



The Teflon Effect: When the Glass Slipper meets Merit

Journal:	<i>Gender in Management: an International Journal</i>
Manuscript ID	GM-12-2014-0111.R1
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	Careers, Gender

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Peer Review

The Teflon Effect: When the Glass Slipper meets Merit

Introduction

In this paper, we draw on the Ashcraft's (2013) metaphor of the 'glass slipper', which encapsulates the alignment between occupational identity and embodied social identities of workers. We argue that women experience a 'Teflon Effect' when misalignment occurs in that merit, on which promotion and progression decisions are often based, goes unrecognised and fails to 'stick' onto those who possess it. The glass slipper is part of a popular fairy tale of unjust oppression – a story of Cinderella, a mistreated and impoverished girl who meets a handsome prince. The prince later identifies her through a dropped slipper into which her foot neatly fits – marrying her in a true fairy tale ending. While not devoid of sexist overtones (Cinderella's ugly sisters attempt to seek the prince's favours by claiming the slipper as their own, but of course their feet are too big), the glass slipper metaphor is an apt one in that it captures the need in certain contexts for alignment and fit. Specifically, Ashcraft (2013) argues for recognition of the identity that attaches to occupations and how this may or may not align with the embodied dispositions of those doing the job.

As Ashcraft contends, occupations come to appear 'naturally' possessed of certain features that fit certain people yet are improbable for others - arguing that studies of inequality need to take this alignment into account. She therefore fosters a 'bilateral' view which suggests a reciprocal relationship between identity and work i.e. 'people derive identity from work' and 'work derives identity from associated people' (Ashcraft, 2013:6). Further, she adds a more embodied dimension to current glass metaphors (e.g. glass ceiling; glass cliff) through the emphasis on the meanings attached to the bodies of workers and the extent to which these 'fit' the nature of the work they do.

Ashcraft does not delve deeply into the consequences of a *misalignment* (i.e. when occupation and embodied social identity do not fit) and in this context the metaphor tends to overlook the processes underlying work based disadvantage. In response this paper considers consequences of

1
2
3 such misfit by examining the processes of assigning and rewarding women according to merit. By
4
5 drawing on the glass slipper concept, and by introducing the Teflon Effect, we develop a more
6
7 embodied understanding of merit and of the glass ceiling more generally. Specifically, we go some
8
9 way to explain the existence and persistence of the glass ceiling in the form of career barriers by
10
11 suggesting that merit may not adhere to specific bodies if a misalignment occurs between the
12
13 occupational identity and embodied social identity. This highlights the significance of the
14
15 recognition, performance and embodiment of merit and how, through the Teflon effect, it may fail
16
17 to adhere to the bodies of women in management and leadership roles.
18
19

20
21 Our paper is organized as follows. We firstly outline work, largely in the gender in management
22
23 domain, which has been based on the metaphor of glass – including a detailed account of Ashcraft’s
24
25 (2013) conceptualisation of the glass slipper and the implications of fit and misfit. We then critically
26
27 discuss and evaluate conceptualisations of merit as a method of reward allocation in organizations,
28
29 highlighting the significance of the recognition, performance and embodiment of merit. We apply
30
31 the metaphor of the glass slipper to these conceptualisations and introduce the notion of the Teflon
32
33 Effect in the context of a misalignment between occupational identity and embodied social identity.
34
35 We conclude by arguing that the Teflon effect combined with the glass slipper concept help explain
36
37 the persistence of the glass ceiling in management and organizations more generally.
38
39
40

41 **Glass Works**

42
43
44 The notion of glass has become a well utilised and apt metaphor for the invisible yet durable barriers
45
46 and obstacles that women and other groups face in the workplace. Dominant among these different
47
48 conceptualisations is the so-called Glass Ceiling, first coined in 1986 by the Wall Street Journal,
49
50 which has captured the artificial barriers to the advancement of women and minorities and has
51
52 sought to throw light on the reasons for the persistent paucity of women in senior management
53
54 roles. These reasons have included norms supporting men and women’s differential hierarchical
55
56 positioning (e.g. Morrison and Von Glinow, 1990); gendered notions of successful management
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 based on masculine characteristics (e.g. Schein, 1973; Powell, 1993); the effects of homosocial
4 reproduction whereby (male) decision makers choose others for key positions similar to themselves
5 (e.g. Kanter, 1977) ; stereotypes and negative perceptions of women (Powell, 2005); a male model of
6 working based on uninterrupted work and long hours (Mainiero and Sullivan, 2005); the demands of
7 motherhood (Hewlett, 2007); lack of mentoring (Ragins, 19990; and different development
8 experiences (job variety, challenging tasks) which are often given to men rather than women and
9 give men a competitive edge (Ohlott, Ruderman and McCauley, 1994). A useful summary of the
10 factors contained within the glass ceiling can be found in Weyer (2007) in this journal.
11
12

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21 Other, perhaps less utilized conceptualisations, include the Glass Cliff which captures the problems
22 women face once they have achieved a leadership position (Ryan and Haslam, 2005) and suggests
23 that women are often put into precarious or risky roles where there is a higher likelihood of failure.
24
25
26
27
28 As Ryan and Haslam found, companies that appointed women to boards of directors had
29 experienced consistently poor performance in the months preceding the appointment of women
30 whereas performance was more stable in companies that went on to appoint men. Another glass
31 metaphor, the Glass Wall, describes persistent occupational segregation attributed to employment
32 barriers that restricts the access of women to particular types of jobs or functional areas. These walls
33 tend to see women segregated into jobs or roles that carry low pay and less prospects compared
34 with men (Bronstein et al, 1993; Miller, et al, 1999) so drawing attention to horizontal rather than
35 vertical barriers. Finally, the Glass Escalator refers to the hidden and often subtle mechanisms that
36 enhance men's positions in female dominated occupations (Williams, 1992) so that men take their
37 gender privilege with them despite relative numerical rarity, ascending the hierarchy in these
38 occupations more rapidly and more consistently than women.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 The glass metaphor has accordingly been a useful one in helping to highlight hidden yet durable
53 processes in organizations that disfavour some groups while favouring others and has been
54 foundational in shaping the field. However, at the same time it has been subject to critique. These
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 often focus on the idea that the glass metaphor implies external, transparent edifices based on
4
5 realist assumptions that serve to reify understandings of careers as 'objective' phenomenon (Cohen,
6
7 2014) which women themselves must work to overcome (thereby placing responsibility firmly in
8
9 women's domain). Cohen (2104) argues for a more socially constructed orientation that sees career
10
11 experiences as a process 'cast and re-cast in the flow of time and across space' (Cohen, 2014:165).
12
13 This undermines any conceptualisation of career barriers as a concrete reality and places such
14
15 constraints at the interface of social/cultural context and individual dispositions, themselves
16
17 conditioned by past and present circumstances.
18
19

