edu*

Priya Fielding-Singh

*Stanford University*

Devon Magliozzi

*Stanford University*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarship.law.uci.edu/faculty\\_scholarship](https://scholarship.law.uci.edu/faculty_scholarship)



Part of the [Gender and Sexuality Commons](#)

---

### **Recommended Citation**

Swethaa Ballakrishnen, Priya Fielding-Singh, and Devon Magliozzi, *Intentional Invisibility: Professional Women and the Navigation of Workplace Constraints*, 62 *Soc. Persp.* (2019).

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by UCI Law Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Scholarship by an authorized administrator of UCI Law Scholarly Commons.



SCHOOL OF LAW

UNIVERSITY of CALIFORNIA • IRVINE

*Legal Studies Research Paper Series No. 2019-17*

*Intentional Invisibility: Professional Women and the  
Navigation of Workplace Constraints*

*Swethaa S. Ballakrishnen*

[sballakrishnen@law.uci.edu](mailto:sballakrishnen@law.uci.edu)

*University of California, Irvine ~ School of Law*

*Priya Fielding-Singh*

[priyafs@stanford.edu](mailto:priyafs@stanford.edu)

*Stanford University*

*Devon Magliozzi*

[dmaglioz@stanford.edu](mailto:dmaglioz@stanford.edu)

*Stanford University*

The paper can be downloaded free of charge from SSRN at:

1

## 2 INTRODUCTION

3           Research on the persistence of gender inequality in the workplace focuses on two  
4 explanations for women's underrepresentation in the top tier of organizations: structural  
5 barriers to promotion (e.g., Elliot and Smith 2004; Gorman and Kmec 2009; Kanter 1993;  
6 Miller 1976) and gendered behaviors internalized through socialization (e.g., Coltrane  
7 1996; Helgesen 1990). Scholars concur that there is a recursive relationship between  
8 structure and socialization (Alvesson and Billing 1997; Ridgeway and Correll 2004),  
9 meaning that in organizations, one's position impacts one's behavior and vice versa. Yet,  
10 little is known about the processes through which organizations encourage and  
11 employees adopt specific behavioral strategies that contribute to gender inequality. Our  
12 research advances this growing scholarship (e.g., Blair-Loy 2009; Reid 2015; Williams  
13 and Dempsey 2014) by theorizing how women select strategies to respond to structural  
14 constraints in the workplace, and how the strategies they select may unwittingly reinforce  
15 extant inequalities.

16           We use in-depth interview and observational data from two cohorts of a women's  
17 professional development program at a large non-profit organization in the western  
18 United States to examine how professional women strategically balance workplace and  
19 familial demands. We find that women facing structural constraints, such as unequally  
20 distributed household responsibilities and gender biased organizational policies, adopt a  
21 low-risk strategy of conflict avoidance that we call "intentional invisibility." Women in  
22 our sample demonstrate three interrelated motivations for embracing intentional  
23 invisibility: they use it to resolve dissonance between professional and personal

24 identities; straddle the double bind they face at work, in which women are penalized for  
25 assertiveness while professional advancement requires it; and accommodate a  
26 disproportionate share of familial responsibilities. While our data alone cannot support a  
27 causal link between intentional invisibility and long-term career outcomes, when  
28 considered alongside research demonstrating the importance of visibility to professional  
29 advancement (e.g. Correll and Mackenzie 2016; Ibarra 2012; King et al. 2017; Leahey  
30 2007; Simmard et al. 2008), our findings suggest that this strategy for navigating  
31 workplace bias may be detrimental to gender parity.

32

### 33 BACKGROUND

#### 34 *Gendered Barriers in the Workplace*

35 Women have entered the U.S. workforce in droves since the mid-twentieth  
36 century. Middle class, educated women in particular have seen substantial gains as they  
37 have infiltrated managerial and professional positions (Cotter, Hermsen and Vanneman  
38 2009). Yet, even as they have entered previously male-dominated occupations, white-  
39 collar women remain underrepresented in top-level professional positions (Ely and Rhode  
40 2010). A historical explanation for the underrepresentation of women in senior positions  
41 was the “pipeline” problem—that not enough qualified women were available to make  
42 the transition to positions of power (Eagly and Carli 2008). However, as gender-equal  
43 rates of entry across many workplaces have failed to result in equal representation at  
44 senior levels (Kulis, Sicotte and Collins 2002), the pipeline hypothesis has been  
45 increasingly discredited. Likewise, the popular metaphor of the “glass ceiling,” which

46 implies that women seeking career advancement come up against a barrier impeding  
47 access to top positions, does not map onto the ongoing, complex barriers to advancement  
48 that women face. By blocking access to leadership, the glass ceiling allegedly resigns  
49 women to a professional plateau or encourages them to “opt out” of the race altogether  
50 (Belkin 2003), but evidence that women self-select out of competitive career tracks is  
51 weak (Goldin 2006). Further still, the linear metaphor suggesting that women have only  
52 one juncture in their careers where they are stymied fails to encapsulate the range of  
53 persistent and subtle barriers that women face *throughout* their career paths.

54         Instead, researchers have begun to converge on the argument that it is pervasive,  
55 structural problems that are at the root of women’s underrepresentation (Ely, Ibarra, and  
56 Kolb 2011; Monroe and Chiu 2010). This argument has pushed scholarship towards  
57 “subtle” and “unseen” barriers as a way of explaining the scarcity of women in positions  
58 of senior leadership (DeRue and Ashford 2010; Ibarra and Petriglieri 2007; Kolb 2013).  
59 To describe the barriers impeding women’s career trajectories, Eagly and Carli (2007)  
60 replace the singular image of the glass ceiling with one of a labyrinth: though women are  
61 no longer uniformly barred from the C-suite, their paths to leadership are riddled with  
62 biases, discrimination, and other obstacles. In this updated metaphor, women do not  
63 merely leave organizations or stagnate professionally when they encounter an obstacle.  
64 Instead, women who find themselves caught in a convoluted web are forced to navigate it  
65 continuously as they confront recurring instances of organizational bias.

66

67 *Navigating Structural Constraints*

68           As women navigate biased organizations, gender is constantly operating as a  
69 “background” identity that shapes individual choices, organizational processes, and  
70 institutional beliefs and arrangements (Ridgeway and Correll 2004). In professional  
71 settings, widely shared expectations about gender leave women in a conundrum. On the  
72 one hand, women are expected to fit into environments that are predominantly structured  
73 with men in mind (Acker 1990; Jacobs and Gerson 2004; Williams 2000). At the same  
74 time, when women *do* conform to expectations about the masculine, ideal worker, these  
75 behaviors are not well received (Rudman and Glick 2001; Rudman et al. 2012). As a  
76 result, women are stuck in a double bind, where those who demonstrate masculine traits  
77 face backlash while those who lack them risk being dismissed (Eagly and Carli 2007).

78           The double bind manifests across the professional hierarchy. At more senior  
79 levels of professional organizations, abstract ideals are more strongly associated with  
80 stereotypically masculine traits, such as assertiveness and dominance, than in lower  
81 levels of management and administration (Acker 1990; Ridgeway and Correll 2004). For  
82 example, many professional development training programs routinely advise women  
83 towards masculine typed behavior, such as interjecting at meetings, speaking with  
84 authority, and self-promoting. Yet, when women do these things, especially from  
85 positions of power, they are deemed “control freaks” (Eagly and Carli 2007) and chided  
86 for not being modest enough (Kendall and Tannen 1997). Meanwhile, women in the  
87 workplace are expected to be more likeable than men, and are penalized for being  
88 “deceitful, pushy, selfish and abrasive” when they violate feminine norms (Heilman et al.  
89 2004). As Eagly and Carli (2008) point out, this creates a no-win situation where women

90 are thought of as not having the “right stuff” for powerful jobs regardless of whether they  
91 act in communal or agentic ways.

