



Spatial Work in Between Glass Ceilings and Glass Walls: Gender-Class Intersectionality and Organizational Aesthetics

Organization Studies
2015, Vol. 36(11) 1485–1505

© The Author(s) 2015

Reprints and permissions:

sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav

DOI: 10.1177/0170840615593583

www.egosnet.org/os



Varda Wasserman

The Open University, Israel

Michal Frenkel

The Hebrew University, Israel

Abstract

This study explores the relations between organizational spatiality, gender, and class. It examines the work performed by managers and architects on the one hand, and by various groups of female employees on the other, in constructing, reproducing, and challenging gender-class identities through space-related means. Three types of gender-class spatial work are identified—discursive, material, and interpretive-emotional—to highlight the role of space in constructing and reconstructing inequality regimes within organizations. Applying insights from Lefebvre’s spatial theory, we analyze the case of the Israeli Ministry of Foreign Affairs’ new headquarters, demonstrating how the spatial work of various actors is both gendered and gendering. We also show how space is enacted by women from different social groups in accordance with their habitus and with the aim of distinguishing themselves from others.

Keywords

class work, control and resistance, embodiment, gender work, gender-class intersectionality, habitus, Lefebvre, organizational aesthetics, organizational space, spatial work

Introduction

Studies of inequality in organizations have repeatedly shown that workplaces are an important arena for the production and reproduction of gender, class, ethnic, racial, and other social hierarchies through various mechanisms of exclusion (Acker, 2006). However, despite growing references to the role of spatial and aesthetic aspects of the organization as markers of inequality,

Corresponding author:

Varda Wasserman, The Open University, 1 University Road, P.B. 808, Raanana, Israel.

Email: vardawa@openu.ac.il

and despite the “aesthetic turn” (Minahan & Cox, 2007) in organizational studies (see Clegg & Kornberger, 2006; Dale & Burrell, 2008; Gagliardi, 1990; Linstead & Hopfl, 2000; Strati, 1999), the literature on inequality regimes has not yet developed a systematic theoretical account of the role of space in the doing of gender.

In the present article, we juxtapose the literature on gender and class work in organizations with that of organizational aesthetics (OA) to develop a theoretical conceptualization of the “*spatial work*” performed both by the organization and its various members (“users”) in the construction, reproduction, and challenging of gendered and class distinctions. These distinctions serve to reinforce the organization’s identity and goals, as well as its members’ attempts to position themselves vis-a-vis their employers’ expectations and in relation to other groups. More specifically, we draw upon Henry Lefebvre’s triad of conceptual spaces—the *conceived space* (the planners’ discourse and conceptualization of space), the *perceived space* (the translation of the architectural discourse into material artifacts and bodily gestures), and the *lived space* (the users’ interpretations of space)—to point to three types of *spatial gender-class work* performed in the organization. These are the *discursive spatial work* that justifies the aesthetic choices made by the architects and managers; the *material work* of translating design ideas into colors, shapes, materials, and emplacement, as well as into the bodily practices enabled and encouraged by the physical environment; and the *interpretive-emotional work* involved in interpreting the physical space.

Drawing on the case study of Israel’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs (IMFA) building, we point to the *discursive work* carried out by architects and managers through “technologies of enchantment” in clarifying the architectural symbols and producing the envisioned identity and the organization and its ideal workers. While the architects’ and managers’ discursive work rarely refers directly to gender or class, it nonetheless lays the foundation for the rejection of markers of femininity, or indeed of anything that diverges from a Western, middle-class, rational aesthetics. Staff at the IMFA have also taken part in this discursive work, sometimes adhering to the managers’ and architects’ logic and sometimes challenging it.

We also study the *physicality* of the building, including the emplacement technologies, colors, shapes, and materials chosen by the architects on the one hand, and employees’ alterations of their work environment on the other. Pointing to the differences in the spatial environments of top managers, junior diplomats, and administrative staff, and analyzing the material work ‘done’ by female members of these three groups, we highlight the role of physical and bodily work in segregating these groups.

Finally, the strong *emotional* reactions toward the physical environment and publicly displayed interpretations of its materiality are analyzed as forms of emotional-interpretive work carried out by workers as they define their personal identities in relation to expectations of them.