20
21
22
23
24 In terms of the former, highlighting issues of context, Symons (1992) has argued that while the glass
25
26 ceiling concept suggests that women bring problems into a gender neutral organization with a
27
28 gender neutral logic and language, they in fact encounter a 'long standing dynamic' of gender based
29
30 domination and subordination. Further, the 'dispositions' of the workers (perceptions, assumptions,
31
32 values, embodied capital), foregrounded by Cohen, are often overlooked. In particular, the glass
33
34 ceiling and its related concepts fail to recognize the embodied dimensions of work – how bodies are
35
36 not just the containers of capital (skills and knowledge) and the primary source of effort – but also
37
38 carry meanings that are intimately related to gender, race, class, nationality, sexual orientation and
39
40 able-bodiedness. These meanings imply that some individuals may be seen as more 'suitable' for
41
42 some forms of work.
43
44

45 46 **The Glass Slipper**

47
48
49 This idea of 'suitability' finds purchase in Cohen's suggestion for a more fluid notion of career as a
50
51 "product of a particular time and place and social circumstance, informed by experience and history"
52
53 (Cohen, 2014: 167). Here she develops the concept of a 'career imagination' – a construct that
54
55 defines the limits of what a person sees as possible in career terms and in so doing also what is
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 impossible. As she argues, career imaginations are circumscribed by the occupations and sectors
4
5 that are seen as available and appropriate and by the progression routes prescribed.
6
7

8 This suggests a need to recognise that particular occupations may be deemed more 'suitable' or
9
10 'appropriate' for some groups over others. Here, Ashcraft (2013) argues for a more embodied use of
11
12 the glass metaphor which, drawing implicitly on notions of suitability, she develops into the 'glass
13
14 slipper'. As she suggests, current work on equality has tended to assume a unilateral view that
15
16 disconnects diversity issues at work from the nature of the work itself – creating a 'blind spot' in
17
18 diversity research. While it is accepted that individuals derive identity from work, what is less
19
20 evident is that *work also derives identity from associated people* so that occupations assume
21
22 aggregate identities by virtue of their alignment with social identities. Work has a 'collective self'
23
24 that can alter over time and with economic and social circumstances. Introducing the concept of the
25
26 glass slipper, she explains:
27
28

29
30 *"...occupations come to appear, by nature, possessed of central, enduring and distinctive*
31
32 *characteristics that make them suited to certain people and implausible for others. Like*
33
34 *similar metaphors in management science such as the glass ceiling...or the glass cliff...the*
35
36 *glass slipper exposes systematic forms of advantage and disadvantage, in this case*
37
38 *stemming from alignment between occupations and social identities "* (Ashcraft, 2013:7)
39
40
41

42 Drawing on Kirkham and Loft's (1993) study of accountancy, she shows how the occupation became
43
44 professionalised by mobilising gender to upgrade accountancy practice (casting the work as
45
46 technical and elite and suitable for men) while downgrading bookkeeping through feminization.
47

48 Occupations therefore are distinguished by collective identities in that we treat lines of work as
49
50 typified by central, abiding and unique features – features that emanate partly from social identities
51
52 of those who undertake such work but which can also 'stand alone' – independent of incumbents.
53
54

55 These social identities shape the content, value, practices and administration of the job. As Ashcraft
56
57 (2013) points out, accountancy became upgraded and 'masculinized' - divorced from book-keeping
58
59
60

1
2
3 – leading to changes in entry requirements, formal employment classifications and task divisions
4
5 that presented the work as complex, technical and valuable. The nature of work therefore does not
6
7 speak for itself - ‘to secure professional privileges an occupation must first construct and control the
8
9 identity of its work’ (Ashcraft, 2013: 14). As she suggests, this implies a propensity to not just
10
11 discriminate against individuals but to also discriminate against some forms of work – devalued, for
12
13 example, as lacking in value and skill.
14
15

16
17
18
19
20 Ashcraft identifies two main forms of body-work associations which, together, suggest that the
21
22 identity of work is constructed in relation to the embodied social identities associated with it. One is
23
24 based on physical characteristics and *demographic alignment* between an occupation and certain
25
26 social identity characteristics such as gender or race with studies often focussing on the extent and
27
28 implications of numerical proportions. At issue here is who actually does the work – which socially
29
30 coded bodies (white, black, male, female) in that labour processes such as the degree of supervision
31
32 and/or promotion opportunities may ‘develop around the race and gender profile of those doing the
33
34 work’ (Ashcraft, 2013: 8). This may include implications of numerical disadvantage for women’s
35
36 career progression, such as the experiences of women in male dominated, management roles (e.g.
37
38 Kanter, 1977; Simpson, 1997). Secondly, she draw attention to *symbolic alignment* whereby some
39
40 groups may be ‘discursively or emblematically’ associated with some forms of work and how work is
41
42 coded through social identities such as through the sex typing of particular tasks. This conceives of
43
44 social identities, not as measurable, physical entities (e.g. the number of women in particular roles),
45
46 but as entailing embodied performances and bodily imagery. As example, primary school teaching
47
48 may be seen as suitable for women based on notions of the unthreatening maternal body ,
49
50 appropriate for the care of others, versus the more ‘dangerous’ bodies of men (Simpson, 2009). As
51
52 Swan (2012) suggests, cleanliness and associated meanings of morality are commonly associated
53
54 with ‘whiteness’ and with the white, middle-class body whereas black and working-class bodies are
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 marked as 'unclean' and routinely carry dirt's stigma. In the context of domestic service, Duffy
4
5 (2007) has highlighted the consistency, through historical precedent, with which 'dirty work' (i.e.
6
7 undesirable work) in the form of reproductive service work has been relegated to and seen as
8
9 suitable for ethnic minority women. This leads analyses towards the meanings attached to bodies
10
11 undertaking particular forms of work, based for example on notions of devaluation, and how
12
13 'bodies, real and imagined are invoked as figurative practitioners to construct the nature of
14
15 occupations' (Ashcraft, 2013: 9).
16
17