92         Alongside the double bind, women face “the second shift” – after confronting  
93 workplace challenges, they return home to a disproportionate amount of familial  
94 responsibilities (Hochschild 1989). Research has shown time and again that this  
95 inequality in unpaid domestic labor remains a roadblock to women’s advancement in the  
96 paid labor force (Bianchi et al. 2012; Coverman 1983; Sayer 2005; Sayer, Bianchi, and  
97 Robinson 2004). Even in heterosexual families in which both partners work full time,  
98 wives report doing twice as much housework and childcare as their husbands (Coltrane  
99 1996). Together, these inequalities at home and in the workplace produce a “frozen”  
100 middle management tier comprised of women who are not leaving the workforce, but  
101 also are not likely to ascend to leadership in their professional environments (Yee et. al.  
102 2016).

103         To address these complex and often competing structural constraints,  
104 professional women across contexts employ a range of navigational tools. While the  
105 labyrinthine obstacles facing professional women are well documented, less is known  
106 about women’s navigational strategies. Scholars have highlighted the importance of  
107 cultivated identities in allowing people to navigate the organizations they are embedded  
108 in (Ibarra 1999; Ibarra and Petriglieri 2007; Pratt et al. 2006; Ramarajan and Reid 2013,  
109 2016). Many organizations expect employees to perform a kind of idealized professional  
110 identity (Acker 1990; Britton 2000; Williams 2000) that rewards work prioritization  
111 (Blair-Loy 2009; Kellogg 2011) and penalizes family prioritization (Cooper 2000).

112 Indeed, despite the proliferation of new kinds of “flexible” work, women are often  
113 marginalized when they select family-friendly work arrangements (Glass 2004;  
114 Hochschild 1997; Kelly et al. 2010). To reconcile competing work and non-work  
115 expectations, many women professionals choose between *accepting* organizational  
116 pressures, *passing* as someone they are not, or *revealing* their true identities despite  
117 consequences (Ramarajan and Reid 2016).

118

## 119 THE CURRENT STUDY: STRUCTURAL CONSTRAINTS AND INTENTIONAL 120 INVISIBILITY

121 While women are constrained by biased organizations, their individual choices and  
122 preferences, cultivated during years of socialization within gendered structures, also  
123 contribute to inequality (Correll 2001; Correll 2004; Cech and Blair-Loy 2010). Faced  
124 with professional norms that encourage masculine behavior, many women choose to  
125 modify their behaviors and networks to match those of male counterparts (Blair-Loy  
126 2009; Davies-Netzley 1998; Ramarajan and Reid 2013, 2016; Reid 2015). Our study  
127 reveals an alternative strategy that some professional women embrace when confronted  
128 with conflicting organizational and familial expectations.

129 We contribute to the growing body of work on how women navigate biased  
130 organizations by examining how women use intentional invisibility to respond to  
131 workplace bias while rejecting masculine professional norms. Unlike *accepting*, *passing*,  
132 or *revealing*, intentional invisibility offers women a way to balance professional and  
133 personal demands while projecting an authentic sense of self. By remaining behind the



134 scenes and valuing communal, collaborative work, women who embrace intentional  
135 invisibility reject – rather than seeking to embody – the masculine norm of the ideal  
136 worker. The women in our study who embrace invisibility often acknowledge that doing  
137 so may limit their opportunities for advancement, but nonetheless turn to the strategy to  
138 avoid conflict, project an authentic self, and gain a sense of stability.

139         While research demonstrates the importance of visibility to professional  
140 advancement (Correll and Mackenzie 2016; Ibarra 2012; Simmard et al. 2008), we found,  
141 in keeping with past research, that even as women expressed professional ambition they  
142 were unlikely to seek visibility (King et al. 2017). The women in our sample recognized  
143 that seeking visibility is a conventional strategy for climbing the organizational ladder,  
144 but described remaining behind the scenes as a personally satisfying and professionally  
145 strategic option. Our data show three, interrelated motivations for embracing intentional  
146 invisibility in spite of its potential costs. First, intentional invisibility enabled women in  
147 the professional development program we tracked to avoid conflict with both their  
148 managers and the teams they managed within the context of a biased organization.  
149 Second, women in our sample used invisibility to reconcile their personal identities with  
150 their workplace selves, reporting that staying behind the scenes felt more authentic than  
151 assuming the spotlight. Finally, remaining invisible allowed women to quietly pursue  
152 feminist goals and aspirations at work without falling behind on the feminine demands of  
153 their modern partnerships.

154         We focus on participants' stated preferences for and interpretations of invisibility  
155 to add nuance to accounts of how women navigate biased organizations. The women in

156 our organization were not passively pushed and pulled by organizational tides; they were  
157 active agents making daily tactical choices in interactions with co-workers and long term  
158 strategic choices in light of organizational structures. At the same time, the women we  
159 followed did not create the workplace labyrinth that they were obliged to navigate, and  
160 they were not at liberty to redesign it from the ground up. By emphasizing women's  
161 preferences and choices, we do not mean to suggest that they are responsible for the  
162 unequal work environments they inhabit or the curtailed career trajectories they may  
163 experience. Attaining gender parity in top tier professional positions will require  
164 changing organizational processes and reducing unconscious biases in workplace  
165 interactions (e.g., Acker 1990; Correll et al. 2014; Heilman 2012; Kanter 1993). Until  
166 such sweeping changes are made, however, it is important to recognize that women's  
167 daily workplace practices may impact their career attainment, earnings, and satisfaction  
168 in predictable and unintended ways (Rudman and Phelan 2008).

169

## 170 DATA AND METHODS

171 We collected data for this project over two years (October 2013-September 2015)  
172 as part of a case study of a women's professional development program at a large multi-  
173 division nonprofit organization in the western United States.<sup>1</sup> The program was designed  
174 by the organization's Human Resources department in consultation with the research  
175 team to create gender awareness among women employees and equip them with tools for  
176 combating gender bias at work. Whether the program effectively equipped women to  
177 combat bias is not the focus of this paper. Instead, we treat the program as a unique site

178 for studying gender in the workplace, as program meetings were a space where women's  
179 professional attitudes, perceptions, and experiences were foregrounded.

180         Once the program launched, Human Resources took the organizational lead while  
181 the research team positioned ourselves as nonintrusive observers and interviewers. The  
182 HR team recruited women employees to serve as facilitators of discussion circles. These  
183 facilitators, in turn, recruited 5-10 other women employees to join their circles. In many  
184 cases, facilitators recruited members who shared a common characteristic or an interest in  
185 a common theme, such that there were circles organized for women with young children,  
186 women of color, and women dealing with aging parents. In other cases, facilitators tapped  
187 their professional networks to recruit diverse circles, whose only commonality was a  
188 shared interest in professional development. Across all circles, facilitators were expected  
189 to schedule seven meetings covering pre-determined topics, such as negotiation and  
190 implicit bias. Circle members watched an educational video before arriving at each  
191 meeting and spent approximately two hours during the meeting discussing their views  
192 and experiences related to the topic. The first program cohort convened from October  
193 2013-June 2014 and included 140 women, while the second cohort met from October  
194 2014-June 2015 and included 196 women (see Table 1 for participant characteristics).

195

196

<Table 1 about here>

197

198         Across each cohort, the research team collected systematic observational and  
199 interview data.<sup>2</sup> We selected three circles from each cohort to observe throughout the

200 year, chosen to capture diversity in terms of age, race/ethnicity, and career stage of  
201 participants. In Cohort 1, researchers followed 1) a circle of mid-career women of color,  
202 2) a circle of predominantly white women advanced in their careers, and 3) a racially  
203 diverse circle of early career mothers with young children. For consistency, we selected  
204 circles to follow in Cohort 2 that matched these compositions as closely as possible. For  
205 each selected circle, one author attended and audio recorded all discussion meetings and  
206 wrote extensive field notes. In addition, each author interviewed the facilitators and three  
207 randomly selected members of the circle they followed at the start and end of the  
208 program. To capture the experiences of participants in circles that were not selected for  
209 observation, we attended program-wide trainings and social events and interviewed ten  
210 randomly selected participants at the start and end of the program. In total, we observed  
211 36 circle meetings and 15 program-wide meetings. We conducted 86 interviews,  
212 including 41 participants interviewed at the start and end of the program and 4  
213 interviewed once (see Table 2 for interview respondent characteristics). Interviews  
214 averaged about an hour and were audio recorded and professionally transcribed. The  
215 findings we present in this paper draw only from those respondents whom we both  
216 observed in circle meetings and with whom we conducted in-depth interviews, amounting  
217 to data from over 75 hours of observation and 66 interviews.

