

**Marginal to Mainstream: Scaling Up Gender
and Organizational Change Interventions**
Case Conference
June 23-27, 1997

Simmons Institute for Leadership and Change

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	iii
Authors	iii
Introduction	1
Sticking Points	3
Creating Gender - Equitable Organizations: Four Case Studies	5
1. Credit	5
2. Crops	8
3. Fortune 500	13
4. Good Stuff	16
Issue Synthesis and Discussion	18
Conclusion	23

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We gratefully acknowledge the contributions of many people to the success of the conference. Aruna Rao and David Kelleher, Fellows with the Simmons Institute for Leadership and Change, designed and led the conference. Deborah Kolb, the Director of the Institute, provided valuable advice in thinking through the conceptual basis of the conference. Diane Hammer and the administrative staff of the Institute dealt cheerfully and effectively with the multitude of essential, but changing, details of an international conference. Deborah Merrill-Sands, Program Director for Gender and Organizational Change at the Institute, provided valuable editorial and intellectual assistance in the preparation of this report. We also gratefully acknowledge the financial support of the Ford Foundation for the Case Conference Series. Finally, we recognize the energy and insight of conference participants (Annex I).

The Simmons Institute for Leadership and Change (SILC), founded in 1994, is based at Simmons College in Boston, MA, USA. SILC is dedicated to empowering women and men to act individually, collectively, and institutionally to promote gender equity in their workplace, communities, and in their personal lives. The Institute brings together academics, managers, and professionals to develop innovative change strategies based on models of collaboration, action research, and participation. In July 1998, the Gender and Organizational Change Program of the Institute, which sponsored this conference, moved to the new Center for Gender in Organizations at the Simmons Graduate School of Management. The mission of the Center is to serve as a national and international resource for scholars and practitioners who work at the intersection of gender and strategic organizational issues. The Center's work is based on the belief that organizational performance is enhanced by gender equitable work environments that allow both women and men to be active and productive contributors. The Center pursues this agenda through education, collaborative research, conferences, and dissemination of information.

Working Papers and Conference Reports can be obtained by contacting The Center for Gender in Organizations at cgo@simmons.edu or by calling (617) 521-3824.

AUTHORS

David Kelleher is an independent organizational consultant operating from Ste Anne de Prescott, Canada. He works primarily with NGOs and other public organizations. These past two years he has been a Fellow at the Simmons Institute for Leadership and Change.

Kirsten Moore has worked in the international women's health community for ten years. While at the Population Council, she developed materials and training curricula to help mainstream social scientists and policy makers understand the concept of gender and its importance for their research and programmatic initiatives. She has just completed her masters in public affairs at Princeton University and is currently a Senior Research Assistant with the Office of Population Research, Princeton University.

INTRODUCTION

What do competence, target achievement, electronic products engineering, and micro credit have to do with the concept of gender? Moreover, how are these issues related to processes of organizational change? At first glance, the links might appear to be tenuous. Indeed, even those who work to create gender-equitable organizations often struggle over how to define these connections. A case conference hosted by the Simmons Institute for Leadership and Change (SILC) in June of 1997 offered researchers, consultants and program managers an opportunity to define these links and, in the process, advance their own thinking and planning in the area of gender and organizational change.

SILC was established in 1994 with the objective of empowering women, individually and collectively, to transform their lives and the places where they live and work. It offers an intellectual and institutional home for innovative research and collaborative dialogues between academics, and professionals in business and community organizations. In 1996-97, SILC hosted a monthly case conference series on gender and organizational change initiatives. The conference on June 23-24, 1997—"Marginal to Mainstream: Scaling Up Gender and Organizational Change Interventions"—marked the culmination of the series. It grew out of the monthly discussions at SILC as well as deliberations within projects concerned with institutionalizing change toward gender equity.

The conference was based on the premise that a number of gender or work/family projects associated with SILC had been moderately successful at local sites of large organizations. The problem lay in "scaling up" these interventions so they affected the way of working in the organization as a whole (and, perhaps, outside the organization in the families of organization members).

Scaling up refers to the process of looking beyond discrete practices or problem areas in organizations to engage with, and fundamentally challenge, the power relations and associated narratives that define the meaning of work in late 20th century organizations. This involves re-envisioning organizations and the roles of those who work within them, and rethinking the lines between an organization and its geographic and professional communities. It also involves rethinking the kinds of management skills and leadership styles that can create a gender-equitable¹ environment.

¹ The term "gender equity" is used in many ways. We have defined a gender-equitable environment as one that: 1) includes and supports both men and women; 2) stimulates their fullest productivity and satisfaction in their professional and personal lives; 3) engages men and women in decision-making that shapes the work and work environment; 4) harnesses men's and women's diverse skills, perspectives, and knowledge; and 5) values diverse perspectives and ways of working. See Deborah Merrill-Sands, "Gender Issues in the Workplace," Presentation to Association of Women in Development, Washington, DC, September 1996.

As we prepared for the conference, we began to think that, although there are many issues in scaling up, this conference should look at two:

1. Taking senior managers from sponsors to learners—in all of our cases, senior managers have been supportive of the intervention but have not had to be learners themselves. If the interventions are going to be institutionalized, senior managers will have to change the way they manage and give leadership to ongoing efforts to build gender equity. These are not easy changes. Beliefs regarding gender equity and work/family balance are deeply held.

2. What is the real work? In all of our cases, we have worked on a “dual agenda,” asserting that the work is not only about gender equity or work/family, but is also about more effective accomplishment of the mission of the organization. Yet our concern is that, for most managers, issues of gender equity lack the importance of “real work.” Real work, in the cases discussed in the conference, is about delivering credit or developing seeds or writing software. In the narrative in managers’ minds, the connection between gender equity and real work is not made.

The conference focused on four cases. All were well-resourced, long-term efforts to effect organizational change that would advance gender equity or work/family balance and improve organizational effectiveness. This focus on the “dual agenda” is an important aspect of SILC’s approach to intervention:

We select those issues that we believe will both, a) create a work environment that is supportive to both men and women, i.e. gender equity; and b) help the organization to meet its strategic objectives and strengthen its performance. The intersection of these two sets of concerns is what we call the dual agenda.²

Each of the four cases enjoyed some level of senior management sponsorship. These managers were interested in knowing what kind of gender relations existed in their organization, and whether these helped or hindered the organization’s ability to be effective. They were, however, less concerned with “deeper” questions of how organizational work practices and culture created an environment that was inherently at odds with the goal of bridging the divide between work and family life, or of delivering programs and services in a way that promoted gender-equitable relations. Although managers supported broad goals of work/family balance or increased gender equity, their interest or tolerance for deeper questions of changing relationships of power was mixed at best.