Ministries of foreign affairs offer fascinating case studies of the micro-mechanisms of work in its broader social context. As part of their role in providing an official representation of their nation-state to the external world, they are probably the type of organization most visibly influenced both by local and global norms (Neuman, 2005). Almost by definition, professional diplomats are required to reflect this duality in their own bodies and lifestyles. They need to express loyalty to a positive representation of the nation, as well as adhering to the somewhat old-fashioned norms of the global diplomatic community. The IMFA is especially interesting in this regard, given Israel’s position between East and West, as well as its complicated issues of identity and international legitimation.

Our theoretical and programmatic approach allows us to formulate several theoretical contributions:

1. We demonstrate how organizational spaces are simultaneously *gendered* and *gendering*. As part of the inequality regime characterizing many organizations, organizational spaces construct and reproduce social hierarchies while at the same time being shaped and enacted by members who are trying to position themselves within the organization.
2. By homing in on the spatial micro-mechanisms through which gender and class categories and identities are constructed, we contribute to the growing understanding of gender and class as a result of “work” rather than of fixed categories and to the growing understanding of gender-class intersectionality as categories that shape and reshape each other.
3. We contribute to Lefebvre’s theory by focusing on the ways that gender (intersected with class) identities are not only constructed in all three Lefebvrian spaces but also resisted and challenged in them as well.

We shall start with insights from the literature concerning gender and class work and of OA. Then, after a short methodological section, we will delve into the different types of spatial work practiced by different actors at the IMFA.

“Gender-Class Spatial Work”: Theoretical Background

Gender and class in organizations: From inequality regimes to gender-class work

It is widely accepted that socioeconomic inequalities and the construction of gender, class, ethnic, racial, and other identities are produced and reproduced in organizations (Acker, 2006; Alvesson & Billing, 2009; Ely, 1995; Ely & Meyerson, 2000; Kanter, 1977). At the same time, a growing interest in diversity management in organization studies and in gender studies has led to the emergence of the theoretical framework of intersectionality (Brah & Phoenix, 2013; Crenshaw, 1991; Hancock, 2007; Shields, 2008), with a number of empirical studies documenting the organizational experiences of women of distinct social backgrounds (Acker, 2006; Holvino, 2010; Özbilgin, Beauregard, Tatli, & Bell, 2011; Styhre & Eriksson-Zetterquist, 2008). However, notwithstanding these advances, and despite recent calls for a better understanding of how different marginalized identities are mutually constructed within organizations (Acker, 2006), little empirical research has been devoted to the processes and practices involved in the mutual construction of gender and other identities. Even less attention has been paid to the ways in which specific organizational characteristics, such as spatial design, may affect the ways in which men and women of different social backgrounds enact, perform, or construct identity, be that gender, class, racial, or ethnic.

Accordingly, we draw upon the notion of “gender work” (Gherardi, 1994) and “gendering practices” (Martin, 2006; Poggio, 2006), defined as gendered “activities which are situated, corporeal, and shaped by habitus without reflection” (Thévenot, 2001; cited in Poggio, 2006, p. 228). From this perspective, organizations are viewed not only as imposing gender hierarchies upon their members, but also as encouraging their members to enact (or challenge) the gendered dispositions and habitus they bring with them from the external world.

Similarly, Gray and Kish-Gephart (2013) have developed the notion of “class work.” They argue that organizational members’ class habitus—a set of dispositions, expectations, and behaviors that influence the practices, perceptions, and attitudes that members of a social class construct as normal or appropriate (Bourdieu, 1984)—can position workers within the organization, but that it can also help workers to reposition themselves. Because of their differences in habitus, members of different social classes experience the organization differently. These differences

form institutionalized, class-specific (and gender-specific) behaviors, which Gray and Kish-Gephart term “class work.” In enacting their class dispositions and habitus, workers enact and reproduce class and gender distinctions.

Combining these insights, we offer the notion of “gender-class work,” which leads us to enquire how gender-class dispositions are enacted or challenged in the organization. We ask how upper-class women, who share a class habitus with upper-class men in top organizational positions, enact their class habitus through a specific type of gender-class work, that of “aesthetic work,” in order to distinguish themselves from lower-class women and to position themselves as professionals who are entitled to the top positions to which they aspire.