218

219

<Table 2 about here>

220

221           Observational and interview data were analyzed using the qualitative software  
222 package *Dedoose*. We analyzed the data using thematic analysis, an inductive form of  
223 analysis oriented toward identifying patterns in qualitative data (Charmaz 2003; Gibbs  
224 2007). Select transcripts were read by all authors and discussed in analytical team  
225 meetings to ensure rigor and coder consistency. Using an inductive approach, we first  
226 developed an initial coding scheme to identify emergent topics and themes. We  
227 iteratively revised the coding scheme as additional interviews were coded. Multiple  
228 rounds of coding revealed a set of strategies that, drawing on our participants' own  
229 words, we identified as related to "invisibility." We probed the data to better understand  
230 the rationales motivating participants to seek invisibility. We mapped variation across  
231 participants' characteristics, engaging with existing theory and empirical research to  
232 contextualize workplace strategies.

233           Our data allowed us to track how women across varied backgrounds and identities  
234 navigate workplace barriers. Throughout our findings, we discuss how women's  
235 intersectional identities – including their race, sexual orientation, age, seniority, and  
236 education – inform their embrace of invisibility. However, we limit our focus in this  
237 paper to one key axis of variation: family composition. Across other characteristics,  
238 women with partners and children were drawn to conflict-avoidance in the workplace  
239 more consistently than their single and childless counterparts. While workplace  
240 navigation strategies vary across many dimensions of difference, we found familial  
241 demands to be the most commonly invoked rationale for remaining behind the scenes in  
242 the office.

243

244 FINDINGS

245 Our data reveal how women experience and interpret workplace barriers and, in  
246 turn, seek to overcome them. We use the term “intentional invisibility” to describe a set  
247 of strategies that professional women in our sample used to navigate the workplace while  
248 remaining largely behind the scenes. While we use the term as an analytic category, our  
249 use closely tracks how program participants described their own ideals and experiences.  
250 Participants across the organization, in varying career and personal circumstances, drew  
251 on strikingly similar strategies to avoid workplace conflict, attain a feeling of authenticity  
252 within their professional roles, and balance work with familial responsibilities. While our  
253 data cannot speak directly to the efficacy of the strategies women adopted with regards to  
254 professional advancement, we demonstrate how the professional pathways women take  
255 may lead to low visibility among women across an organization.

256

257 *Avoiding Conflict Within a Biased Structure*

258 The women in our study identified gendered barriers to advancement and job  
259 satisfaction in multiple registers: workplace policies that conflicted with parental  
260 responsibilities, supervisors and supervisees who conveyed gender biases, and double  
261 standards embedded in performance evaluations, for example. In their unequal work  
262 environments, women often reduced their visibility to avoid conflict, which they saw  
263 threatening to distract from their core professional responsibilities. Diana, for instance,  
264 works as a software engineer in a division of the organization where men are

265 overrepresented at the management level. More than once, she has walked into meetings  
266 where the men around the table assume she is a secretary rather than an engineer. While  
267 Diana recalls that these moments stressed her out when she was younger, as she's gained  
268 experience and seniority she has come to "get a kick out of it." Now, she tries to advance  
269 by "just being the professional person I need to be" instead of reacting to bias. Diana  
270 explains, "I've never been a fan of, and I've never joined, like the Society for Women  
271 Engineers... That seems counter to the cause, in my mind, like calling attention to things  
272 in a way. We're just engineers, we don't have to be women in engineering." Diana  
273 describes such groups as "self-isolating," and worries that advocating for women in her  
274 field would detract from her core professional identity as an engineer. For Diana, keeping  
275 a low profile and being quietly competent allows her to incrementally advance in her  
276 career without risking the backlash or interactional discomfort that calling attention to her  
277 presence as a woman might.

278         Similar to Diana's strategy for deflecting attention from her gender within a male-  
279 dominated field, women across divisions of the organization sought to minimize the  
280 visibility of feminine-typed "issues" such as pregnancy and maternity leave. Jane, who  
281 works as an administrator in a male-dominated division, has a senior colleague who had a  
282 baby on Wednesday and came back to work on Monday. Jane wondered about her  
283 colleague's quick return, "Is it because it's a sexist environment? ... Is it because she feels  
284 like she has to [come back to work immediately] to be able to compete as a woman? Or is  
285 it just because she loves what she does and felt like she was up to it?" Jane's colleague  
286 had the option of taking a longer maternity leave—in fact, the organization has a better

287 than average parental leave policy. Yet, in Jane’s analysis, taking a longer leave might  
288 have created a competitive disadvantage for her colleague “as a woman.” Taking  
289 advantage of ostensibly egalitarian policies like parental leave is fraught, and in Jane’s  
290 view, her colleague chose to navigate this gendered situation by creating as little  
291 disruption as possible.

292         Women often tried to minimize their visibility specifically when they recognized  
293 gender bias. In moments of heightened bias, many women—like Jane’s colleague,  
294 according to Jane—felt particularly vulnerable to backlash and did not want to stick out  
295 as women. Gloria, for instance, has worked in a male-dominated field in corporate and  
296 non-profit settings for the past thirty-five years. Gloria tells us that she has no doubt “that  
297 strong women in the workplace are still perceived as bitches.” She recognizes this  
298 stereotype as unfair, and in the privacy of her circle voices her resistance to it. In her  
299 office, though, rather than rebel, she has learned to adapt her own behavior, assuming a  
300 more passive demeanor, to avoid the pejorative label: “One of my personal goals and  
301 self-learning over the course of the past thirty-five years is that I had to moderate my very  
302 strong personality and strong opinions on things.”

303         When Gloria stays quiet in meetings or thanks her colleagues for doing things that  
304 should be routine it is not because she is shy, lacks confidence, or is used to taking the  
305 ingratiating position. Instead, she knowingly subdues what she considers her natural  
306 tendency to come on strong for the sake of professional advancement. Gloria is far from  
307 alone among the women we spoke to in reducing her visibility to avoid being perceived  
308 as bitchy. Jackie describes filing a complaint about a supervisor’s sexual harassment as a



309 “naïve” career mistake; Carly showed up for an office “clean-up party” that her male  
310 supervisor had organized only to find that he had not bothered to show up and that the  
311 only volunteer cleaners were women, but she wrote off the experience by saying that  
312 while she “was a little bit frosted” she knows her boss is serially forgetful and that “we  
313 all have our roles.” Though women routinely recognized gendered barriers in their  
314 workplaces, they viewed quietly proceeding with work as the most strategic way of  
315 responding.

316 Women like Gloria, Jackie, and Carly sought to minimize the gendered issues  
317 they faced and to reduce their visibility as women in order to manage the complex, often  
318 conflicting barriers and biases they encountered daily. Indeed, program participants  
319 employed intentional invisibility in a range of everyday interactions, from team meetings  
320 to office clean-ups, with bosses and the teams they managed. This strategy, though, was  
321 most apparent when discussing workplace contexts where women were in leadership  
322 positions. Women’s descriptions of their own leadership and their definitions of ideal  
323 leadership often explicitly referred to invisibility as a goal to which they aspired. Whether  
324 within their immediate work team, their division, the organization more broadly, or even  
325 their family, women across both cohorts we tracked aimed to embody leadership without  
326 putting themselves in the spotlight. For example, Martha, a supervisor who managed a  
327 male-dominated division, explained, “...there is the stereotype of the leader, leading from  
328 the front as opposed to pushing from the rear. And I think some people don’t necessarily  
329 recognize what I will call ‘soft leadership.’” For Martha, soft leadership meant subtly  
330 enabling others to succeed by pushing them towards goals. Stephanie likewise defined

331 leadership as an unselfish pursuit, saying “[A good leader is] a person that is not walking  
332 out of the room taking all the credit, and really empowering others to be successful.”