Participants at the conference were drawn from a variety of professional backgrounds, and work in the for-profit, not-for-profit and government sectors. The group included academics who carry out action research, change agents within organizations and consultants working on these issues

² Deborah Merrill-Sands, “Gender Issues in the Workplace,” Presentation to Association of Women in Development, Washington, DC, September 1996.

in several organizations. Despite their overlapping interests, two distinct approaches to this work were observable. Advocates who have worked for over two decades to define and implement international development policies and projects that are gender-equitable are coming up against the hard realities of systemic relations of power, and the organizational practices that maintain these relations. These advocates are now engaged in the challenging task of trying to re-envision organizations and ways of doing work. At the same time, change agents in the for-profit sector are trying to move beyond “equality projects” (e.g., hiring quotas) and the creation of organizations that better accommodate employees' family roles and women's ways of working, to begin to challenge deeply held assumptions and practices around concepts such as “productivity” and “efficiency.” The agenda for those who begin with work/family issues is not as overtly feminist or bent on women's empowerment, even though their vision of a new work life is distinctly radical.

At one level, what follows is a report of the conference. At another level, it is a "story." This narrative term is used to draw attention to a recurring theme of the two-day conference—how knowledge is created within and by organizations as well as how knowledge is created by those who study or seek to change organizations.

In this spirit, this report is a manufactured creation of several people who have tried to "mirror" the two-day discussion back to participants as well as to an outside audience. The first part of the report covers the discussion which emerged from presentations by four teams who are using gender analysis or a "gender lens" to create organizational change. The second part raises a series of questions, or repeating dilemmas, that continue to surface as our work in this area matures.

STICKING POINTS

Before discussing the cases, we identified "sticking points" in our work. Participants were asked to write three dilemmas or challenges they currently face in their work on three separate index cards. These topics were posted and participants then described their problems in greater depth. Not surprisingly, there were many overlaps. There were also a number of distinct themes:

- **Gender and organizational change projects require a certain change in power dynamics.** Internal change agents and other staff are leading a change process and expecting managerial support. Managers may be expecting to ensure that the process does not get "off track" (stray into issues within management purview). Who owns the process? Who moves it forward? How are differences negotiated between staff and management?
- **Power relations between managers and external change agents are also problematic.** How much latitude do external change agents have in raising issues and challenging management? How is this relationship negotiated?

- **Collaborative inquiry (the basis of much of our work) is time- and resource-intensive.** Internal staff need to balance involvement in gender projects with already full work lives. How can the process be sustained and energy maintained? Is the episodic involvement of external teams a part of this problem?
- **Using the dual agenda approach risks the disappearance of the gender side as interest in organizational effectiveness issues overshadows gender equity issues.** This involves the distinction between the "real work" or core business issues and gender as a lower priority issue. This also reflects the fact that women are devalued and hence work on gender is devalued. There can be a tendency for the work to become cosmetic instead of leading to the kinds of profound changes needed to create the basis for gender equity. As we scale up, how do we ensure that fundamental gender issues remain on the agenda?
- **We are not satisfied with our effectiveness in helping internal change agents use the gender lens and continually apply it in the organization.** Change cannot be sustained and scaled up without internal change agents.
- **Sustained change depends (at least in part) on the pressure of an external constituency such as donors, clients or consumers.** How are such external pressures fostered? How is accountability on this issue fostered?
- **The leadership group in any organization is likely to be attached to cultural and working practices that work for them.** What is "in it for them" to change the rules of the game and foster gender equity?
- **Backlash from groups who feel they are "losing out" disrupts the process of sustaining change and scaling up.** What do these groups think they are losing in the process of promoting gender equity? How can their concerns be constructively addressed? How can they be brought in as allies and supporters?

In our group discussion, it was clear that many of the issues identified were related to power. To be successful, our work should result in a fundamental change in power relations between women and men. But managers, generally men, may see their self-interests threatened by this process. At the very least, they are not likely to see gender work as real work. Nevertheless, they need to be partners and learners in the process. Change agents—both internal and external—need to have the license and ability to raise issues and challenge the organization in ways that create allies and do not result in a backlash. Even though change agents are working on the sufferance of management, they need to be able to work with outside constituencies and build organizational and managerial accountability for the change.

CREATING GENDER-EQUITABLE ORGANIZATIONS: FOUR CASE STUDIES

The case studies which were the foundation of the discussion were:

1. CREDIT³—a large southern non-governmental organization (NGO)
2. CROPS—an international agricultural research organization
3. FORTUNE 500—a multinational electronics corporation
4. GOOD STUFF—a multinational consumer products corporation

SILC associates played leadership roles in all these change efforts and all the cases share a general approach. All SILC projects are concerned with furthering the dual agenda. They use an action research method that begins with a collaborative search for aspects of organizational functioning that are gender-inequitable and organizationally ineffective. Although the cases are similar in many respects, there are also important differences between them along such dimensions as external pressure for change, the extent to which gender equity or women's empowerment could be seen as part of the organizational mandate, and explicit focus on gender issues.

In each case, team members posed a dilemma or set of dilemmas around their efforts to scale up the change process. In this context, scaling up means moving gender from the margins to the mainstream and moving from organizational experiments to institutionalized alternative work practices.

These organizations are doing brave work, but the learning process exposes a number of real tensions within organizations. Understandably, they are reluctant to expose these difficulties to an outside audience. Moreover, while these tensions may be interesting from an academic standpoint, they are being lived out in a very real environment. Action researchers' and consultants' relationships with organizations as well as relationships within organizations are at stake. Very often, the work is in progress, and it is always possible that tentative findings or observations may be misunderstood or misrepresented by an external audience. Nevertheless, we hope we have presented enough information to justify the conclusions drawn.

1. CREDIT

CREDIT is a very large indigenous rural development organization based in one of the poorest developing countries. In 1997, there were over 18,000 staff, approximately 30 percent of whom were women. CREDIT provides a variety of services to rural poor people (health, primary education) but its major program is the provision of small loans to support income generation projects.

Four years ago, at the beginning of the project, attitudes toward women in the organization—both as staff and as clients—were complicated and not necessarily complementary. Female staff

³ All names are pseudonyms.

were harassed or teased and, despite their growing numbers, their turnover rate continued to be high.

Concerned by women's inability to be full participants in program delivery, the executive director supported the development of a well-funded gender program, led by a team which included senior staff from CREDIT and outside consultants. The aims of this program were (1) to build staff capacity to plan, deliver and monitor gender-equitable programming and (2) to work with managers and staff to strengthen organizational systems in support of its gender goals.