18
19
20
21 Similarly, in the context of management and leadership, research has indicated how the tasks and
22
23 skills of management and ideas of successful leadership are inscribed onto the bodies of (white,
24
25 middle class) men through shared notions of discipline, rationality, detachment, direction and
26
27 control (Kerfoot & Knights, 1993). Typical descriptions of masculinity call upon qualities which are
28
29 (among others) analytic, quantitative, rationalist and outer focused (Due Billing & Alvesson, 2000;
30
31 Hines, 1992) and which find purchase in dominant conceptualizations of management practice and
32
33 skills. Schein (1973), for example, drew attention to the strength of the relationship between
34
35 characteristics perceived to be held by men and those perceived as required for managerial success
36
37 ('think manager, think male') while Collinson and Hearn (1994) highlighted how the managerial
38
39 prerogative over key decisions can be seen as part of a highly masculine discourse based on power
40
41 and control. For example, gendered assumptions can be discerned in initiatives such as performance
42
43 reviews and performance targets which can be linked to masculinist concerns with personal power
44
45 and accountability (e.g. Hearn, 1994; Kerfoot & Knights, 1993; 1998) while strategic management
46
47 can be seen as masculine both in its militaristic language (campaigns, attacks, targets) and in its core
48
49 assumptions that plans, objectives and techniques can render the future controllable (Hearn, 1994).
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 As Hearn (1994) argues, this coincides with contemporary forms of masculinity that emphasizes
4 conquest and involves a 'disembodied and emotionally estranged concept of reason'. Given the
5
6
7 higher proportion of men in senior management and leadership roles in most organizational
8
9
10 contexts, this supports the notion that there is a demographic as well as a symbolic alignment
11
12 between the figurative masculine body (associated with dryness, discipline, containment) and the
13
14 identity of management/leadership roles.
15

16
17
18
19
20 In referring to the alignment between occupational identity and embodied social identities, the glass
21
22 slipper concept allows, as Ashcraft contends, to see how identity of work (e.g. accountancy,
23
24 management, cleaning, teaching) is constructed in relation to the embodied social identities
25
26 associated with it. People accordingly derive identity from work and work derives identity from
27
28 people so that practitioner bodies and the nature of work are mutually influential. This 'coupling' is
29
30 based on socially classified physical bodies (who is doing the work and how that shapes the
31
32 construction of tasks, skills); task features in terms of content and how this invokes bodies; the
33
34 material organization of work and how occupational configurations and bodies interact.
35
36

37
38 The glass slipper metaphor therefore brings bodies into how we conceptualize career effects – how
39
40 physical bodies, work properties and their complex relationship will 'play out' in any given context.
41
42 The metaphor, from her perspective, is a powerful one for its ability to capture the ways that
43
44 occupations "come to appear possessed of inherent characteristics that render them a natural fit for
45
46 some and a stretch if not an impossibility for others" (Ashcraft, 2013:16) granting certain social
47
48 identities 'natural rights' to an occupation; through the privileging within the fable of a 'young
49
50 woman of dainty physique' it captures the central role of embodied social identities in constructing
51
52 the identities of work and how criteria for gauging suitability and competence are often
53
54 disconnected from the actual work done (shoe size is immaterial in undertaking a princess role).
55
56
57 Further, as the experiences of the ugly sisters attest, it potentially highlights the difficulties of fit
58
59
60

1
2
3 when one's own social embodied identities do not readily align with those used to construct the
4
5 identity of work.
6
7
8
9

10
11 While the possibility of misalignment is acknowledged in her paper, this is not pursued in any
12
13 substantive sense – despite the growing body of work that has examined work contexts and
14
15 experiences of men and women who are either (demographically) in the minority at work or who do
16
17 not (symbolically) appear to fit the perceived characteristics of the job (e.g. Kanter, 1977; Simpson,
18
19 1997; Cross and Bagilhole, 2002; Lupton, 1999). Further, the glass slipper does not explain why and
20
21 how disadvantages accrue beyond the notion of *devaluation* of the occupations and/or the social
22
23 identities concerned. In other words, what are the processes that contribute to work based
24
25 disadvantage when a misalignment exists between the two? In exploring some of these processes,
26
27 we draw on understandings of merit and integrate these with the Teflon effect, discussed further
28
29 below.
30
31
32

33 **When the Glass Slipper does not Fit**

34
35
36 While alignment of occupational identity and embodied social identities may have positive effects in
37
38 terms of remuneration, progression and other aspects of work based experiences, misalignment has
39
40 potential to lead to systematic forms of disadvantage. While not fully explored in her account, if
41
42 some people are seen to 'naturally' fit certain occupations and roles, it follows that others do not
43
44 align with the social definition of the work they do. Looking at nursing care, some work (Simpson et
45
46 al, 2012; Pullen and Simpson, 2009) has highlighted how meanings attached to men's bodies (e.g. of
47
48 rationality, detachment, cleanliness, authority) are seen as incongruent with the demands of bodily
49
50 nursing care and emotional support. Instead these demands are commonly inscribed onto the
51
52 bodies of women (Evans, 2002) with their association with 'lower order' behaviours. Men are seen
53
54 as out of place and unsuitable for the demands of such roles. Similarly, as discussed earlier,
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Anderson (2000) refers to how norms of acceptability deem some 'dirty work' such as domestic
4
5 cleaning to be appropriate for women – their bodies marked by misogyny and carrying dirt's stigma
6
7 – but not, from Glenn (1992) suitable for the 'cleaner' bodies of men.
8
9