333 By describing invisibility as a positive leadership characteristic, women were able  
334 to assign value to the workplace strategies that they and their colleagues adopted to avoid  
335 backlash. Janice, a woman in her 40s who holds a PhD, offers a definition of ideal  
336 leadership that is typical of program participants: “Strong leadership is not only leading  
337 by example, but in such a way that other people can learn it, other people can do it. And  
338 the leader becomes part of a team. They become almost invisible, as part of the team—  
339 except as a resource.” In Janice’s account, good leadership requires stepping aside to  
340 allow others to advance. A good leader is available to help the team as a resource that  
341 team members can utilize, but is otherwise indistinguishable from the team. Mary, a  
342 technology services specialist, likewise noted, “I’ve seen people excel in leadership who  
343 are in very invisible roles; they’re very much behind the scenes. But they are so good at  
344 what they do, and they are so willing to go there, to do what needs to be done.” In Mary’s  
345 account, an excellent leader is not a foreperson who delegates to a team and takes credit  
346 for a finished project, but rather a worker doing unglamorous, unrecognized tasks.

347 Participants often recognized that the high value they placed on invisibility  
348 contradicted organizational norms. Cathy has worked as a fundraiser long enough to see  
349 time and again that “women, particularly, who are really efficient in their work, they get  
350 stuff done, they meet their deadlines, they hit their numbers, they move things forward—  
351 they get stuff done... when it comes to mind for them to think about a promotion they’re  
352 passed over for those who maybe have a better sense of big picture.” Nevertheless, Cathy

353 says that one of the leadership skills she is working to develop is “[learning] to cover up  
354 more, and shut my mouth once in a while.” Cathy defines ideal leadership in a way that  
355 fits with her everyday workplace strategies for reducing her exposure to backlash. She  
356 knows that earning a reputation as someone who quietly “gets stuff done” is not the  
357 obvious path to promotion, but she defines her goals to align with the strategy of  
358 invisibility, explaining, “I ultimately made the choice to kind of stop looking for  
359 promotions and just find jobs that were rewarding to me.”

360 To craft careers that felt rewarding, women sought to reduce the chances for  
361 interpersonal conflict and to increase opportunities for friendly relationships within their  
362 work teams. Embracing invisibility within leadership positions facilitated these goals by  
363 fostering collaboration and complemented other strategies for mitigating potential  
364 conflicts with colleagues, such as excusing offensive remarks or softening critiques.  
365 Thus, when a man said to Sharon after leaving a meeting, “God, I’m glad I’m not married  
366 to you!” her takeaway was, “I must have been projecting more sternness than I knew I  
367 was capable of.” She thereafter worked to change her conference room demeanor.  
368 Maureen, for her part, embraced a definition of bias as a decision-making error after her  
369 circle watched a video on the topic because it would give her a way to educate male  
370 coworkers without accusing them of misconduct: “So you’re not saying to someone,  
371 ‘You’re prejudiced.’ It doesn’t become such a negative. It just, it’s a way of looking at  
372 things. You’re biased towards pink, not blue, or hair up vs. hair down.” Sharon, Maureen,  
373 and their peers developed non-confrontational responses to gendered situations to limit

374 their vulnerability, and to define leadership in a way that incorporates intentional  
375 invisibility as a positive trait.

376

377 *The Authenticity of Invisibility*

378 In addition to mitigating the risk of interactional conflict, embracing invisibility  
379 offered a way for women in the program to reconcile professional and personal identities  
380 into an “authentic” self. Many women associated seeking visibility with aggressiveness  
381 or self-promotion, and they considered these traits to be at odds with their character and  
382 values. While discussing a professional development module about navigating power  
383 dynamics within workplace relationships, Nanette’s circle debated techniques for using  
384 body language to communicate authority. When a colleague proposes that taking up more  
385 space with grand gestures or erect posture could be helpful, Nanette rebuts by advocating  
386 for “just trying [different techniques] out and seeing what fits. I mean I’m never going to  
387 be big, I just never am.” Nanette concedes, “I could be bigger than I am. And maybe a  
388 little bit bigger would be helpful and useful,” but she attributes her usual passive body  
389 language to a personality characteristic that “just never” will be completely altered.  
390 “Being big” comes more easily to some of the other members of Nanette’s circle, but  
391 they nonetheless question whether it is a desirable behavior. When the group challenges  
392 the ethics of compensating for weak content with a confident presentation in a meeting,  
393 Gloria retorts, “I know men who do!” With her comment, Gloria suggests that perhaps  
394 circle members should lower their ethical standards to those of their male counterparts,  
395 but she also codes “being big” as a masculine behavior. Another circle member goes

396 further by describing “being big” in animalistic terms, likening the proposed strategy for  
397 increasing visibility in meetings to the recommended strategy for warding off an  
398 aggressive mountain lion. Women in this circle acknowledge that changing their body  
399 language might increase their visibility and impact in meetings, but they reject the  
400 strategy nonetheless as inauthentic, arguably unethical, and certainly unfeminine.

401         In lieu of “being big,” many women preferred to be less visible in order to remain  
402 true to their authentic personalities and align their actions with their ethics. Karen, a mid-  
403 level manager, explained that what differentiated authentic from inauthentic leadership  
404 was humility: “Real leaders don’t really have to say what their title is, or have to brag  
405 about their accolades or whatever. It is just inherent, and your work should speak for  
406 itself.” For Karen and other women, discomfort with titles and self-promotion was also  
407 supported by a belief that such approaches were signs of overcompensation. A member of  
408 a different circle, Tanya, likewise said in an interview, “Not that there is anything wrong  
409 with people who want to promote themselves and make money and have great titles—it’s  
410 just that I was very uncomfortable with the word ‘leadership’ until I was able to redefine  
411 it for myself.” Like many women interviewed, Tanya viewed the conventional definition  
412 of leadership, and the form most commonly used in organizations, as including self-  
413 promotion and a profit-driven mindset. While Tanya hedged that there was nothing  
414 wrong with this style, her discomfort indicated otherwise. Other women discussed fears  
415 of losing themselves if they took on a more executive style, often framing the latter as an  
416 overly masculinized approach. For leadership to feel authentic to Tanya, it demanded less  
417 selfish motives.

418            Similarly, during a circle meeting, Maxine described herself as a person “who  
419 values integrity and authenticity.” To that end, she questioned whether she could be both  
420 authoritative and likable as a leader, concluding that she wanted her team to think, “We  
421 are so fair that you should want to view us as authentic and approachable, but you should  
422 also respect us and not push us to be authoritative with you.” In Maxine’s view, being  
423 authoritative was a last resort and could be avoided through a fair, authentic,  
424 approachable workplace style. As a leader, Maxine believed that if she was well-liked  
425 and respected, such behaviors would serve the same end as being directly authoritative. A  
426 third circle member from senior management in Development, Lucy, explained that she  
427 didn’t want women to have to take on the characteristics of men in the workplace. These  
428 characteristics may involve being more authoritative, she told us, but they would drive  
429 her crazy because they are “cold and rational, and they aren’t compelling, passionate or  
430 interesting.” For Maxine, Tanya and Lucy, elements of what they viewed as a masculine  
431 workplace style felt similarly wrong. Maxine recoiled from authoritarianism, Tanya could  
432 only see herself as a leader according to an alternative definition that excluded self-  
433 promotion and monetary motives, and Lucy regarded executive leadership as cold and  
434 boring.

435            But an adoption of intentional invisibility was not just about framing traditional,  
436 executive workplace behaviors as inauthentic. For many women, framing success in the  
437 workplace to comply with feminine norms was fitting. Women are normatively expected  
438 to be communal rather than individualistic (Eagly and Carli 2008), and our participants’  
439 descriptions of the mechanics and goals of a good workplace reflected this expectation.

440 The norm that women ought to be communal bore on how participants thought managers  
441 should oversee their teams. Louise, who supervises a small team in Human Resources,  
442 explained that teams should be talented and diverse, and that leaders should not enforce a  
443 hierarchical order. Louise believes that she should prioritize the group over the potential  
444 personal gains of ascending a hierarchy.