After conducting a needs assessment, the team worked with senior managers to sharpen the potential program's focus and develop a field level intervention, called the "GQAL cycle."⁴ The methodology was based on action learning⁵ for bringing about change. This approach believes in the importance of situating learning in the work and doing the learning in intact office groupings rather than abstracting it into a discrete training initiative.

Large numbers of staff in different area offices were asked to define gender equity and organizational change issues in any one of three areas—individual attitudes and behavior, programmatic outcomes, and organizational systems—on which they could act. These action learning teams, supported by members of the gender team, selected a particular issue, focusing on the more actionable causes of the larger issue. A series of follow-up steps were designed to keep the process moving forward, and to help participants take action as well as see the connections between gender and organizational effectiveness. The gender team met regularly with regional and senior managers who, in turn, discussed the issues raised in the action learning groups, taking action on a number of issues.

A recent evaluation described how "improved relationships" between men and women staff have furthered the dual agenda, and how CREDIT is now being pushed to consider more fundamental issues.

The most common stated outcome or change achieved by the GQAL Program has been in the area of improved working relationships and more open communication at the area office level. For women, there is some indication that the improved relationships with their male colleagues and atmosphere in the area office has made staying in CREDIT a more attractive proposition. For example, a female program assistant reported to a GQAL facilitator that she changed her decision to resign after seeing such improvements in the area office. In some divisions, mostly due the larger numbers of women staff, "improved relationships" have had clear gender dimensions such as improved working relationships between men and women, women eating along with male staff, and reduced gendered demarcations in work leading to men valuing women's capabilities. Male staff report more respect for women staff's capabilities, and in some cases have gone out of their way to stop community members from teasing women staff riding bicycles.

⁴ Gender Quality Action Learning Program

⁵ See Nancy Dixon, *The Organizational Learning Cycle: How We Can Learn Collectively*, McGraw-Hill, London: 1994

A related outcome appears to be a democratization of the relationship between levels of staff specifically between the front-line workers, program organizers, and managers, and as well between area office staff and the regional managers. Regional Managers report that the "commanding voices" of managers have changed to "listening voices." Some spill-over effects of this improved relationship can be seen in work efficiency through mutual support and joint problem solving, improved time management, and work effectiveness. For example, previously, managers simply instructed staff on what to do. Staff now analyze problems and try to come up with solutions jointly. This, the managers conclude, increases staff's ownership over the work—it's no longer the manager's problem or CREDIT's problem, it's theirs. In addition, staff are naming program problems early on so that they can be dealt with before they take on large proportions. Managers report a greater willingness on their part to listen to these problems and not penalize staff for raising them. Another spillover effect of improved communications at the area office has been in improved work family balance. Managers cite a greater sensitivity to staff needs to communicate with their families and are more willing to grant leave on a regular basis and not view it as a lack of commitment to work. Managers have been pleasantly surprised that posting spouses in the same branch or close to home has not resulted in decreased work efficiency; in fact quite the opposite has occurred.

A clear outcome evidenced by the above is that staff members who have participated in GQAL assisted by trained facilitators, are now quite familiar with GQAL's action learning process. They can identify and analyze an issue, develop an action plan to deal with it, and carry out a set of activities aimed at achieving their objective. This has led to increased transparency of issues and decisions taken to deal with them. As a result, managers who were wary of GQAL at the start have breathed a sigh of relief. They no longer believe that the process will lead to heaping of blame on their shoulders and thus jeopardize their career prospects in CREDIT. The entire process was carefully shepherded by the GQAL facilitators, many of whom have evolved from trainers to change agents and problem facilitators. Where they were experienced program personnel, joined the staff as a member not as an outsider, and continually engaged staff in discussions rather than confrontation, we saw productive outcomes.⁶

This problem-solving and responsibility-taking on the part of staff has opened space within the organization for critical voices. At the same time, this new critical space has allowed bigger, more complex issues about leadership and the culture of leadership to surface. Although the organization holds women's empowerment as a goal, it seeks to achieve this goal through very instrumental means. To this end, field level managers have been valued for their ability to manage the "hard" aspects of development, such as meeting targets for loan disbursement and repayment. However, to achieve the broader goals of social change, managers who can manage the "soft" aspects of development such as staff relations, empowerment, and gender issues are also needed. At the same time, as a result of the GQAL process, new forms of power relationships are beginning to emerge within the organization. Values such as collegiality and transparency are helping to change the organizational culture, particularly at the field level.

However, this change raises questions about power and leadership. It poses a challenge to mid-level and senior managers who must consider how traditional, patriarchal systems of accountability, forms of control over information, definitions of success and decision-making can support increased attention to empowerment.

⁶ Aruna Rao and David Kelleher, GQAL Program Evaluation, August, 1997.

These issues, along with a proposal for how management could examine issues of power and leadership, were presented to senior managers by the external consultants. However, debate about whether and how to move forward has been suspended for the time being. This is due in large part to the fact that managers in the organization are overwhelmed by the pressures to deal with the day-to-day aspects of basic operations. In particular, the organization has set a goal of becoming financially self-sustaining by the year 2002. Managers argue that taking time away from the pressing needs of organizational business to discuss and plan for issues such as gender and leadership is not possible at the present time.

Our discussion highlighted that the dichotomy created—between time spent on leadership and the operational requirements facing managers—raises the possibility not of a "dual agenda" (focusing on both gender and organizational effectiveness) but of "dueling agendas." We wondered whether the narrative of "organizational effectiveness," which is embedded in ideas of efficiency, return on investment, competition for resources and attention to quantitative instrumental ends, is compatible with a focus on gender, which must work with a less hard-edged idea like social relations. We realized that success depends on resolving this apparent dilemma—and asked if it made sense to integrate gender considerations of power and leadership into CREDIT's upcoming strategic planning exercise. Although there were concerns as to whether a process such as strategic planning (with all its connotations of organizational rationality) could be a place of resolution between gender equity and organizational effectiveness, it was felt that this was the best opportunity to knit together these apparently disparate strands.

Finding ways to link the goals of social change, empowerment and organizational efficiency remains a challenge for the consulting team. They are not alone—throughout the two-day discussion, participants continually described a similar problem. Gender or the enhancement of gender relations is rarely seen as the real work of an organization. Therefore, managers can make a fully rational decision to marginalize or put on hold these questions while they continue with the organization's "real work," be it scientific research, expanding market share or increasing area coverage of a rural development program. Managers and staff need language and concepts to understand and be able to make these connections. At the same time, they need the resources of time and space, to be able to step back and think critically and creatively about alternative possibilities for managing organizational performance and growth.