10
11 In the context of management, research has shown how women's bodies are 'out of place' in a
12
13 leadership role. As we have seen, management comprises a space of disembodied rationality, where
14
15 authority is associated with the white, masculine body (Swan, 2005). Women and minorities, who do
16
17 not 'fit' the social definition of the job, often feel conspicuous, awkward and self-conscious (Puwar,
18
19 2004). Women in particular are seen to be profoundly embodied, carriers of "nature, sexuality,
20
21 emotions and hormones" (Swan, 2005: 319) and hence incongruent with the demands for
22
23 rationality, authority and control. Management as disembodied has led to women being
24
25 'problematic signifiers' (Brewis and Sinclair, 2000: 195) in the workplace – so that women have to
26
27 manage their bodies to construct authority through dress, talk, comportment. In short, and drawing
28
29 on the glass slipper metaphor, women do not fit the occupational identity of management and the
30
31 glass ceiling, which focusses on the barriers that women face, fails to take into account the dynamic
32
33 interplay between embodied dispositions and the social definition of the job.
34
35
36

37 **Merit and the Glass Ceiling**

38

39
40 Drawing on earlier discussions, the glass ceiling is based on notions of a concrete reality that is
41
42 largely divorced from considerations of the identity of the work and from the embodied dispositions
43
44 of the workers. Education, skills and past achievements – that comprise key criteria for merit and the
45
46 distribution of rewards – are seen to adhere to a neutral body with the suggestion that women (or
47
48 other groups) must work hard - in Sheryl Sanberg's terms, '*lean in*', to overcome barriers faced.
49

50
51 Heavily influenced by liberal-democratic ideals, merit is seen in most Western organizations as an
52
53 'objective' measure of ability and achievement and is generally accepted, both morally and
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 practically, as the main criterion determining progression within organizations – replacing earlier
4
5 standards of assessment based on family, religion or birth. Thus, as Farber and Sherry (1995) explain:
6
7

8 *“The meritocratic ideal is that positions in society should be based on the abilities and*
9 *achievements of the individual rather than on characteristics such as family background,*
10 *race, religion, or wealth. This ideal requires that merit be objective in the sense of being*
11 *definable without reference to those personal characteristics”.* Farber and Sherry (1995:856).
12
13
14
15
16

17 Meritocracy is therefore a social order in which individuals are ranked on the basis of their individual
18 merit or worth - with the assumption that ability can be quantified, separated from social context
19 and assigned to the individual, leading to the identification of characteristics that are seen as
20 meritworthy or not (Jackson, 2007). Merit is therefore presented as an objective measure of
21 individual ability and achievement based on qualifications and the ability of the individual to apply
22 them to job-related tasks (Kumra, 2014). This is seen to help create a ‘level playing field’, aimed at
23 ensuring that fair chances are available to all individuals and groups, where decisions are based on
24 individual ability and/or the passing of technical qualifications in open competition (Crompton &
25 Sanderson, 1986).
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 Within this aim in mind, the meritocratic ideal is presented as a strategic mechanism through which
38 equality of opportunity is ensured. Through an emphasis only on the talents and effort made by
39 individuals, it is felt that opportunity is available to all as differentiation between individuals based
40 on their membership or otherwise of particular groups is rendered irrelevant and unjust. Those with
41 merit will be rewarded for their talent and contributions and those who do not succeed do not do so
42 because of unjust or discriminatory organizational practices, but rather as a result of their lack of
43 merit.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 Various criticisms have been presented of this meritocratic ideal. One strand has focused on the
54 supposedly ‘objective’ nature of the criteria used to judge merit which presupposes reliance on
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 rational choice in decision making (Thornton, 2007). From this view, far from being a purely
4 objective measure, judgments on merit contain an in-built uncertainty as they require subjective
5 predictions about future performance based on the past (Thornton, 2007; Knights & Richards, 2003).
6
7
8

9
10 Other critiques highlight how concepts of merit are divorced, problematically, from social and
11 historical context. In this respect, Williams (1991) argues merit standards, while presented a-
12 historically and as power-neutral, represent socially acceptable preferences developed in an
13 instrumental sense by members of social groups in power at a particular time and place. As
14 Roithmayr, (1997) argues, rather than protecting against discrimination, merit is inscribed with
15 subjective, hierarchically based social bias which reproduces the status quo. In this respect, the
16 heavy reliance on discourses of merit to justify (promotion/hiring) decisions at higher levels of the
17 organizational hierarchy – and given that the top of most organizational hierarchies are dominated
18 by men - the benchmark for the 'best person for the job' is often based upon a masculine model of
19 success (Thornton, 2007) where merit celebrates a particular hegemonic masculinity oriented
20 towards a timetable of the male life course (Heward, 1994). This bias however is largely hidden by
21 the desire to see merit in fixed, universal terms (Sen, 1992) where it can assuage concerns about
22 unequal allocations of power and authority, and provide a discursive mechanism by which inequality
23 is justified.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40
41 Studies of women in management and the professions support these critiques. Brink & Benschop
42 (2012) in their study of the construction of merit in professorial appointments, take issue with a core
43 contention of meritocracy i.e. that those in power are there because they are the most meritorious.
44 Along with Sommerlad (2011), Williams, (1991) and Roithmayr (1997) they argue the constitution of
45 merit is constructed and endorsed by prevailing power elites who stand to gain most from
46 maintaining the status quo. By presenting the processes which enabled them to reach their positions
47 of seniority and power as precise, objective and unequivocal, these processes are rendered beyond
48 reproach and the responsibility for anyone who does not succeed within the prevailing system lies
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 with the individual (Brink & Benschop, 2012). Those from disadvantaged groups who struggle to
4
5 meet these so-called objective criteria are accordingly deemed incapable of meeting 'absolute',
6
7 'objective' and 'fairly applied' standards for success.
8
9