445 Likewise, the communal orientation that Louise refers to shapes the *why* of  
446 intentional invisibility. In her interview, Louise explained that non-hierarchical,  
447 collaborative groups are ideal because, “whatever the mission of the group or the  
448 organization [is, it] can be best realized by having that really strong, supported group.”  
449 Other participants agreed that leaders should pursue organizational goals rather than seek  
450 self-promotion. Program participants further espoused this mission-oriented, communal  
451 approach to leadership by contrasting it with a more executive, self-promoting style.  
452 Janine, a mid-level manager, explains that she has trouble respecting leaders who do not  
453 put others first: “[Leaders] can really have just the most brilliant idea, but if it’s at the  
454 expense of people it doesn’t do anything for me.” Similarly, Robyn, in senior  
455 management, notes that a professional approach that values promotion and self-  
456 advancement makes her uncomfortable: “Even women who are very career-oriented  
457 aren’t necessarily the most satisfied from those type of positions, and their goal is not  
458 necessarily endless promotion.” Robyn goes on to explain that women leaders may  
459 approach their work differently than men. “[Women] are not always going to consider  
460 something a win just if we got more of something numbers-wise. A lot of us are in this  
461 because of something that’s more heart-related.”

462           According to Robyn, while men may rely more heavily on numbers and statistics  
463 as markers of success, women value and measure their professional success in other  
464 ways. This sentiment is reflected in responses we heard throughout interviews,  
465 suggesting that women reject masculine-typed workplace behaviors in favor of a more  
466 communal and less self-promotional work style. Together, distaste for masculine  
467 workplace behaviors and a preference for a communal approach made *invisibility* the  
468 most effective tool at many women’s disposal. And by positioning invisibility as  
469 intentional, authentic and effective, the women in our sample were rejecting—rather than  
470 failing at—professional advancement.

471           Other women dealt with similar deliberations between the leadership they saw  
472 around them and the leadership that they wished to embody themselves. Again, key to  
473 this negotiation between ideal and actual was the tool of invisibility. Meredith, a circle  
474 member who worked in Health Services, says that she is comfortable being outspoken.  
475 She is not sure, however, that being “the person in the room who says the thing that  
476 everyone else is thinking” is an effective strategy. “Maybe the goal for me is to figure out  
477 how to be smart about [speaking out]; how to be more political about it, without losing  
478 my voice and without getting burned out.” Meredith values speaking her mind and has  
479 the skills to do so, but senses that it might stunt her career advancement. Earlier, she  
480 practiced a more assertive, visible workplace style, but in the face of negative feedback is  
481 seeking to learn a less visible strategy. Others who generally turn to behind the scenes  
482 strategies likewise justify the choice by arguing that a direct, executive style would be  
483 self-defeating. Amy, a mid-level employee, explains that she has a difficult boss: he



484 neither thrives as a manager nor completes his own work successfully. Rather than  
485 confronting him, Amy shares with her circle that she is “controlling her boss by playing  
486 low, by being ingratiating... Sometimes you do it strategically and it elevates your  
487 status.” Rather than risk repercussions for directly addressing her boss’s insufficiencies,  
488 Amy uses an invisible tactic to improve her professional standing.

489         Even when women’s behaviors aligned with executive norms, they tended to  
490 humbly re-frame their strategies as examples of invisibility. Gretchen, a senior  
491 administrator, admires a woman who can take control but maintain “the niceness of it, the  
492 dealing with people [kindly].” While few would object to managers treating team  
493 members kindly, Gretchen’s admiration for control tempered with niceness reminds her  
494 that she ought “to take a step back, because I tend to control.” Even for a leader, control  
495 was to be softened or modulated, rather than embraced. Likewise, even though April  
496 finds an executive negotiation style to be effective when shopping for a car, she feels  
497 uncomfortable breaching interactional norms with her assertiveness. April recounted to  
498 her circle that she approached the male salesperson at the car dealership in a very  
499 authoritative manner that was “not her” at all, and she ended up getting a very cheap deal.  
500 However, after the deal was made she apologized to the male salesperson because she felt  
501 she had emasculated him. She thought to herself, “I’m being such a bitch!” and felt she  
502 had to apologize and explain that this was not really her, but was the game she had to  
503 play. The executive style that April and Gretchen’s co-worker employed adhered to the  
504 rules of the game and proved effective, but was interpreted by the women as inauthentic

505 and unethical. April and Gretchen, like many women in the program, would prefer to  
506 minimize their guilt and ambivalence by practicing a less assertive behavioral strategy.

507         Other women feared the reactions of their team members were they to take on a  
508 more confrontational, assertive style. Sally, who holds a PhD and oversees an IT Services  
509 team, recounted a time when she confronted her colleagues about an issue with a project  
510 and worried she was “being an ass.” Sally’s circle members and workplace peers  
511 reassured her that she was in the right when she stood up for herself, but she nonetheless  
512 cites the experience as a time “when I felt first-hand the extent of the double standard for  
513 women who are otherwise reserved.” Program participants experienced or witnessed  
514 interactions where women who too visibly took control were sanctioned. As a result,  
515 invisibility was not necessarily a default, but rather became an intentional strategy that  
516 women employed to avoid backlash or a feeling of inauthenticity.

517

### 518 *The Paradox of the Modern Partnership*

519         The women in our sample spanned a number of characteristics including age,  
520 race, and career stage. Yet among these characteristics, family composition stood out as  
521 the central differentiator of women’s leadership strategies, with mothers with children at  
522 home most strongly embracing invisibility. For many women who participated in the  
523 professional development program, remaining behind the scenes was an intentional  
524 strategy for navigating workplace biases. But for women with families, intentional  
525 invisibility offered, in addition, a vital way of ensuring stable employment and a stable  
526 family life.

527 Carly, who was married with two young children, exemplified this balancing act.  
528 Carly was unhappy in her current job. After returning from maternity leave, she reduced  
529 her hours to 75% but felt that she still had a full-time workload and decreased status  
530 within her department. Carly wanted to go back to working full-time but told her circle  
531 that she had not “acclimated the husband yet.” Her husband was working freelance in the  
532 technology sector, and therefore had a flexible schedule, but Carly did not want to limit  
533 his career opportunities by saddling him with responsibilities like transporting the kids  
534 between activities. Even though Carly earned substantially more than her husband, she  
535 thought “his per capita rate of income would be really high in theory—but that is only if  
536 he actually got a job.” While she laughed about his sporadic employment with her circle,  
537 she also structured her career around his risky path. She maintained a flexible but low  
538 status 75% schedule with a reliable salary and benefits in the hope that her husband might  
539 win big by joining a start-up tech company. She served as her family’s breadwinner, but  
540 endured career dissatisfaction and low mobility in order to meet her family’s needs.  
541 Carly’s position as a caretaker constrained her from pushing for a full-time, high status  
542 role in her organization or elsewhere.

543 Like Carly, Sandra curtailed an upward professional trajectory to better reconcile  
544 her professional and familial responsibilities. Sandra had moved from a corporate job to  
545 the non-profit sector and was thriving in an upper-level administrative position. However,  
546 when one of her children was diagnosed with a medical condition that would require  
547 more hands-on adult supervision, she moved to a lower stress, and lower prestige, staff  
548 position within the organization. Sandra, like her husband, continued to work full-time.

549 Her salary and benefits remained integral to her family. But in scaling back her  
550 ambitions, she felt more capable of creating the mental and emotional space for managing  
551 her family's evolving needs. Sandra and Carly, like many of their peers, took for granted  
552 that they would maintain employment throughout marriage and childrearing. They also  
553 shared an accompanying assumption that they could outsource many household  
554 responsibilities, including childcare, to maintain a full-time work schedule. While these  
555 women differ from those a generation ago who might have left the workforce to care for  
556 their families, they nonetheless continue to bear the gendered burden of maintaining  
557 family stability by being constantly available to deal with caretaking and family  
558 contingencies. To do so, they crafted careers around flexibility and stability while their  
559 husbands pursued riskier, and potentially more rewarding, ambitions.