2. CROPS

With the assistance of an external action research team, an international agricultural research center in Latin America undertook a several-year, multi-phased collaborative action research project. The goal was to identify aspects of the organization's work culture and practices that hindered its ability to (1) create a workplace that is equally supportive of the productivity and job satisfaction of men and women; and (2) achieve its mission and strategic goals.

The team conducted interviews with a representative sample of CROPS staff, using open-ended questions, but focusing on a range of themes that experience and theory suggest are closely linked to fostering gender equity in organizations. The topics included: the organization of work

and work processes; use of time and the interface of work and family responsibilities; organizational culture; decision-making and communications; internal collaboration; management systems; leadership and management styles; and vision and strategic direction. Based on these interviews, the consultant team developed an analysis of "mental models"—deeply held assumptions and core beliefs of individuals within the organization about its mission, its way of doing things, and the kinds of practices that are expected and valued widely.⁷

Like many other not-for-profit organizations, CROPS operates: in an environment of multiplying priorities; with changing demographics in the labor force; with new, collaborative relationships being developed with other institutions; and with tightening financial resources. In other words, the "what" of the organization had changed, but "how" the organization carried out its mission was slower to adapt. The action research team sought to identify the operative mental models that were impeding the organization's ability to adjust to this changed external environment as well as to foster greater gender equity.

The action research team identified four mental models: reliance on a unifying and compelling mission; belief in individual achievement; default to hierarchy; and the "ideal" CROPS worker. Although these mental models used to make sense for CROPS, they now create dilemmas and tensions for staff as the organization tries to reposition itself in a changed environment. In addition to offering unfiltered feedback of the organizational culture, the team's analysis demonstrated systematically the implications of these models for gender equity and organizational performance.

For example, a belief in a unifying mission or individual achievement created an environment in which work agendas were over-crowded, and collaboration, support or the production of "intermediate" products such as improved methodologies, information or research support was devalued. The model of the "ideal" worker, defined as someone who would sacrifice almost anything to carry out the organization's mission, created tremendous pressures on the increasing numbers of families of working women and men with working spouses. Similarly, the belief that a worker had to do it all translated into a reluctance to delegate tasks or come up with new models of accomplishing work.

A new strategic organizational focus or mission would likely lead to improvements in the quality and efficiency of the organization's research. A clear strategic focus and rethinking the "ideal" CROPS worker would also help address the problems of time and agenda overload and reduce the stress felt by many staff, particularly those with heavy family responsibilities. Developing more explicit and systematic ways to recognize and reward staff for the wider range of contributions and products called for by the new mission would likely motivate a broader pool of organizational workers, thus enhancing organizational performance. It would create an

⁷ The term "mental models" is a concept developed by Peter Senge at Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He defines mental models as "deeply ingrained images and assumptions...which we carry in our minds of ourselves, other people, institutions...Like panes of glass, framing and subtly distorting our vision, mental models determine what we see and how we act. Because mental models are usually tacit, existing below the level of awareness, they are often untested and unexamined." (Senge et al., *The Fifth Discipline Fieldbook*, Doubleday, New York: 1994: 235-36).

environment in which the contributions of those in support or intermediate product roles and positions, many of whom are women, would be valued. A more collaborative work structure would encourage different perspectives on solving complex research models and would thereby improve organizational performance.

This analysis was presented to the organizational community over the course of six days. The feedback process was highly interactive. Staff and managers, grouped by organizational units and programs and then by thematic interests, were asked to discuss the analysis and its relevance to their work, and to identify possible strategies or experiments for change. This intensive, interactive event released creative energy within the organization and, importantly, modeled alternative and non-hierarchical ways of working and communicating. The discussions resulted in the identification of eight priority organizational change experiments which were designed to disrupt the dominant models and provide staff with an opportunity to experience alternative ways of working and interacting. A Change Catalyst Committee (CCC) was set up to provide stewardship and facilitate the changes.

Approximately nine months later, the action research team carried out a "taking stock" analysis to identify whether the strategies and experiments were being enacted, whether they were contributing to improvements in organizational performance and gender equity, what changes might be necessary, and what lessons could be extracted and institutionalized. The most encouraging finding was that the work environment was significantly more hospitable, making it easier for women as well as men to succeed and contribute. Staff reported that more work was needed but that change was clearly moving in the right direction. Equally important, men did not report experiencing negative repercussions from the efforts aimed at strengthening gender equity.

The interviews also pointed out, however, several continuing dilemmas. Not surprisingly, one of the more important observations was the difficulty of keeping attention focused on both parts of the dual agenda—organizational effectiveness and gender equity. Staff noted that progress had been made in developing a sharper strategic focus, enhancing the downward and upward flow of communication and participation in decision-making, and initiating more collaborative activities. On the other hand, progress had been slow to nonexistent with regard to two dimensions with particularly salient gender themes: recognizing diverse products and contributions and invisible work; and time pressures and the ability of staff to more effectively integrate their work and personal lives.

In other words, staff continued to feel intense time pressures and remained unsure about the organization's ability to develop work practices that would help it perform better with a newer, flatter structure. In some ways, this echoes concerns raised elsewhere during the conference about the separation in many managers' minds between real work and gender equity. However, because the analysis so carefully spelled out the connections between the two agendas, it is more likely that the lack of progress on these latter initiatives also reflects the difficulty of creating and enacting structural changes in an organization's culture. Managers or organizational leaders who have performed successfully in an organization may find it difficult to imagine alternative work practices, such as video conferencing or expanding the channels of feedback on performance.

Using a gender lens allowed the action research team to point to aspects of organizations—such as organizational culture, decision-making and communication, and leadership—that affect the ability of male and female, old-timers and newcomers, and employees in different functions of the organization to produce, innovate, contribute fully, and lead satisfying professional and personal lives. It also enabled the team to look at "feminine" aspects of organizational culture—such as systems of support, caring, inclusion, and collaboration—that do not typically receive attention. However, as both the action research team and conference participants noted, the difficulty of keeping attention focused on the gender implications of some of the broader issues discussed in the organization begs the question of how useful most staff find the concept of gender.

This is a particularly salient question given that the first round of interviews and the feedback session highlighted other, more obvious dimensions of social inequality within the organization—most notably a division between international and national staff. One of the experiments chosen by staff during the feedback process was the establishment of a task force, comprised of both internationally and nationally recruited staff, to review the benefits package of both groups and reduce the disparities between them. The Change Catalyst Committee worked at getting this "experiment" underway for almost a year but was never successful. The pressure for action to address perceived inequities among some national staff overrode the interest in inquiry and analysis. In the end, the Human Resources Department took on the issue and began to work on staff classification and salary issues. Despite the failure in launching the experiment, during the "taking stock" exercise, staff noted that this greater attention to equity issues for national staff was an area of positive change.