Space, gender, and social hierarchies: Lefebvre in organizational studies

Scholars from different theoretical perspectives, including sociology (Bourdieu, 1984) art and architecture (Markus, 1993), philosophy (Foucault, 1977), and critical geography (Harvey, 1996), have examined the role of space in constructing and marking status. In organizational studies, scholars of organizational aesthetics (OA) have described space as “regimes of identity formation” (Dale & Burrell, 2008; Hancock & Spicer, 2011) emphasizing the ways in which physical arrangements within the workplace are used as “identity markers” (Elsbach, 2004). For instance, the size of an office or chair is used to signify hierarchical position and professional identity (Strati, 1999), and the use of prestigious materials symbolizes the organization’s cultural sophistication (Wasserman & Frenkel, 2011). While recognizing the importance of aesthetics in identity construction, the OA literature has rarely dealt with the production of space as a stratifying process that is constantly enacted, reproduced, and challenged.

It was Lefebvre’s (1974/1991) theory of the production of space that has recently inspired OA scholars to explore both the structural constraints and the enactment of space involved in constructing social hierarchies in everyday life (Dale & Burrell, 2008). This has exposed how space is tailored to upper-class social groups and to a universal, white, middle-class, masculine subject. Taken together, these insights suggest that *spatial work*—that is, the gender and classwork that organizational actors do in relation to their material space—may be crucial to the understanding of the more subtle and process-driven ways by which identity categories and hierarchies are “done” in organizations.

We next elaborate how the three Lefebvrian spaces have been imported into organizational studies.

The conceived space and organizational studies. The *conceived space* is defined as the discursive conceptualization of space constructed from abstract representations, codifications, and imaginary aspects of materiality. According to Lefebvre, this is the bureaucratized space of planners, constructed through discourse and abstractions reflecting the structural force of the social order in marginalizing disadvantaged groups. Lefebvre argues that space is never neutrally conceptualized; rather, it reflects the priorities of the dominant group, and it is affected by the social position of those in power to dictate specific elite tastes.

In the organizational context, the conceived space relates to the architectural and managerial discourse that accompanies the planning process conceptualizing the “appropriate” organizational identity, the ideal worker and expected behaviors. OA scholars emphasize the role of architects and managers in reproducing organizational inequalities and “powerscapes” (Baldry, 1999) and argue that space is never neutral, but rather hides mechanisms of exclusion under the cloak of “modern” ideas (such as openness, transparency, and flexibility), which serve as managerial ideal-types for how organizations should operate.

Regarding gender, Grosz (2001) argues that architectural discourse is phallogocentric in that it does not take into consideration the multiplicity of bodies and the ways they move in the space. Thus, a unified conceptualization of space and male-centered planning processes perpetuate women's invisibility and inequality.

The perceived space and organizational studies. The *perceived space* refers to the “physicality of materiality” (Dale & Burrell, 2008, p. 7), emphasizing emplacements, the embodiment of the spatial discourse and its everyday manifestations. For Lefebvre, the perceived space translates the tastes of those in positions of power into material and corporeal technics. It is the disciplining space in which individuals are kept in their place and wherein their everyday activities are constrained by physical structure.

In the organizational context, the perceived space relates to the materialization of the managerial and architectural discourse—namely, design style, shapes, colors, emplacement, and so forth. It also pertains to corporeal practices by which users manipulate the space in order to attain certain values. Drawing on the four Foucauldian technologies of fixing—enclosure, partitioning, classification, and ranking—organizations produce a segregated landscape and reproduce their employees' docile bodies (Dale & Burrell, 2008).

The role of the perceived space in marking status hierarchies within organizations has interested many OA scholars (for a review see Elsbach & Pratt, 2007). However, only scant attention has been paid to gender-related markings and segregations. Spain (1992), for instance, points to the historical separation between women's and men's work areas in buildings. However, with the gradual disappearance of formal gendered emplacement in modern organizations, spatial segregation has become more subtle and grounded in gender-occupational segregation that distinguishes between work areas for “men's jobs” and “women's jobs.” We too discuss the hidden spatial mechanisms that perpetuate gender segregation in modern organizations.