560         Some women feared or had experienced backlash from their partners if they  
561 started valuing ambition or risk-taking in their careers. Mary's story is emblematic of this  
562 dynamic. Mary, who had a husband and two young children, felt increasingly empowered  
563 over the course of the program. After years in middle management, she had recently  
564 discovered and hoped to act on a desire to climb the professional ladder. However, during  
565 her circle's fourth meeting, Mary came in with a "cautionary story" for the group. Since  
566 joining the group, she had put into practice and begun to move full-speed ahead with her  
567 professional development plans. Mary explained, however, that this new approach to her  
568 career had jolted things at home:

569         *In my mind, I was becoming the person I wanted to be. I was taking*  
570 *professional development classes and talking to people and practicing it in*  
571 *my real life. And one day, I saw my husband getting increasingly upset*  
572 *with me. So finally I said to him, 'Did I do something?!' and he said, 'I*

573 *don't even know who you are anymore! You're making all of these plans,*  
574 *you're talking about going back to school, you're doing this and that, and*  
575 *you're not present, you're not here for us. We used to talk about things*  
576 *that would impact the two of us.' I realized in that moment, 'Oh, I guess*  
577 *there's a reality.'*

578  
579 Mary's spouse felt disturbed and alienated by his wife's increasingly ambitious career  
580 aspirations. While Mary continued to participate in the program, a change in her fervor  
581 and demeanor was noticeable following this event.

582 Similarly, Divya, who holds a Ph.D. and directs a division within the  
583 organization, explicitly articulates the challenges of balancing professional aspirations  
584 with personal responsibilities. She feels that the expectations of her as a wife and a  
585 mother precluded her from being able to focus on and achieve her career goals:

586 *I think that if I had been a man, I would perhaps been able to achieve*  
587 *more professionally. And that's for no other reason except holding myself*  
588 *back, too. And there's also the biological thing. You know, you have a kid,*  
589 *you step out of the workplace. You have a spouse who has a professional*  
590 *career. You sort of support many things in your life without putting your*  
591 *profession first [...] I think we're talking about single-minded focus on*  
592 *your career. And I think that for me, being a woman and taking on all the*  
593 *expected roles, that I have never focused single-mindedly on my work.*  
594 *There are lots of competing things: walking the dog, making sure the kids*  
595 *are fine; you know, making sure you have dinner or cleaning up after*  
596 *dinner. You know, keep up 101 things in mind.*

597  
598 Compared to women with children, we found that women who did not have  
599 families to support approached their careers with less risk aversion. A sizeable minority  
600 of circle participants who fit these criteria noted concerns other than stability and  
601 flexibility when discussing their careers. While they too embraced invisible leadership  
602 and expressed worries about being inauthentic or unlikable if they practiced executive  
603 leadership, concerns for these women about job security and flexibility were largely

604 absent. These women were also aware of their comparative freedom to pursue their  
605 careers. Larissa, a rising mid-level manager in her late 30s, discussed how much easier it  
606 was for her to work long hours and get ahead compared to her female colleagues who  
607 were also mothers. As she and her spouse had decided not to have children, she felt freed  
608 to make riskier “reach” decisions with her own career.

609 For women with children, invisibility was one deliberate tool for managing  
610 conflicting expectations. Within the modern partnership, women are free to, and indeed  
611 may be required to, pursue a career. However, many find that they can only pursue their  
612 ambitions to a point to ensure stability. Specifically, in order to continue with their  
613 careers while also meeting familial obligations, these women selected an invisible style  
614 that allowed them to be effective workers while staying out of the spotlight and avoiding  
615 negative backlash both in and out of the workplace.

616

## 617 DISCUSSION

618 Most of the women in our study were highly educated, middle and upper class  
619 professionals from dual-income households. Many identified as leaders in their careers  
620 and had access to outsourced help for their household and care work. Yet, even among  
621 this self-selected set of ambitious and advantaged women, we found that many embraced  
622 “intentional invisibility.” Despite being aware of executive professional styles, these  
623 women found that a less visible approach to navigating the workplace helped them  
624 maintain their professional position without putting it at risk.

625           Our findings shed light on broader trends in women’s career advancement,  
626 deepening our understanding of how and why women’s professional and economic gains  
627 in recent decades have not been commensurate with their human capital. Scholars largely  
628 agree that pervasive, structural problems underpin women’s underrepresentation. At  
629 work, women face a labyrinth riddled with biases, discrimination, and other obstacles  
630 throughout their careers (Ely, Ibarra, and Kolb 2011; Monroe and Chiu 2010). At home,  
631 women continue to share a disproportionate burden of familial and caregiving  
632 responsibilities (Bianchi et al. 2000, 2012; Coverman 1983; Sayer 2005; Sayer, Bianchi  
633 and Robinson 2004). We show that women embrace invisibility as a conflict-avoidant  
634 strategy that allows them to feel authentic and maintain stability at work and home  
635 without challenging feminine expectations. Our findings suggest that regardless of the  
636 impact intentional invisibility may have on career advancement the long run, the strategy  
637 appeals to diverse women who find themselves caught within biased organizations.

638           To resolve the puzzle wherein professional women limit their own visibility, we  
639 show first that the women in our study encountered bias, backlash, and constraints in  
640 their workplace environments. Participants described a range of non-confrontational and  
641 vulnerability-minimizing “invisible” responses that they had developed to counter  
642 inequality and interactional discomfort in the workplace. But unlike other forms of  
643 executive workplace norms that felt inauthentic, navigating the labyrinth in this way  
644 allowed these women to accomplish organizational goals while also avoiding the  
645 backlash that individual self-promotion or assertiveness might have engendered.

646 We additionally demonstrate that despite being ambitious and career driven, the  
647 women in our study approached their work with an eye to fortifying their families for  
648 possible contingencies. Indeed, our data show how the responsibility many women bear  
649 for ensuring the wellbeing of their families serves as a multi-level barrier that encourages  
650 them to stay out of the spotlight. For example, women like Sandra and Carly took for  
651 granted that they would have careers through marriage and childrearing with access to  
652 paid help to maintain a full-time work schedule. However, both women also bore the  
653 burden of maintaining family stability and being available to deal with contingencies in  
654 ways that their husbands simply did not. Women saw their career stability as a way of  
655 freeing their husbands or partners to pursue riskier, but potentially more lucrative or  
656 fulfilling, opportunities. Together, the personal and organizational pressures that these  
657 women faced made invisibility an optimal strategy.

658 Still, while we suggest that intentional invisibility may have consequences for  
659 individual women's advancement and gender parity in the workplace more broadly, our  
660 conclusions are tempered by our awareness of selection challenges and methodological  
661 limitations. First, our study precludes us from examining all the dimensions along which  
662 workplace navigation strategies might differ for women from different backgrounds and  
663 intersectional identities. The women who participated in the professional development  
664 program were predominantly white and middle or upper class, and had opted to work  
665 within the same large organization. Likewise, because women self-selected into the  
666 organizationally-sanctioned program, our research design could have led us to observe  
667 women less inclined than others to challenge the gender norms in their workplace. Given



668 selection bias, we acknowledge that invisibility might not be a dominant strategy for all  
669 women, but rather, a strategy preferred by status-conforming women less interested in  
670 “rocking the boat.” We hope that future research on organizational interventions and  
671 inequality will be attentive to the interpretive and behavioral strategies that diverse  
672 women employ across unequal settings.

673         In addition, we did not track long-term career outcomes and thus cannot speak to  
674 the causal impacts of invisibility. To the extent that this workplace strategy contradicts  
675 conventional professional norms, invisibility could stymie the career advancement of  
676 those who practice it; indeed, many participants who embraced invisibility were  
677 concerned about this consequence. However, it could be that this invisible, communal  
678 approach to work creates effective teams and successful organizations, and will therefore  
679 benefit women professionals in the long-term. Our findings suggest that regardless of the  
680 causal effects this strategy may have in the long run, intentional invisibility offers women  
681 an effective, adaptable set of strategies to maintain both professional and personal  
682 stability as well as feelings of authenticity and femininity.