10
11 As Heward (1994) suggests, merit is about establishing a reputation, being visible, ensuring one's
12
13 activities are recognised and valued by those with decision making power. This suggests that merit -
14
15 as in the possession of attributes - is insufficient in that it has to be recognized through practice and
16
17 performance. In this respect, Kumra and Vinnicombe (2010) found that women in professional
18
19 service firms not only had to meet the stringent requirements of the job but also had to engage in
20
21 impression management so that they could be seen as ambitious and available. Referring to the
22
23 gendered nature of 'fitness to practice' in law and accountancy firms, Haynes (2012) describes how
24
25 success is predicated upon a masculine body and how women must distance themselves from
26
27 negatively constructed aspects of their femininity through overt displays of positively viewed
28
29 masculine forms of embodiment (e.g. dress, voice and self-presentation) if they wish to be taken
30
31 seriously. However, as Kumra points out, women often find some of these practices, particularly
32
33 around self-promotion, problematic - seeing them as 'inherently subjective, manipulative and largely
34
35 self-serving' (Kumra, 2014: 277) while Miller et al (1992) suggest that self-promotion is normatively
36
37 more acceptable for men than for women.
38
39
40
41

42 These studies indicate that merit is not just a set of skills and attributes that an individual possesses,
43
44 as a form of physical capital anchored on a gender neutral body but also involves embodied
45
46 performances. In other words, merit has to be demonstrated in day to day activities and practices
47
48 e.g. through dress, language, comportment as well as self-presentations and impression
49
50 management – so that others can be persuaded of value and worth. Merit is therefore conveyed
51
52 through performance and the extent to which it is seen as deserved will depend in part on the
53
54 meanings attached to the bodies in which merit is partly contained. So-called 'objective measures'
55
56 such as qualification and skill will therefore be differentially valued according to how they are
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 performed - and 'authentic' and valued performances will depend in part on the meanings attached
4 to bodies in context. Thus, as Haynes (2012) found, possession of capital (and hence, potentially,
5 'merit') are linked, through gender based embodied performances, to the acquisition of status and
6 distinction and are associated with hierarchical and inegalitarian notions of worth. Women
7 accountants and lawyers, through dress, voice and self-presentation, accordingly 'worked' their
8 bodies to conform to masculine ideals and to support their credibility and authority in their work
9 based aspirations.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 **When the Glass Slipper meets Merit: The Teflon Effect**

19
20
21 Haynes's (2012) study highlights how professional identity and gendered embodiment are closely
22 interlinked. This has clear parallels with the glass slipper concept which demonstrates the importance
23 of an alignment between occupations and embodied social identities. As discussed earlier, bodies are
24 seen as appropriate for different forms of work – an alignment that can be both demographic (based
25 e.g. on gender, race, class) and symbolic in that some groups may be 'discursively or emblematically'
26 associated with the job (Ashcraft, 2013:9). Professional services such as law and accountancy are
27 accordingly linked to the embodied dispositions and embodied performances of men.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 As Ashcraft (2013) argues, and as discussed above, these alignments and misalignments 'expose'
38 systematic forms of advantage and disadvantage at work. This suggests that merit, as a dominant form
39 of resource allocation in Western organizations, is differentially valued according to both the nature of
40 work and the embodied social identities aligned with it i.e. it is contingent, largely, upon the 'glass
41 slipper fit'. As we have seen, the meanings attached to white middle class masculine bodies align with
42 the occupational identity of management. Merit (in the form of qualification, knowledge, skill, expertise)
43 performed through speech, language, dress, comportment, appears persuasive and easily adheres. In
44 other words, in these contexts, merit sticks.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 The notion of stickiness has been introduced and used in the dirty work literature (e.g. Bergman and
56 Chalkley, 2007) to describe how, from a social psychological perspective, stigma can adhere to the
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 individual and affect, negatively, perceptions on the part of others of internal attributions of the
4
5 individual concerned. Following this, we can see that 'stickiness' can also find purchase in
6
7 understandings of the processes around the assignation of merit, as qualities that must be effectively
8
9 performed and given external recognition. Such processes involve adherence to and absorption into
10
11 bodies that are deemed to 'fit' the identity of the job. Thus, through processes of attribution – the
12
13 *recognition* of merit - leadership qualities such as authority and decisiveness stick to and are absorbed
14
15 into the bodies of men.

16
17
18 Stickiness implies an opposite namely, the capacity for certain attributes to 'slide off' the body and to
19
20 fail to adhere – which we refer to as the Teflon Effect. Teflon is a brand name of a non-stick chemical
21
22 used on cookware – a term that is widely used, metaphorically, to refer to any non-stick properties of
23
24 individuals e.g. where people do not accept particular identities or, in popular discourse, where they
25
26 refuse to take on board criticism or blame. Alvesson and Robertson (2015) for example adopt the term
27
28 'teflonic identity manoeuvring' to refer to a process of disengagement where deeper personal meanings
29
30 of work identity are avoided. In the media, the term is often drawn on to describe a leading figure
31
32 whose popularity appears unaffected by scandal or what is seen as poor judgment. As we suggest,
33
34 the term can be equally used to refer to the 'stickiness' or otherwise of merit, capturing potentially
35
36 the way merit adheres to some individuals – recognised as worthy and deserving – and not to others
37
38 even though actual credentials may be broadly the same. More specifically, giving an understanding
39
40 of some of the *processes* underlying misalignment or misfit, we can argue that a misalignment
41
42
43 between occupation and embodied social identity may lead to the Teflon effect whereby the possession
44
45 of merit fails to stick and the performance of merit lacks conviction and does not persuade.