The habituated corporeal practices enforced by space and the gendered embodiment of organizational aesthetics in the perceived space have attracted much less attention, despite the growing corpus of research into the aesthetics of the body (Hancock & Tyler, 2000, 2007; Harding, 2002; Trethewey 1999). Grosz (2001), for instance, has called for the inclusion of the feminine body and other “peripheral” bodies in the built environment, but her work does not relate to organizational spaces, nor does she provide empirical data on how organizational spaces exclude women's bodies. Wasserman (2012) provides preliminary evidence about how modern workplaces are shaped around the idea of a universal body, ignoring gender differences. However, the notion of class differences and the ways in which space is enacted differently by women of different classes has not yet been addressed.

Drawing upon Hofbauer's (2000) socio-semiotic reading of open-plan designs, we argue that perceived space transmits messages regarding how female bodies are expected to move in space, how women are supposed to sit, whom are they supposed to see, and with whom are they supposed to communicate.

The lived space and organizational studies. The *lived space* refers to the spatial experience of the users, their interpretations, and their daily (mis)use of space. The lived space emerges through the enactment of space and its lived usages by its occupants in a way that might serve or undermine prevalent forms of spatial ordering (such as graffiti or street riots).

In the organizational context, the lived space relates to the informal daily experiences of space that reproduce or undermine the prescribed organizational order (such as cartoons). It is this space that allows for a much more complex understanding of space as enacting class and gender prepositions, since it shows not only that the space is constructed top-down by architects and

managers, but that it is also lived by employees, who experience it through their class and social positions.

OA scholars have shown that architectural and managerial discourses are actively perpetuated through users' interpretations of the space and the spatial enactment of managerial intentions. Following Gagliardi's (1990) concept of "pathos," OA scholars have acknowledged the significance of the sensory and emotional understanding of a given space. For instance, emphasizing the role of emotions in retailing and service organizations, Gilboa and Rafaeli (2003) explored various aspects of organizational design (such as order, cleanliness, and visual richness) and their impact on clients' emotional reactions (such as pleasure and arousal). These emotional reactions help them to "sense" the nature of organizational products or services and to behave accordingly. Other studies have developed this point by suggesting that emotional reactions to space may be influenced by gender (Tyler & Cohen, 2010), ethnicity (Yanow, 1995), and class (Elsbach, 2004).

These studies suggest that more attention should be paid to the role of differentiated (by gender and class) emotional reactions in the enactment of space and in the reproduction of gender and class identities in the organization.

The multilayered analysis of Lefebvre's spatial trialectics. A number of OA scholars have recently incorporated Lefebvre's triad of spaces in their work (e.g., Halford & Leonard, 2006; Hancock & Spicer, 2011; Watkins, 2005). Much of this scholarship regards the conceived and the perceived spaces as structural constraints enforced on passive individuals, and sees only the lived space as having any agentic emancipatory potential. It is our contention, however, that actors are engaged in *spatial work* that may reproduce or challenge social hierarchies in all three of the spaces. Our analysis of the role of space in the construction, reproduction, and resistance of gender-class identities does not consider either the conceived or the lived space as a given. Following Taylor and Hansen (2005) and Spicer and Taylor (2006), who have theorized the various ways that the three Lefebvrian spaces can be resisted, we focus on the work carried out both by managers and architects, and by different groups of female workers, in stabilizing (and destabilizing) gender-class categories.

Regarding the conceived space, we analyze architects' and managers' representations of the space as a form of *discursive spatial work*, defining it as top-down work that is performed both by architects and managers as well as by employees (who either resist or internalize the managerial discourses and sometimes even enforce them on others).

In the perceived space, we analyze the choice of colors, materials, shapes, and emplacements as selected (top-down) by architects and managers, as well as the personalization of space and the bodily habituated practices performed (bottom-up) by different groups of organizational members. We conceive of these as forms of *physical and bodily work* (also termed *material work* so as to include both aspects) aimed at reinforcing gender and/or class distinctions and at positioning oneself higher than others.