Team members and conference participants struggled with the extent to which gender as an axis of social inequality gets privileged above other axes such as race, ethnicity, and professional training. In this example, this privileging was reflected both in the composition of the external team (predominantly white, North American, professional women) and the scope of its mandate.⁸ By continuing to separate gender from other aspects of social inequality, are we as action researchers and activists guilty of the same kind of functional isolationism for which we often criticize social programs? Alternatively, do we need to make explicit attempts to highlight gender because it is so often made invisible?

Another theme from this case that resonated among workshop participants was the issue of creating effective internal constituencies. Because the action research team wanted to build internal capacity for advancing the change effort, it first worked with a Gender Task Force composed of staff appointed by the Director General to offer insights and feedback on the research design and analysis. The Gender Task Force also collaborated on the feedback process and the development of ideas for change. Once new strategies or experiments were identified, however, a new Change Catalyst Committee was established, composed exclusively of volunteers, to move these initiatives forward.

⁸ It is important to note that after the initial data collection process, the action research team communicated the importance of national staff concerns to senior staff and recommended that a different, but complementary, consultancy be established to address these issues and the links to organizational effectiveness.

While this approach was successful at the level of system-wide interventions, it was less successful when it came to changing work practices within specific units or projects. Managers questioned the committee's role and authority in looking at these issues, feeling that these were not "gender" issues but "management" issues. The action research team also noted that, in relying almost exclusively on the volunteer committee as its collaborative partner, it lost contact with senior managers. Finally, because the committee was made up of volunteers, supervisors were reluctant to acknowledge the time commitment in staff's formal work plans. They implicitly asserted that staff interested in working on the committee should do so on their own time.

Stepping back to ask what strategies were aiding as well as blocking scaling up, the conference came up with the following:

- **The project's emphasis on broad staff participation strengthened staff's ownership of the analysis and proposed changes and experiments.** This contributed positively to scaling up the effect.
- **The use of mental models helped people to hold on to the core of the analysis and to a certain extent, to the dual agenda analysis.** It gave them language to discuss behaviors and norms that had been taken for granted in the organization.
- **The Director General set up a new committee (the Change Catalyst Committee) to continue work on the changes emerging from the analysis** (this drew on some members of the original Gender Task Force, but also included others who had become excited about the kinds of changes being promoted). This group was designed to become the "voice for the dual agenda" as well as an internal group pushing for change. The shortcomings were that the action research team did not spend enough time with this group working on the analysis so that it was internalized and shared; the Chair had not gone through the feedback session; and members were not experienced or well informed about how to bring about organizational change. From a political point of view, the volunteer group suffered because it did not include recognized organizational leaders.
- **The action research team kept close links with the Director General, and he understood the process and analysis.** But they did not devote sufficient time to working with the middle managers who actually had to champion the workplace experiments and also who felt the most threatened by the process.
- **The project had the benefit of external pressure from donors,** which has helped to ensure that managers and staff continue to pay attention to these issues and feel accountable for showing results.

- **A major challenge for the action research team was developing the capacity of the internal change agent group and establishing a collaborative relationship with them.** The outside team was also frustrated by the polarization that ensued as the CCC felt empowered and middle managers felt threatened, and the loss of connection with the management team as the outside team attempted to give voice to others. The real problem was getting experiments launched in work groups. Once the team met again with the managers, this began to move forward.
- **The action research team used the Take Stock exercise after nine months to refocus people on the issue, the mental models, the change experiments and the desired outcomes.** They also used this as a way to assist the organization in narrowing the scope of the work and focus on several initiatives to which members of the management team were committed. This helped to reestablish energy and interest that had waned through the polarization of relationships between the CCC and the management team.
- **Other equity issues have been opened up as a result of the work on gender and these are more controversial (e.g., national-international staff issues).** These can tend to overshadow gender or cause retrenching as managers feel that too much is being "opened up."

Identifying and nurturing a broad base of stakeholders of the dual agenda, and creating mechanisms to mobilize staff interest without overburdening their time or an organization's limited material resources, remains a challenge for many workshop participants. The need to create a broader base is suggested by the inability of staff and managers to articulate for themselves what a concern with gender equity means in the context of their organization. The origins of this disconnect are considered in the next case.

3. FORTUNE 500

Concerned that the turnover rate among female employees, particularly executives, continued to be high and that women were not moving up the organization hierarchy despite a range of policies and benefits packages intended to maintain and support them, a Fortune 500 company agreed to assist a team of external action researchers in a knowledge-seeking process. In their research framework, the team used a "work-family lens" to engage people in a process of reflection on systemic dimensions of work—such as how work is structured, how time is spent, and how commitment and competence are defined—that make it difficult for individuals to integrate their work and family lives.

Using data collected through in-depth interviews and on-site observations, the research team was able to document how shared organizational norms about the ideal worker emphasized someone who was willing to devote all his or her energy to the good of the company. They also found that, for many, images of the ideal worker were closely intertwined with gender roles and expectations. Thus men were expected to put their career first and to have wives who would take primary responsibility for child care. These ideas were translated and reinforced in various work practices such as early morning meetings, all-night work sessions, and week-long training

programs in distant cities. Despite policies that allowed for flex-time or work-sharing, male employees were reluctant to ask for these arrangements. Female executives spoke of an internalized pressure to hide their families and family responsibilities. The team was also able to demonstrate how these kinds of attitudes and practices translated into poor productivity. People who were denied, or were reluctant to seek, alternative work arrangements would call in sick or take days off, leaving the company short-staffed and contributing to a backlog of work. The action research team also reinterpreted all night work sessions as the result of poor planning rather than heroic efforts.

The team worked with managers to institute experiments to boost productivity and support a more balanced work-family life. Line managers began to encourage more flexible work arrangements, and to rethink their criteria for competence and commitment. At the same time, they saw that these changes did not interfere with, and in fact often boosted, productivity. In one site where semi-autonomous teams were responsible for their own work schedules, there was a 30 percent decrease in absenteeism, and customer responsiveness was increased with extended coverage. At another site, the researchers helped engineers restructure their work days to include, among other things, blocks of time when engineers would focus on their own work without interruptions. The results were less overtime and an on-time launch of a new product which won a number of excellence awards.

Despite these successes, the research team was disappointed when a company executive, as part of a public presentation to a business school, was unable to link the project to the strategic and structural initiatives in the firm. Before the presentation, one of the principal researchers from the work-family intervention urged him to describe the intervention and its positive outcomes, yet he could not work it into the presentation. This seemed to indicate the gap in managers' minds between this work and questions of strategy and effectiveness.