46
47
48
49
50
51
52 As example, in a recent film *The Imitation Game*, based on the breaking of the enigma code during the
53
54 war, the team leader Professor Turing selects potential code breakers by inviting candidates who had
55
56 solved a particularly tricky cross-word puzzle to attend a selection test. The room is full of men ready to
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 start when a woman appears at the door. She is told she is in the wrong place. She protests 'I've come
4 to take the test. I solved the cross word puzzle and was invited to come'. But, says the man on duty at
5 the door, did you really do it yourself? He refused to believe that, as a woman, she was capable of such
6 a feat (she in fact had a double of first in Mathematics). The slipper did not fit – and merit did not stick.
7
8
9

10
11
12
13
14 In Haynes's (2012) study of lawyers and accountants, merit also fails to adhere. One of her participants,
15 a female lawyer, recalls:
16

17
18
19 "We disagreed with the hiring partner on a candidate ... his reaction ... to the way that she
20 was speaking, because she does have this very authoritative manner of speaking, is that she
21 was forceful and he couldn't get past that and listen to what she was saying". (Haynes,
22 2012: 495)
23
24
25
26
27

28
29 In the context of law where, as Haynes points out, powerful advocacy and assertive behaviour are
30 required for effective performance of the job – particularly in areas such as litigation - an
31 'authoritative manner' might be seen as an asset, reflecting an ability to protect a client's interests.
32
33 From the Oxford English Dictionary, 'authority' is equated with confidence, firmness, influence and
34 respect. It implies possession of knowledge that is confidently and effectively displayed. These are
35 qualities embedded within the social definition of the work – qualities, however, that do not align with
36 the embodied dispositions of women. Similarly, looking at the context of the work meeting, research
37 (e.g. Maddock, 1993) suggests that authority adheres to men but that women have to work hard to
38 display the same level of competence. Simpson's (1997) study of MBA graduates is a case in point.
39
40 Here, she found that women managers, despite having the same credentials as male counterparts,
41 felt the need to attend meetings exceptionally well briefed. To be seen to be asking too many
42 questions or not being 'up to speed' were considered undesirable if they wished to avoid being seen
43 as naïve, 'dumb', ill-informed. Not surprisingly, male colleagues did not appear to share this pressure
44 and were often less well prepared – arriving casually at meetings and, in the words of one woman
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 manager “not have a notepad and they’ll sit back in the chair and be very relaxed and, you know,
4
5 add a few comments here and there” (Simpson, 1997: 125). However, this did not appear to affect
6
7 the level of ‘authority’ or expertise conveyed. Merit adhered no matter how they presented
8
9 themselves while women had to work hard to deserve recognition. In other words, merit is not
10
11 something that is ‘possessed’ but must be demonstrated through embodied performances. So while
12
13 authority adheres to men, it fails to stick to the bodies of women – the Teflon Effect - even when, as in
14
15 Haynes’s study, it is displayed. Merit in this case was not recognised and was reinterpreted as ‘strident’
16
17 in highly gendered and devalued ways.
18
19

20 21 **Conclusion**

22
23 In this paper, we have introduced the Teflon Effect, integrating it with Ashcraft’s (2013) notion of the
24
25 ‘glass slipper’ – the latest in the glass metaphors to describe the problems women face in
26
27 undertaking or aspiring to management roles. We accordingly draw attention towards processes
28
29 underpinning misalignment or misfit, largely overlooked in her account. We argue that women
30
31 experience a ‘Teflon effect’ when misalignment occurs between occupational identity and the
32
33 embodied social identity of workers in that merit (requisite skills, qualifications, expertise) fails to
34
35 ‘stick’. As the ugly sisters found as they sought to squeeze into the glass slipper and claim the prize
36
37 of marriage to the prince, bodies are marked with meaning. Their bodies did not fit the idealised
38
39 notion of a princess if only because of their unattractiveness and their oversized feet. They may have
40
41 the qualities for a princess (whatever that may be) but merit did not stick.
42
43
44

45
46 However, fit alone may not be sufficient for achieving equality at work. As Ashcraft contends,
47
48 discrimination can be focussed on the work or occupation as well as on the individual who performs
49
50 it. Work has its own, sometimes devalued, identity so that disadvantage may accrue primarily due to
51
52 the nature of the job. Within the area of management, HRM has struggled over time to maintain a
53
54 valued identity –often seen as non-core and lacking in strategic importance (Brewster and Smith,
55
56 1990). HRM managers therefore, traditionally excluded from the boardroom, may face disadvantage
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 from their occupation which ultimately 'rubs off' in terms of how others perceive them. There is
4
5 therefore a complex interplay between mutually reinforcing entities based on occupation and self.
6
7

8 Following the above, the Teflon Effect does two key things. Firstly, it provides an explanation for the
9
10 persistence of the glass ceiling through a focus on how perceptions of merit are influenced by the fit
11
12 between embodied social identities and perceived characteristics and features of the job – thereby
13
14 helping to develop a more embodied understanding of the glass ceiling effect. As Ashcraft (2013)
15
16 maintains, the dominant unilateral view of work-practitioner relations obscures the reciprocal
17
18 relation between embodied social identity and work. Combined with notions of merit, the Teflon
19
20 effect gives greater weight to this relationship and in so doing provides a deeper explanation for the
21
22 persistence of barriers, despite equality initiatives and the possession, on the part of individuals
23
24 concerned, of relevant credentials.
25
26

27
28 Secondly and more specifically, the concept enables an understanding of the processes underlying
29
30 misfit i.e. why and how a misalignment between social identity and the nature of the job may lead to
31
32 persistent disadvantage. As we have seen, while the glass slipper incorporates a wider, bi-lateral
33
34 view of discrimination at work, it does not address the underlying processes of misalignment. In this
35
36 respect, building on Ashcraft's more embodied understanding of the glass ceiling, the Teflon effect
37
38 draws attention to the embodied nature of merit. Thus, merit needs to be effectively demonstrated
39
40 through embodied performances that require recognition for it to carry conviction and have value –
41
42 recognition that is undermined when embodied social identity and occupational identity do not fit.
43
44 This highlights the significance of the recognition, performance and embodiment of merit and how,
45
46 through the Teflon effect, it may fail to adhere to the bodies of women in management and
47
48 leadership roles and hence, fail to persuade. Our analysis highlights how merit, far from being an
49
50 objective measure, is unstable and contingent. So while the glass ceiling concept is based, somewhat
51
52 unproblematically, on a stable definition of merit, and while the glass slipper introduces a bi-lateral
53
54 and more embodied orientation, the Teflon effect highlights the processes underlying misfit,
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 foregrounding merit's instability and contingency and tying it closely to notions of embodied
4
5 performance.