Finally, the lived space, which is grounded in the users' sensory maps, gives rise to *emotional spatial work* through which users develop a strong sense of their place within the organization, the organization's priorities, and its expectations of its different members. These expectations may be met with compliance or resistance. Drawing on Strati's (1999) notion of "empathy" and Gagliardi's (1990) notion of "pathos," we define this type of spatial work as the sensory (rather than intellectual) interpretation of the space. Emotional work is grounded in "the ability to express judgments based on taste and to live the social practices performed in organizations with emotion, affect and attachment" (Gherardi, Nicolini, & Strati, 2007, p. 318).

While actors are not always strategic in their attempts to reproduce or challenge specific gender and class identities and distinctions, we argue, following Bourdieu, that individuals' class and

gender habitus—developed outside the organization but sometimes refined or transformed through professional experience—largely define the spatial practices available to them and the emotional reactions they develop toward the space.

Methodology

The study is grounded in qualitative methodologies and employs an interpretive approach to the analysis of everyday spatial practices in a single organizational site. A single case study—often seen as adequate for the purpose of generating theory (Siggelkow, 2007)—allows for the juxtaposition of the researcher's interpretations of space with those of the various organizational participants: workers, managers, clients, and designers (Yanow, 2006). It also allows for the investigation of discrepancies among the various interpretations of a specific space by all these actors.

The case

The research focuses on the IMFA, which in 2002 was relocated to an impressive new building, which has been the focus of steadfast resistance on the part of the ministry's workers. In contrast to the old organizational home, the new IMFA building clearly distinguishes between the professional staff (the diplomats) and the administrators (secretaries, drivers, and other clerical staff), a distinction that often resonates with class and habitus differences (and, in Israel, with ethnic differences too). This distinction is further reinforced by the architectural decision to invest more resources in areas devoted to the diplomatic corps than in the administrators' work spaces.

Because so much of Israel's diplomatic efforts re concentrated on presenting itself as a Western developed country (and not as identified with the Middle East), the example of the IMFA is particularly interesting, all the more so given that the building's architecture was chosen specifically in order to brand Israel precisely as a Western, developed country.

Data collection

The study is based on various methodological tools (text analysis, observations, and interviews) that allowed us to examine the three Lefebvrian spaces. Specifically, we analyzed two books and many newspaper articles written about the building to detect the architectural and managerial vision behind the aesthetic choices; we carried out 20 on-site observations to detect movement patterns, bodily gestures, and social interactions; and we interviewed 56 female employees sampled from three different occupations and ranks (20 senior managers who have private offices, 16 junior diplomats, and 20 clerks, who sit in open cubicles).

Data analysis

We carried out interpretive readings to decipher meanings and to provide a rich description of the case that could assist in drawing broader theoretical conclusions (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994). Following Lefebvre (1974/1991) and Yanow (2006), our analysis is grounded in a meticulous comparison between the designers' and managers' intentions regarding the space, and the users' experiences in it. This comparison was carried out at a number of levels and through a number of stages (see Table 1). For an extended and detailed depiction of our research and analysis process, see <http://sociology.huji.ac.il/docs/frenkel-vassermanMethodology-%20extended%20version.pdf>.

Table 1. Methodological Process.

	Conceived Space	Perceived Space	Lived Space
Defined as	Architects' and managers' discourse regarding space, the organization and the identity and behavior of the "ideal worker"	The space as it was materialized and users' physical gestures	Users' interpretations of the conceived and perceived spaces
Data	Books published by the architects and the IMFA about the new compound, interviews with architects, IMFA managers and other state functionaries involved in the planning and construction process.	The material space: shapes, size, colors, zoning, artwork, technologies, light, bodily practices and spatial habits, including movement, gestures, and social interactions, as seen through researchers' observations and users' depictions. Divided into two noticeable layers: architects' design and users' design	Interviews with users (mostly IMFA workers), union leaders, and media depictions of the space
Mode of analysis	Discourse analysis aimed at detecting the main issues emphasized by planners	Space analysis based on "spatial vocabulary" and "design gestures"	Interpretative-hermeneutic analysis of users' interpretations (regarding the architects' discourse, the material space, and their own practices within it)