In our conference, participants viewed a video tape of the presentation and took up two questions: (1) why was this executive unable to make the connections; and (2) what strategies might gender and organizational change consultants pursue to help make these connections more obvious? In answer to the first question, participants suggested that the presenter's perception of his audience, their interest, and the kind of role he wanted to project were important. The presenter used macho language and gestures (for example, he spoke repeatedly about the "guys" in the company and focused heavily on the issue of compensation and how managers who did not measure up were gone). Because the composition of most business schools continues to be predominantly male, it is reasonable to assume that, in the presenter's mind, talking about gender and work-family issues would not have communicated what he wanted to about himself and the company.

Another participant pointed out that, although his presentation emphasized "organograms" and "interconnected bubbles," it was still a traditional view that lacked real understanding of a number of the innovations he was describing. For example, he spoke about "empowerment" as a discrete attribute that employees either did or did not have, as if the company could simply replace people who weren't empowering or empowered with those who were. In short, the presentation on organizational change simply gave a different title to an old paradigm.

Phrases like "empathic listening," "energizing people," and "teamwork" remain abstract without concrete examples of what they look like in practice. As several participants pointed out, because gender and organizational change agents look at the nitty-gritty of everyday work practice, we can demonstrate how skills like empathic listening can help smooth difficulties and avoid crises in the workplace, or how teamwork involves passing on key information to others and taking time from individual work to teach someone a new way of doing something. At the same time, however, the focus on the nitty-gritty tends to yield a complex and often messy picture. Therefore, we speak in "ifs, ands, and buts," and this can be frustrating, even alienating, to those who are accustomed to thinking in terms of discrete outputs. As one participant noted, our language is about dilemmas, whereas their language is about results.

The level of abstraction in the presentation provoked a discussion among participants about what prompts personal transformation or the ability of an individual to really "get" gender. Does it happen because of a crisis? For example, does a male business executive suddenly begin to prioritize gender issues once his own daughter shares stories of her experience with sexual harassment? Or are people motivated to understand someone else's story because they develop a caring relationship with someone of the opposite gender or a different race, ethnic or class background? More importantly, if the locus of transformation is indeed at the personal level, what does this imply for our efforts to change structures?

Clearly, developing a personal relationship with someone "different" does not necessarily mean a change in attitude, particularly if, as in the case of gender roles, expectations are scripted by social institutions. This suggests that a focus on structural changes may not be misplaced, as it provides an opening in the "conversation" or "script" in which people can think differently about themselves and their relationships with others. In this regard, one strategy for promoting change is to develop language or scripts that sound somewhat familiar to the managers and leaders with whom we work. Offering concrete examples that allow them to situate phrases like "empathic listening" and "teamwork" within their own work culture is key.

Perhaps we can begin to think about our work as a product—i.e., paying attention to gender issues accomplishes certain goals. In this way, we can also begin to think about how to "market" our product. This could involve asking our "opponents" to define the gaps—what in our analysis or language or product does not make sense to them, what seems extraneous, and so forth. Once these gaps have been identified, we can ask our allies to help us create language that will effectively communicate what our "product" offers. This could also involve creating demand for the product by creating situations in which a manager or organization gets rewarded for paying attention to gender issues and the link these have to organizational effectiveness.

In the not-for-profit sector, emphasizing donor priorities is one "hook," but this may also work against us as donor priorities change—we do not want the work to seem to be only a passing fad. It may also be possible to link this work to other external changes, such as changing demographics in the labor force or customer/client base. Conversely, it may be possible to link this work to internal or staff needs for change in the day-to-day operations. Regardless of the hook used, participants agreed that the critical issue was to demonstrate to managers and leaders that, by not addressing gender issues, organizational effectiveness will be lessened.

4. GOOD STUFF

As with the CREDIT and CROPS cases, this case focused more on the "gender" component of the dual agenda. An action research team was invited to collaborate with staff and senior managers to develop interventions to promote gender equity within a for-profit corporation. Based in the UK, the organization manufactures, distributes and sells finished consumer goods in its own retail shops in over 50 countries around the world. Established by a socially conscious and activist woman, the company takes a radical approach to business and campaigns for a variety of social and political causes as it promotes its own products.

The goal for the action research team in this case was to develop a theoretical framework and action approach that would radically challenge the language, cultural assumptions and practices that create and perpetuate the processes that lead to gender inequities. This kind of approach seeks to legitimize other voices, integrate masculine and feminine, and challenge oppressive roles and images. Only by challenging core assumptions and power relations will new narratives of work, criteria for success and participation, and alternative formulations of careers emerge. As always, however, this critique and alternative visioning are linked to issues of organizational effectiveness. In other words, the action research team hypothesized that current gendered practices and narratives undermine productivity at the individual and systemic levels.

In the data collection phase, members of the team interviewed a range of staff in the organization, from those who worked on the production lines to those who supervised the lines, to managers responsible for more strategic activities such as marketing and advertising. A dominant theme that emerged from these interviews was that many staff felt under-appreciated and complained of having a difficult time doing their jobs. These sentiments were echoed by staff at all levels in the organization, regardless of tenure or gender. This is perhaps not surprising given that the organization is only 20 years old and has grown at a phenomenal rate, particularly in the last decade. Channels of authority and hierarchy developed on a somewhat *ad hoc* basis, and are more often tied to individuals and their relationships to senior managers, including the founder, than to specific functions or systemic work flows. Individuals who were very aggressive and self-promotional, and who developed personal relationships with senior staff, tended to be the ones who advanced in the organization. Significantly, these individuals, more often than not, were men. Consequently, as new staff have been brought on in recent years to help manage and guide the company as it continues its rapid expansion, there have been challenges incorporating these people into the organization. This has led to escalating tensions over whether people with the appropriate skills are working at the appropriate tasks.

In staff narratives, this dilemma is framed in terms of "competence." Senior managers complain that people who report to them are not competent for their jobs, so that managers have to do their jobs as well as their own, inhibiting effectiveness. At the same time, lower-level staff report being unable to carry out their responsibilities because supervisors are constantly micro-managing their work.

Although confident in their analysis, the research team was concerned that this diagnosis, focusing on both gender and organizational effectiveness, would be accepted by the organization as a critique of organizational practice generally, and that the gender part of the analysis would disappear. In an earlier intervention with this organization, the team had set up self-managed teams in one of the factories in an effort to both improve effectiveness and change gender inequities on the shop floor. Although the self-managed teams worked reasonably well and were extended by management, the original connection to gender equity was lost by men and women alike. In the next phase of the intervention, having developed the analysis which showed how competence was systematically degraded (and how this happened in different ways for women), the research team was concerned that once again, gender would be lost.