683         While our data are not representative and do not speak to invisibility’s long-term  
684 effectiveness, our findings suggest that women within biased organizations construct and  
685 employ novel strategies for reconciling professional and personal demands. By shifting  
686 attention away from barriers themselves and towards the women who negotiate them, we  
687 point to how the daily choices women make in the workplace bear on their sense of self  
688 and sense of stability. While women may seek to stay out of the spotlight in the

689 workplace, here we highlight how their preferences and decisions contribute to gender  
690 dynamics in the office and at home.

691

## 692 CONCLUSION

693 Although scholars of gender and leadership have a strong theoretical grasp on the  
694 ways in which organizations fail women, they have a weaker understanding of how  
695 women internalize and respond to these organizational constraints in ways that influence  
696 their career outcomes. Our analysis of women's aspirations and decision-making  
697 highlights both the nature of the challenges women encounter as well as the tools they  
698 can leverage to navigate these challenges. Particularly, in tracking women's professional  
699 aspirations alongside the strategies they employ daily to navigate workplace  
700 responsibilities and relationships, we find that women's use of "intentional invisibility"  
701 helps them as they continually confront and navigate maze-like barriers to professional  
702 advancement. Together, our findings demonstrate the importance of workplace policies  
703 that not only level the playing field, but also recognize the gendered baggage and toolkits  
704 that employees bring to the workplace.

705

## 706 REFERENCES

707 Acker, J. (1990). Hierarchies, Jobs, Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organizations.

708 *Gender and Society* 4 (2): 139-58.

709 Alvesson, M. and Billing, Y. (1997). *Understanding Gender and Organizations*. London.

710 Sage

- 711 Belkin, L. (2003). The Opt-Out Revolution. *The New York Times*, October 26.
- 712 Bianchi, S., Sayer, L., Milkie, M. and Robinson, J. (2012). Housework: Who did, does or  
713 will do it, and how much does it matter? *Social Forces* 91(1): 55-63.
- 714 Blair-Loy, M. (2009). *Competing Devotions: Career and Family Among Women*  
715 *Executives*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- 716 Britton, D. (2000). The Epistemology of the Gendered Organization. *Gender and Society*  
717 14(1): 418-434.
- 718 Cech, E., and M. Blair-Loy (2010). Perceiving Glass Ceilings? Meritocratic versus  
719 Structural Explanations of Gender Inequality among Women in Science and  
720 Technology. *Social Problems* 57(3): 371-397.
- 721 Charmaz, K. (2003). 'Grounded Theory', in J.A. Smith (ed.), *Qualitative Psychology: A*  
722 *Practical Guide to Research Methods*. London: Sage.
- 723 Coltrane, S. (1996). *Family Man: Fatherhood, Household and Gender Equity*. New  
724 York. Oxford University Press.
- 725 Cooper, M. (2000). Being the "Go-To-Guy": Fatherhood, Masculinity, and the  
726 Organization of Work in Silicon Valley. *Qualitative Sociology*. 23(1): 379-405.
- 727 Correll, S., Kelly, E., Trimble, L. and Williams, J. (2014). Redesigning, Redefining  
728 Work. *Work and Occupations* 41 (1): 3-17.
- 729 Correll, S., Benard, S. and Paik, I. (2007). Getting a Job: Is There a Motherhood  
730 Penalty? *American Journal of Sociology* 112 (5): 1297-1339.
- 731 Correll, S. (2001). Gender and the Career Choice Process: The Role of Biased Self-  
732 Assessments. *American Journal of Sociology* 106 (6): 1691-1730.

- 733 Correll, S. (2004). Constraints into Preferences: Gender, Status, and Emerging Career  
734 Aspirations. *American Sociological Review* 69(1): 93-113.
- 735 Correll, S. and Mackenzie, L. (2016). To Succeed in Tech, Women Need More Visibility.  
736 *Harvard Business Review*, September 13, 2016. Available at  
737 <https://hbr.org/2016/09/to-succeed-in-tech-women-need-more-visibility> [Last  
738 Accessed February 27, 2017]
- 739 Cotter, D., Hermsen, J. and Vanneman, R. (2004). *Gender Inequality at Work*. New  
740 York. Russell Sage Foundation.
- 741 Coverman, S. (1983). Gender, domestic labor time, and wage inequality. *American*  
742 *Sociological Review*, 1983 (1): 623-637.
- 743 Davies-Netzley, S. (1998). Women above the Glass Ceiling: Perceptions on Corporate  
744 Mobility and Strategies for Success. *Gender and Society* 12 (3): 339-55.
- 745 DeRue, D. and Ashford, S. (2010). Who will lead and who will follow? A social process  
746 of leadership identity construction in organizations. *Academy of Management*  
747 *Review* 35 (4): 627-647.
- 748 Eagly, A. and Carli, L. (2007). Women and the labyrinth of leadership. *Harvard Business*  
749 *Review* 85 (9): 62-71.
- 750 Eagly, A. and Carli, L. (2008). *Through the Labyrinth: The Truth about How Women*  
751 *Become Leaders*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- 752 Elliot, J. and Smith, R. (2004). Race, Gender and Workplace Power. *American*  
753 *Sociological Review*. 69: 365-386.

- 754 Ely, R. and Rhode, D. (2010). Women and Leadership. In: Nitin Nohria and Rakesh  
755 Khurana, eds., *Handbook of Leadership Theory and Practice: An HBS centennial*  
756 *colloquium on advancing leadership..* 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Cambridge. Harvard Business  
757 Review Press, pp. 377-410.
- 758 Ely, R., Ibarra, H. and Kolb, D. (2011). Taking gender into account: Theory and design  
759 for women's leadership development programs. *Academy of Management*  
760 *Learning & Education* 10 (3): 474-493.
- 761 Glass, J. (2004). Blessing or Curse? Work-Family Policies and Mother's Wage Growth  
762 Over Time. *Work and Occupations* 31(1): 367-94.
- 763 Gibbs, G. R. (2007). Thematic coding and categorizing. *Analyzing Qualitative Data*.  
764 London: SAGE Publications.
- 765 Goldin, C. (2006). The Quiet Revolution that Transformed Women's Employment,  
766 Education, and Family. *NBER Working Paper Series*. Cambridge, MA: National  
767 Bureau of Economic Research.
- 768 Gorman, E. and Kmec, J. (2009). Hierarchical Rank and Women's Organizational  
769 Mobility: Glass Ceilings in Corporate Law Firms. *American Journal of Sociology*.  
770 114: 1428-1474.
- 771 Heilman, M. (2012). Gender stereotypes and workplace bias. *Research in Organizational*  
772 *Behavior* 32: 113-35.
- 773 Heilman, M. Wallen, A., Fuchs, D. and Tamkins, M. (2004). Penalties for Success:  
774 Reactions to women who succeed at male gender-typed tasks. *Journal of Applied*  
775 *Psychology* 89 (3): 416-427.

776 Helgesen, S. (1990). *The Female Advantage*. New York. Doubleday.

777 Hochschild, A. (1989). *The Second Shift: Working parents and the revolution at home*.  
778 New York: Viking.

779 Hochschild, A. (1997). *The Time Bind: When Work Becomes Home and Home Becomes*  
780 *Work*. New York: Metropolitan Books.

781 Ibarra, H. (1999). Provisional Selves: Experimenting With Image and Identity in  
782 Professional Adaptation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 44(4): 764-791.

783 Ibarra, H. (2012). To Close the Gender Gap, Focus On Assignments. *Harvard Business*  
784 *Review*, May 22, 2012. Available at [https://hbr.org/2012/05/to-close-the-gender-](https://hbr.org/2012/05/to-close-the-gender-gap-focus-on-assignments)  
785 [gap-focus-on-assignments](https://hbr.org/2012/05/to-close-the-gender-gap-focus-on-assignments) [Last Accessed February 27, 2017]

786 Ibarra, H., Ely, R. and Kolb, D. (2013). Women Rising: The Unseen Barriers. *Harvard*  
787 *Business Review*.

788 Ibarra, H and Petriglieri, J. (2007). Impossible Selves: Image Strategies and Identity  
789 Threat in Professional Women's Career Transitions. *Unpublished article*,  
790 *INSEAD*.