6
7
8 This has implications for Human Resource professionals, line managers and diversity officers who
9
10 must see beyond so-called objective measures of merit in performance reviews and/or in
11
12 recruitment and promotion decisions to include a level of reflexivity on the significance of merit's
13
14 subjective, 'performed' dimensions – the (e.g. gendered) as well as contextual factors that may
15
16 underpin how merit is recognised and given value. The drive to formalisation (Noon et al, 2013)
17
18 which assumes a stable, rational notion of merit may therefore not achieve the expected fairness of
19
20 outcome if the 'bi-lateral' nature of potential discrimination is not recognised by key decision makers
21
22 and if the potential 'stickiness', as well as 'non-stick' dimensions, of merit are overlooked. In this
23
24 respect, future research could examine circumstances of alignment and misalignment between
25
26 occupational identity and embodied social identity in terms of how merit is recognised and given
27
28 value. This could build on already established work on men and women in non-traditional roles to
29
30 examine enactments and performances of merit: how, in terms of gender and/or race, do
31
32 comparable credentials potentially translate into different notions of worth and value; how is merit
33
34 understood in these contexts and how is it conveyed?
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 In this paper, we have drawn on some of the current glass metaphors that seek to capture and to
42
43 theorise inequality and have sought to add a new dimension to this well established terrain. As
44
45 Alvesson and Robertson (2015) argue, there is a need to supplement current metaphors with new
46
47 concepts that can expand our interpretive repertoires. In this respect, the glass ceiling metaphor has
48
49 captured, in realist terms, the failure of merit in the persistence of barriers faced by women at
50
51 higher levels of the organizations even when relevant qualifications, skills and experience are
52
53 possessed. By drawing on the glass slipper concept, and by introducing the Teflon Effect, we have
54
55 sought to 'reinvigorate' current glass metaphors that describe women's position at work to include a
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 more embodied dimension that can open up an understanding of merit as contingent and unstable –
4
5 dependent in part on embodied performances and on notions of work/identity 'fit'.
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review

References

- Alvesson, M. and Robertson, M. (2015) 'Money Matters: Teflonic Identity Manoeuvring in the Investment Banking Sector', online:
<http://oss.sagepub.com/content/early/2015/07/30/0170840615593591?papetoc>
- Anderson, B. (2000) *Doing the Dirty Work: The Global Politics of Domestic Labour*, London: Zed Books
- Ashcraft, K. (2013) 'The Glass Slipper: "Incorporating" Occupational Identity in Management Studies', *Academy of Management Review*, 38 (1): 6-31
- Barreto, M. and Elemers, N. (2005) 'The Perils of Political Correctness', *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 68 (1): 75-88
- Bergman, M. and Chalkley, K. (2007), "'Ex marks the Spot": The Stickiness of Dirty Work and Other Removed Stigmas', *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 12 (3:): 251-265
- Brewis, J. and Sinclair, A. (2000) 'Exploring Embodiment: Women, Biology and Work', in J. Hassard., R. Holliday and H. Willmott (Eds) *Body and Organization*, London: Sage 192-214
- Brewster, C. and Smith, C. (1990) 'Corporate strategy: A no-go area for Personnel', *Personnel Management*, July 36-40
- Cohen, L. (2014) *Imagining Women's Careers*, Oxford University Press
- Collinson, D. L. & Hearn, J. (1994). 'Naming men as men: Implications for work, organization and management', *Gender Work and Organization*, 1: 2-20.
- Cross, S. and Bagilhole, B. (2002) 'Girl's Jobs for the Boys? Men, Masculinity and Non-traditional Occupations', *Gender Work and Organization*, 9, 2: 204-226
- Due Billing, Y. D. & Alvesson, M. (2000). 'Questioning the Notion of Feminine Leadership: A Critical Perspective on the Gender Labelling of Leadership', *Gender Work and Organization*, 7: 144-158.
- Duffy, M. (2007) 'Doing the Dirty Work: Gender Race and Reproductive Labor in Historical Perspective', *Gender and Society*, 21 (3): 313-336
- Farber, D.A & Sherry, S. (1995) 'Is the Radical Critique of Merit Anti-Semitic?', *California Law Review*, 83: 3, 853-884.

1
2
3 Festinger, L. (1962). *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*. Stanford: Stanford university press.
4
5

6
7 Haynes K. (2012) 'Body Beautiful? Gender, Identity and the Body in Professional Services Firms'.
8
9 *Gender, Work and Organization* 19(5), 489-507.
10

11 Hassard, J., Holliday, R. and Willmott, H. (2000) *Body and Organization*, London: Sage
12

13 Hearn, J. 1994. 'Changing Men and Changing Management: Social Change, Social Research and Social
14 Action'. In M. Davidson & R. Burke (Eds.), *Women in management: Current research issues*: 192-209.
15
16 London:Paul Chapman.
17

18
19 Heward, C. (1994) 'Academic Snakes and Merit Ladders: Reconceptualising the Glass Ceiling', *Gender*
20
21 *and Education* 6 (3):
22

23
24 Hewlett, S. (2007) 'Off Ramps and on Ramps: Keeping Talented Women on the Road to Success',
25
26 Chicago: *Harvard Business Press*

27
28 Hines, R. (1992). 'Accounting: Filling the Negative Space'. *Accounting, Organization and Society*, 17:
29
30 314-341.
31