The dilemma the research team posed to workshop participants was how to mirror this information to the organization so that gender would not get lost. One way to do this is to show how and where individual men and women in the organization experience the dilemma of competence. According to preliminary data analysis, it seems that frustrations run highest in the more strategic units of the firm—units in which women as middle managers and men as senior managers tend to predominate. However, as the research team acknowledged, these patterns are not necessarily consistent. Further, this approach maintains a focus on individuals, whereas the real challenge is to draw attention to system-level power relationships. The goal is to encourage managers to ask "are we giving people the right brief" rather than focus only on whether or not they have the right people.

Participants suggested that the research team present its findings about "competence" in the overarching frame of gender. While the organization, or at least certain individuals and organizational units (specifically marketing, which explicitly draws upon the company's image as a socially conscious manufacturer and trader) take pride in not being a traditional bureaucracy, staff do not seem to have a clearly articulated alternative in mind. At most, some staff identify "feminine" aspects of the organization's identity as different from the norm. However, within the organization, feminine voices are silenced as some of the people who speak in them are rendered incompetent over time. By giving different language to these dichotomies of masculine and feminine approaches—by de-emphasizing the distinction between rationality and emotion—staff and the action research team could then explore questions like: What kinds of competence are necessary for the company to continue to succeed in the global marketplace? What kinds of systems are necessary to support and nurture individual competence? In this framework, questions of competence, which often play out at a very individual level ("does this person have what it takes?") are situated within the larger system of what the organization is and what it is trying to accomplish. This approach also begins to clarify the connections between the dilemmas in an organization which tries to conduct radical business in a capitalist world and the dilemmas—even in the same unit—between individuals who expect or are expected to simply get the job done, and those who expect or are expected to pursue other goals of social change.

Other participants saw benefits in making gender the explicit frame because it allowed an open discussion focused specifically on gender and gendered power relations. Until gender is defined explicitly as a problem, it will remain hidden and no movement is possible.

Some additional thoughts regarding the strategy for the presentation included using real life case studies where success, as traditionally defined by the bottom line, was exemplified in executives or store owners who embody some of the criteria of gender equity. For example, a franchise owner in North America uses her shops to create a platform for social activism in her community around issues like violence against women. Participants also noted that including varying levels of staff in the same feedback session creates a situation in which senior staff have to hear the voices of their subordinates and engage in dialogue with them as they process that information, setting in motion a very different kind of learning and action process.

ISSUE SYNTHESIS AND DISCUSSION

Looking at the cases, what did we learn about scaling up? In particular, what did we learn about our efforts to "engage with and fundamentally challenge the power relations and associated narratives that define the meaning of work in late 20th century organizations?"

The conference demonstrated that we are able to precipitate and sustain change processes that can significantly affect the experience of women in organizations, making organizations more hospitable to women. There were also demonstrated improvements to organizational effectiveness in three of the four cases. Moreover, we are developing agreement on the main outlines of a process for gender and organizational change. There was broad agreement at the conference that staff participation, the dual agenda, an effective internal change agent team, the use of mental models to provide a cognitive map, pressure from outside, and casting changes in terms understood and agreed to by managers are all key factors in successful efforts.

However, the conference also demonstrated the difficulty of reaching deeper levels of these organizations. These change programs had difficulty focusing on issues such as the nature of leadership, the balance between work and family, the question of what type of work is valued, and the place of gender in larger strategic questions related to the mission of the organization. These are questions at the level of what Schein calls underlying assumptions. This is the level of "unconscious, taken for granted beliefs, perceptions, thoughts and feelings that are the ultimate source of values and action."⁹ This has also been called the "deep structure" of organizations.¹⁰

The conference was able to develop some understanding about what makes affecting the deep structure so difficult. It was clear that there are three factors which make this type of change difficult: "dueling agendas," the power of privilege and the lack of systems of accountability. We also realized that we need to improve a key aspect of our strategy—working with internal change agent teams.

Dueling Agendas

⁹ Schein, E.H., from a presentation given at the Cape Cod Institute, Summer, 1995.

¹⁰ Aruna Rao and Rieky Stuart, *Rethinking organizations: a feminist perspective*, Gender and Development, Oxford: Oxfam Publications, February, 1997.

Much of the work in all the cases is founded on a belief in the importance of the dual agenda—that our work is focused on enhancing gender equity *and* organizational effectiveness. Although our discussion did not challenge this as a fundamental orientation of our work, we did realize how gender equity and organizational effectiveness may be seen as dueling agendas. Much of our discussion focused on how these agendas of gender equity and organizational effectiveness are at odds with each other.

In CREDIT, gender was seen as "being nice" as opposed to the normal, not so nice requirements of organizational life. This is a telling observation that betrays the deeper differences between the two agendas. It shows how the pursuit of gender equity in organizations challenges core values and narratives of organizations. There has been much discussion of how the key operating ideas of organizations were designed by men to allow them to work in ways amenable to their sense of identity. The prevalence in all the organizations of the myth of heroic individual effort as a key to success is a strong example of this. Other aspects of the myth structure include the capitalist social structure with its attendant ideology of the market, quantifiable results as the measure of success and the organizational hegemony of operational goals. Contrast this with the trappings of gender work—a focus on process, a concern for hidden aspects of work and their (often contested) gender implications, and a vagueness about outcome.

Most of us would agree that "numbers of women at different levels" is a necessary but far from sufficient measure of our work. The true measures of our work include a concern for relations (particularly, but not exclusively, power relations) between women and men, a concern for organizations' impact on lives of the men and women they serve, and a concern for organizational impacts on the personal and family lives of organizational members. We are also concerned that women and men have equal opportunities to be innovative and productive at work and have equal voice in shaping the strategy, work and work environment of the organization. These are all both difficult to quantify and well outside the competition-driven, liberal political philosophy of the organizations with which we work.

Perhaps it should not be surprising that, in all of the cases, it was a struggle to keep gender visible and on the agenda. Gender was marginalized as an issue, not seen as "real work." In one case, a gender change process had earned its way on the operational agenda of managers, but it is proving much more difficult to get busy, operationally-minded managers to think more deeply about the need for changes in leadership styles and power relations.

Power and Privilege

During the conference, we also spent time talking about how the interests of gender equity and the interests of those currently in power differ and separate along gender lines. First and foremost, gender equity may be counter to the career interests of men in the organization. Secondly, these types of interventions challenge the power basis and unspoken assumptions about power, legitimacy and privilege. Often, those in the vanguard of the challenge are external consultants, there at the sufferance of management, and it is possible that projects can come to an untimely end if they get too far beyond what management sees as important or appropriate. As one participant put it, power can refuse talk. Because of their position, consultants or action

researchers are limited in their opportunities to develop constituencies which may push for change.