791 Jacobs, J., and Gerson, K. (2004). *The Time Divide: Work, Family, and Gender*  
792 *Inequality*. Cambridge, MA. Harvard University Press.

793 Kanter, R. (1993). *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York. Basic Books.

794 Kellogg, K. (2011). *Challenging Operations: Medical Reform and Resistance in Surgery*.  
795 Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- 796 Kelly, E., Ammons, S., Chermack, K., and Moen, P. (2010). Gendered Challenge,  
797 Gendered Response: Confronting the Ideal Worker Norm in a White Collar  
798 Organization. *Gender & Society* 24(1): 281-303.
- 799 Kendall, S. and Tannen, D. (1997). Gender and Language in the Workplace. In: Ruth  
800 Wodak, ed., *Gender and Discourse*, 1<sup>st</sup> ed. London. Sage, pp. 81-105.
- 801 King, M.M., Bergstrom, C.T., Correll, S.J., Jacquet, J., and West, J.D. (2017). Men Set  
802 Their Own Cites High: Gender and Self-Citation Across Fields and Over Time.  
803 *Socius* 3: 1-22.
- 804 Kolb, D. (2013). Negotiated in the Shadows of Organizations: Gender, Negotiation, and  
805 Change. *Ohio St. J. on Disp. Resol.* 28: 241-60.
- 806 Kulis, S., Sicotte, D. and Collins, S. (2002). More than a pipeline problem: Labor supply  
807 constraints and gender stratification across academic science  
808 disciplines. *Research in Higher Education* 43 (6): 657-691.
- 809 Leahey, E. (2007). Not By Productivity Alone: How Visibility and Specialization  
810 Contribute to Academic Earnings. *American Sociological Review.* 72(4): 533-61.
- 811 Miller, J. (1976). *Toward a New Psychology of Women*. Boston. Beacon Press.
- 812 Monroe, K. and Chiu, W. (2010). Gender Equality in the Academy: The Pipeline  
813 Problem. *PS: Political Science & Politics* 43 (2): 303-8.
- 814 Pratt, M.G., Rockmann, K.W., Kaufmann, J.B. (2006). Constructing Professional  
815 Identity: The Role of Work and Identity Learning Cycles in the Customization of  
816 Identity Among Medical Residents. *Academy of Management Journal.* 49(2):  
817 235-262.

- 818 Ramarajan, L., Reid, E.M. (2013). Shattering the Myth of Separate Worlds: Negotiating  
819 Non-Work Identities at Work. *Academy of Management Review* 38(4): 621-644.
- 820 Ramarajan, L., Reid, E.M. (2016). Managing the High Intensity Workplace. *Harvard*  
821 *Business Review* 94(6): 84-90.
- 822 Reid, E.M. (2015). Embracing Passing, Revealing, and the Ideal Worker Image: How  
823 People Navigate Expected and Experienced Professional Identities.  
824 *Organizational Science* 1: 13.
- 825 Ridgeway, C. and Correll, S. (2004). Unpacking the Gender System: A Theoretical  
826 Perspective on Gender Beliefs and Social Expectations. *Gender and Society* 18  
827 (4): 510-31.
- 828 Rudman, L. and Phelan, J. (2008). Backlash effects for disconfirming gender stereotypes  
829 in organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior* 28: 61-79.
- 830 Rudman, L. and Glick, P. (2001). Prescriptive gender stereotypes and backlash toward  
831 agentic women. *Journal of Social Issues* 57 (4): 743-762.
- 832 Rudman L. A., Phelan J. E., Nauts S., Moss-Racusin C. A. (2012). Status incongruity and  
833 backlash toward female leaders: defending the gender hierarchy motivates  
834 prejudice against female leaders. *J. Exp. Soc. Psychol.* 48: 165–179.
- 835 Sayer, L. (2005). Gender, time and inequality: Trends in women's and men's paid work,  
836 unpaid work and free time. *Social forces*, 84(1): 285-303.
- 837 Sayer, L., Suzanne, B. and John, R. (2004). Are Parents Investing Less in Children?  
838 Trends in Mothers' and Fathers' Time With Children. *American Journal of*  
839 *Sociology*. 110: 1–43.



840 Simmard, C., Davies, A., Gilmartin, S., Shiebinger, L. and Whitney, T. (2008). *Climbing*  
841 *the technical ladder: obstacles and solutions for mid-level women in technology*.  
842 [online] Clayman Institute of Gender Research. Available at:  
843 <http://gender.stanford.edu/climbing-technical-ladder-0> [Last Accessed February  
844 27, 2017]

845 Williams, J. (2000). *Why work and family conflict and what to do about it*. New York.  
846 Oxford University Press.

847 Williams, J. and Dempsey, R. (2014). *What works for women at work: Four patterns*  
848 *working women need to know*. New York. NYU Press.

849 Yee, L., Krivkovich, T., Finch, A., Kutcher, E., Cooper, M., Epstein, B. and Konar,  
850 Ellen. (2016). *Women in the Workplace 2016* [online]. Lean In and  
851 McKinsey&Company. Available at <https://womenintheworkplace.com/> [Accessed  
852 27 February, 2017].

853

853

854 ENDNOTES

855 1. Women who participated in the professional development program were assured of  
856 confidentiality by both the Human Resources Department and the research team, and  
857 their discussion groups served as spaces for sharing personal experiences. Because of  
858 the importance of maintaining confidentiality, key details about the organization and  
859 program we studied are obscured throughout this article, and all names are  
860 pseudonyms.

861 2. In addition to observational and interview data, the research team fielded surveys at  
862 the beginning and end of the program to track changes in participants' views. Survey  
863 data are available upon request, but do not inform the findings reported in this paper.

864

865

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of program participants by cohort.

	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
Age (mean)	46	40
Parent <sup>†</sup>	70%	53%
Relationship Status <sup>†</sup>		
Single/Non-cohabiting	17%	29%
Cohabiting	12%	9%
Married	71%	62%
Race <sup>††</sup>		
White	68%	76%
Black	3%	5%
Asian	10%	11%
Hispanic	7%	1%
Other - All other responses	1%	2%
Multiple responses	11%	6%
Hispanic	-	11%
Education		
High School	0	0
Associate's/Some college	1%	4%
Bachelor's	17%	34%
Master's	54%	44%
PhD or Professional	29%	18%
Years in organization (mean) <sup>†</sup>	10	7
Manages others	73%	63%
Income <sup>†††</sup>		
0-49,999	-	3%
50-99,999	-	52%
100-149,999	-	32%
150,000 or greater	-	12%
N	138	177

<sup>†</sup> Among Cohort 1, parental status, relationship status, and organizational tenure were only asked on the post-program survey, which 86 participants completed.

<sup>††</sup> Cohort 1 participants saw "Hispanic" as an available race category and were not asked separately about Hispanic origin. Cohort 2 participants were asked to report their race and Hispanic origin separately; for Cohort 2 participants, the race category "Hispanic" includes those who selected "Some other race (please specify) and wrote in "Hispanic," "Latina," etc. as their race.

<sup>†††</sup> Cohort 1 participants were not asked to report their income.

Table 2. Interview respondent characteristics.

Age (mean)	45
Parent	71%
Relationship Status	
Single/Non-cohabiting/Divorced	24%
Cohabiting	7%
Married	69%
Race <sup>†</sup>	
White	47%
Black	4%
Asian	9%
Hispanic	13%
Other - All other responses	4%
Multiple responses	2%
Education <sup>††</sup>	
High School/Some college	4%
Bachelor's	36%
Master's	36%
PhD or Professional	22%
Years in organization (mean)	11
N <sup>†††</sup>	45

<sup>†</sup>Interview respondents were asked to self-report their race or ethnicity at the end of the interview. Nine respondents (20%) either opted not to self-report race or were not asked to.

<sup>††</sup>Educational attainment is missing for one interview respondent.

<sup>†††</sup>Interviews were conducted with 45 unique program participants. Of these, 4 respondents completed a single interview and 41 respondents completed interviews at the start and end of the program, for a total of 86 interviews.

867

868