32 Kanter, R. (1977) *Men and Women of the Corporation*, New York: Basic Books
33

34 Kelan, E, (2005) 'Gender Fatigue' *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 26 (3): 197-210
35

36
37 Kerfoot, D. & Knights, D. (1993). 'Management Masculinity and Manipulation: From Paternalism to
38 Corporate Strategy in Financial Services in Britain', *Journal of Management Studies*, 30: 659-77.
39

40
41 Kerfoot, D. & Knights, D. (1998). 'Managing Masculinity in Contemporary Organizational Life: A
42
43 Man(agerial) Project'. *Organization*, 5: 7-26.
44

45
46
47 Kirkham, L. and Loft, A. (1993) 'Gender and the Construction of the Professional Accountant,
48
49 Accounting', *Organization and Society*, 18: 507-558
50

51
52 Knights, D. and Richards, W. (2003) 'Sex Discrimination in UK Academia', *Gender, Work and*
53
54 *Organization*, 10: 2, 213-238.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Kumra, S. (2014) 'Gendered Constructions of Merit and Impression Management within Professional
4 Service Firms', in S. Kumra, R. Simpson and R. Burke (Eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Gender and*
5 *Organizations*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 267-290
6
7

8
9 Lupton, B. (1999). 'Maintaining Masculinity: Men who do Women's Work', *British Journal of*
10 *Management*, 11, S33-48
11

12
13 Miller, L., Cooke, L., Tsang, J. and Morgan, F. (1992) 'Should I brag? Nature and Impact of Positive
14 and Boastful Disclosure for Women and Men', *Human Communication Research*, 18: 364-399
15

16
17 Maniero, L. and Sullivan, S. (2005) 'Kaleidoscope Careers: An Alternate Explanation for the Opt-Out
18 Revolution', *Academy of Management Executive*: 19 (1)
19

20
21 Metz, I. and Kulik, C. (2014) 'The Rocky Climb: Women's Advancement in Management', in S. Kumra,
22 R. Simpson and R. Burke (Eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Gender and Organizations*, Oxford University
23 Press: 175-199
24

25
26 Miller, W., Kerr, B. and Reid, M. (1999) 'A National Study of Gender-Based Occupational Segregation
27 in Municipal Bureaucracies: Persistence of Glass Walls?' *Public Administration Review*, 59 (3) 218-
28 230
29

30
31 Morrison, A. and Von Glinow, M. (1990) 'Women and Minorities in Management', *American*
32 *Psychologist*, 45, 200-208
33

34
35 Mulderrig, J. (2007) 'Equality and Human Rights: Key Concepts and Issues', Working Paper for Centre
36 for Research in Education Inclusion and Diversity, The Moray House School of Education, University
37 of Edinburgh.
38
39

40
41
42 Noon, M., Healy, G., Forsin, C. and Oikelome, F. (2013) 'The Equality Effect of the Hyper-
43 Formalisation of Selection', *British Journal of Management*, 24 (3): 333-346
44

45
46 Ohlott, P., Ruderman, M. and McCauley, C. (1994) 'Gender Differences in Managers' Developmental
47 Job Experiences', *Academy of Management Journal*, 37: 46-67
48

49
50 Powell, G. (2005) 'An Opinion: the Family-Friendly Workplace – Just an Illusion', *Industrial-*
51 *Organizational Psychologist*, 42 (4): 27-8
52

53
54 Powell, G. (1993) *Women and Men in Management*, (2nd edition) Newbury Park, CA: Sage
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Pullen, A. and Simpson, R. (2009) 'Managing Difference in Feminized Work: Men, Otherness and
4 Social Practice', *Human Relations* 62 (4): 561-587
5
6
7 Ragins, B. (1999) 'Gender and Mentoring Relationships', in Powell, G. (eds) *Gender and Work*, Sage
8
9
10 Roithmayr, D. (1997) 'Deconstructing the Distinction Between Bias and Merit', *California Law*
11 *Review*, 85, 1449-1507.
12
13 Ryan, M. and Haslan, S, A. (2005) 'The Glass Cliff: Evidence that Women are Over-represented in
14 Precarious Leadership Positions', *British Journal of Management*, 16: 81-90
15
16
17 Schein, V. (1973) 'The Relationship between Sex-role Stereotypes and Requisite Management
18 Characteristics', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 57 (2): 95-100
19
20
21 Sen, A. (2000) Merit and Justice in Meritocracy and Economic Inequality, in Arrow, K. J., Bowles, S.
22 and Durlauf, S. N. (eds.) Princeton University Press.
23
24
25
26 Simpson, R. (1997) 'Have Times Changed? Career Barriers and the Token Woman Manager', *British*
27 *Journal of Management*, 8,121-129
28
29
30 Simpson, R. (2009) *Men in Caring Occupations: Doing Gender Differently*, Basingstoke: Palgrave
31
32
33 Sommerlad, H. (2012) 'Minorities, Merit and Misrecognition in the Globalized Profession', *Fordham*
34 *Law Review*, 80, 2481-2512.
35
36
37 Symons, G. (1992) 'The Glass Ceiling is Constructed over the Gendered Office', *Women in*
38 *Management Review*, 17 (1): 18-25
39
40
41 Swan, E. (2005) 'On Bodies, Rhinestones and Pleasures: Women Teaching Managers', *Management*
42 *Learning* 36 (3): 317-333
43
44
45 Swan, E. (2012) 'Cleaning Up? Transnational Corporate Femininity and Dirty Work in Magazine
46 Culture', in R. Simpson, N. Slutskaaya, P. Lewis and H. Hopfl (Eds) *Dirty Work: Concepts and Identities*,
47 Palgrave: 182-202
48
49
50 Thornton, M. (2007) 'Otherness' on the Bench: How Merit is Gendered', *Sydney Law Review*, 29: 3.
51
52
53 Weyer, B. (2007) 'Twenty years later: Explaining the persistence of the glass ceiling for Women
54 Leaders', *Women in Management Review*, 22 (6): 482-496
55
56
57 Williams, C. (Ed) 1993. *Doing Women's Work: Men in Non-Traditional Occupations*, London: Sage
58
59
60