Accountability

There is some growing understanding in some organizations that equity, and diversity more generally, are in the best interests of organizations because of either marketplace or labor demographics, or because of the opportunities for organizational learning.¹¹ However, conference participants felt that the question of accountability to constituencies as a reason for organizations to pursue gender equity is not a well-developed aspect of our work. Finally, although we believe that gender equity would improve effectiveness, in many of the organizations we discussed, the measurement of managerial effectiveness is not a simple process and most managers are not directly accountable for effectiveness. In fact, effectiveness is a socially-developed concept, and an outsider's view of what is effective may be far from congruent with the true basis of managers' rewards.

Internal Change Agent Teams

Much hope for change is pinned to the success of internal change agent teams. All of the cases worked with a group of insider change agents, and although we recognized their importance to the process, we realized that we are far from understanding how best to work with internal teams. We need to be clearer about the composition, role, training and internal functioning of internal change teams. For example, one group of internal change agents was composed of volunteers drawn from participants at a diagnostic workshop—they were committed and savvy, but lacked the structural license to deal with what were called "management" as opposed to "gender" issues.

(The distinction is interesting and problematic in itself.)

Perhaps even more challenging for internal change agent groups is that they are expected to exemplify the new way while living in the old. For example, one team had a terribly difficult time dealing with its own gender relations and expectations of power relationships, and endured a series of difficult interpersonal conflicts. In addition, this team was also attempting to work in a very democratic manner in a very hierarchical organization, and experienced the strains of fitting ideals to the realities of organizational systems of work planning, performance appraisal and career advancement.

An internal team's relationship with senior management is a critical aspect of its effectiveness and its interest in continuing to work on the issue. Internal change agents need good connections with management to enable access to managerial power. They also need to know that their own careers are not going to be threatened by this work, but may be enhanced. Ironically, some change agents come to be seen as very effective organizational operators and are promoted away from the gender team.

¹¹ See David Thomas and Robin Ely, Making Differences Matter: A New Paradigm for Managing Diversity, Harvard Business Review, Volume 74, Number 5, September-October 1996.

Lessons Learned

By the end of the conference, we came to see that, although all the cases had experienced important successes, scaling up faced the gap between the gender equity agenda and existing life in the organization at the level of the deep structure. The conference developed at least three tentative answers to the question of how to work at this deeper level.

1. Building connection through communication—working with the goals, language and ideology of the organization to build a bridge to equity issues. In CREDIT, the consultants spent many months in discussion with senior managers, developing a conception of the project and of "women's empowerment" that fit with the managers' goals, language and sense of priorities. In GOOD STUFF, close collaboration with key allies was vital to the success of a critical presentation to the board. This communication needs to continue throughout the process, highlighting stories of changes that meet the test of the dual agenda. Another aspect of this bridging is to use familiar organizational tools such as strategic planning, targets and quarterly reviews as a way of working with people around gender issues. This is probably most successful when it combines the "familiar" of planning, setting objectives and so on with the "new" of democratic practice and attention to gender issues. CROPS was a good example of this, with intensive interactive feedback and planning followed up with a stocktaking nine months later.

2. Changing minds through shaping a new organizational narrative and work practices. At CROPS, the project developed the concept of mental models which allowed members to see problems in new ways. Staff members went on to develop new work practices that challenged existing mental models and allowed people to see alternative ways of working and interacting. The use of the mental models as orienting devices became part of the CROPS organizational language. At GOOD STUFF, an analysis of the idea of "competence" is attempting to build a different organizational story that allows people to think in new ways about how women are sidelined.

New organizational narratives challenge the hegemony of traditional organizational thinking, and make visible what was previously unconscious. An important aspect of this strategy is shaping small wins. A number of the cases talked about the importance of working to accomplish achievable goals and build momentum. In particular, creating "ideas that travel," or stories that give people a new way of seeing a piece of organizational reality, is a central strategy for

co-opting or supplanting parts of the current organizational story. A "small wins" strategy, of course, leads to other questions, such as how to aggregate a series of small wins into a larger change process.¹²

¹² See, Karl Weick, Small Wins: Redefining the Scale of Social Problems, *American Psychologist*, Volume 39, Number 1, January 1984.

3. Appealing to the self interests of a broad group of people in the organization. An approach which emphasizes women's issues and sets up a dichotomy of interests will be resisted by the very people with sufficient power to mount that resistance. In contrast, the dual agenda places the focus on both gender equity and organizational effectiveness. Within the discussion of organizational effectiveness, issues of interest to both men and women will inevitably emerge. In CREDIT and FORTUNE 500, the focus on more time for personal and family life was attractive to both men and women. At CROPS, the focus on 360 degree evaluation met the needs of a broad group of men and women for managerial accountability, recognition of “invisible work,” and also met the needs of managers for information and feedback.

CONCLUSION

This conference acknowledged the success of a particular approach to gender and organizational change and also deepened our understanding of the blocks to affecting organizations at the level of the deep structure. It is clear that these interventions need to affect organizations at the strategic level. The link between gender equity and the accomplishment of strategic goals must be clear and explicit.

It may be instructive to reflect on these efforts in the light of what we know of other efforts to affect the deep structure of organizations in order to accomplish strategic ends—that is, the transition to post-bureaucratic forms of organization that has been underway for the past thirty years (at least in Europe and North America).

One way of seeing the cases discussed at the conference is that they have been successful at precipitating change. Their critique of gender relations in organizations and the associated impact on organizational effectiveness has caught the attention of these organizations and opened up discussion of new ways of working. These projects have provided new ways of thinking and a process for discussion, surfaced hitherto silent voices, experimented with new practices and built internal constituencies and leadership for change. They have also provided at least some of the guiding principles that describe the direction of the change. This may be seen as the first phase of change.

Succeeding phases depend on a major organizational commitment but, more specifically, they will depend on a combination of pressure to change (from the outside and the inside) and support for a major organizational learning process. Organizations that are able to invent and sustain new, gender-equitable ways of working will require a learning process that will call on them to be much more permeable, to be searching for ideas and people that can help them develop the new practices and structures. At the same time, they will need to develop the capacity for dialogue—to be able to hold thoughtful discussions that challenge deeply-held values and practices. Most importantly, these changes will succeed if people at all levels of the organization and both genders are willing to give leadership to the effort. The cases discussed at this conference give us hope that such leadership is possible.