Findings: Gender-Class Work in the Three IMFA Spaces

Our findings show that various actors were involved in spatial work of all three types as they constructed gender-class identities and positioned themselves in the "right" place within the IMFA. Drawing on understandings of bureaucracy as inherently gendered, our findings suggest that traditional bureaucratic organizational design draws on what is seen as Western tastes and is experienced by employees as formal and masculine in essence, making middle-class men feel most "at home" in the organization. However, our findings also suggest that women differ from one another, not only in their experience and interpretation of the space but also in their disposition toward the bureaucratic surroundings and the spatial work they perform in keeping with their class and professional aspirations. Below we show how, in their spatial work, architects and managers construct an elite space, and how women from different classes construct their gender-class identity in ways that either reproduce or challenge the bureaucratic and masculine view of the space.

Discursive spatial work in the conceived space: Constructing a gender-class segregation

Analysis of the books written by the IMFA building's architects and interviews with the architects and the IMFA's management show that the new building was primarily aimed at advancing a new organizational and national image for Israel. This new identity was associated with images such as Westernness, advancement, professional diplomacy, representativeness, power, and hierarchy, and was directed both at Western guests and the diplomatic staff. As one of the architects put it:

I think we needed to represent Israeli diplomats as top drawer professionals, and we chose a very restrained design, more orderly and formal ... that would represent the staff and the country in a more positive light than the average Israeli ... In Europe and the US, workers work quietly and do not shout over the phone or at their kids at home at the workplace's expense ... One of the contemporary targets is branding and presenting Israel as Western and progressive; as a country that a European could say to himself "I can identify myself with it." Architecture, technology and sport—these are all perfect domains that we can use for branding ... We are not like our neighbors and architecture can help us to prove it.

The message here is that staff at the IMFA—and especially diplomats—must take on board the Weberian work habits of respectability and discipline, orderliness and cleanliness, formality, and the ability to distinguish between work and personal time. While these features resonate with the middle-class, masculine habitus of both architects and managers, they are at the core of what makes organizations gendered (see Acker, 1990; Britton, 2000). Moreover, in the Israeli context, these dispositions are not class-neutral either. In the architects' and managers' discourse, the formality of the bureaucratic model was associated with Westernness (distancing Israel from its non-Western neighbors). To reinforce this Western ideal worker upon workers and broadcast it to the world, "Western" taste must be displayed by the organization and its employees. However, in the Israeli context, the cultural capital that workers require in order to display "Western" taste is associated with the middle class, whereas the taste of the lower classes is often associated more strongly with Middle Eastern culture. Thus, the top-down spatial work in this case should be seen as "class work" (Gray & Kish-Gephart, 2013) that reinforces not only the sterilization of locality, but also the cultural segregation of employees, positioning those of Western origin higher than those of Middle Eastern extraction.

This idea was further underpinned by the emphasis placed on the hierarchical distinction between workers who come into contact with foreign diplomats and those whose positions are more clerical. The declared ambition here was to formalize labor relations, highlighting the gap between the different statuses. This discursive spatial work was carried out by both architects and managers: architects put forward the motif of hierarchy throughout their book about the building (using terms such as "orderly strata," "hierarchical composition," "a hierarchy of materials," "a hierarchy of shades," "a hierarchy between light and shadow," and "a hierarchical interpretation of the program of repetitiveness"), and senior managers involved in the planning process justified the hierarchy using bureaucratic terms such as efficiency, formality, discipline, and order. Both groups of actors encouraged a new and more "appropriate" taste to be adopted.

However, this discursive work has had a profound influence on the construction of gender-class identities in the IMFA given that the IMFA's senior diplomats are mostly men, while the junior staff—especially those in the administrative sector—are mostly women. Nor is it class-neutral, as the senior staff is mostly made up of middle-class men of European origin, whereas the junior staff include lower-class employees with a relatively higher proportion of people with Middle Eastern (Jewish) origins. Thus, even if not intentionally, the discourse justifying distinguished emplacement contributes to the maintenance of the status quo and best suits the cultural capital of middle-class men.

The transition to the new building also involved a new dress code, and employees were required to attend workshops on how to conduct themselves in their cubicles (with reference to speech, strength and tone of voice, dress, and more). Interestingly, this top-down discursive work was accompanied by bottom-up spatial work performed by some senior female managers, who encouraged the idea that workers' aesthetics should be congruent with the aesthetics of the new building. Thus, they targeted this bodily regulation at lower-class women, who occupy the open spaces visible to all, thereby not only forcing upon them middle-class conceptions of "appropriate"

aesthetics, but also reconstructing the aesthetic distinction between the classes. At the same time, this discourse enabled them to distance themselves from the dominant image of femininity, whereby women are perceived as unprofessional and overly local, and to carry out spatial work that further reinforces a segregated managerial discourse.

Physical and bodily spatial work in the perceived space: Building a segregating space

Our observations at various working spaces in the IMFA found that the discursive work of formality, professionalism, and Western representativeness was translated into the material work of a bureaucratic aesthetics: a restrained monochromatic and restricted color scheme (mainly white, gray, and beige), aesthetic standardization and uniformity, and the use of prestigious imported materials to reinforce the image of the state's institutions as powerful (Rosen, Orlikowski, & Schmahmann, 1990). This work—carried out top-down by the architects and managers as well as by employees (especially diplomats), who have embodied the new national and professional image both in reference to their physical surroundings and to their corporeality—materializes the bureaucratic ideology and the metaphors of organizational order and prioritizes the cultivated or utilitarian over the natural or irrational (Guillén, 1997).

However, as Gherardi (1994) has argued, gender (and, in our case, class) work simultaneously blurs the boundaries of social categories and reproduces them. Here, too, while the official goal was to impose a unified “taste” upon both male and female employees across different professional and class categories, it also physically marked the differences between them through the use of Foucauldian technologies of partitioning, classification, and ranking. For instance, the most striking material marker of gender-class segregation is emplacement. In particular, the new IMFA building has a special wing for the minister, the CEO, and management, and a separate wing for the more junior diplomats and other rank-and-file staff. Moreover, in this latter building, the lower floors were assigned to administrative (mostly female) workers and entry-level diplomats (women and men who were assigned these spaces for a short period only), while the top floors were reserved for middle- to top-level diplomats (men and women). This emplacement strategy led to the creation of a female-dominated space on the lower floors of the building and also impacted on the type of material work that women from the different groups can carry out.

The choice of neutral colors and a highly formal design derive from the planners' and managers' desire that the building reeducate the workers toward “better” aesthetic taste, greater formality, and a respectable Israeliness, but these aesthetic efforts were directed mostly at the (largely feminine) administrative corps. Moreover, while the top managerial areas of the building are exquisitely styled (with exclusive materials, larger workspaces, impressive public spaces, and unique shapes), the junior staff's spaces are standard, with common repetitive shapes, thus transmitting the message that senior employees do not require the same aesthetic disciplining as junior ones (see pictures on the website <http://mfa.gov.il/MFAHEB/AboutUs/MFABuilding/Pages/default.aspx>).

To buttress this new professional image, personal markers were perceived not only as inappropriate and unprofessional but also as reflecting the unbridled Israeli temperament. Thus, only a very limited number of colors were defined as “appropriate” (e.g., red chairs in the cafeteria were perceived as inappropriate for working with European diplomats; pictures of sandy landscapes and black-and-white photographs hang throughout the building; and cubicle walls are covered with gray felt and beige carpeting).

To prevent any interruption of this aesthetic uniformity, a new manager was appointed to supervise cleanliness and order in the new building. He targeted most of his disciplinary measures at

junior employees (mainly women) from the lower classes who had added colorful accessories that “did not fit” with the new image of Israel. For instance, he forbade staff from bringing ethnic carpets to work that would disrupt the color spectrum, and which exhibit non-Western tastes. Moreover, in keeping with Dale and Burrell’s (2008) concept of the technologies of fixity and homogeneous domination, here too workers located in open spaces were denied any possibility of changing the position of the furniture in the room. Similarly, in order to promote a more “appropriate” formalistic decor, staff were allowed to hang framed pictures in their offices, as long as their message was one of globalism or professionalism (such as a map of the world, photographs of political figures, or pictures of Jerusalem).

This kind of material work was further reinforced by employees, including women themselves, who were active executors of the spatial work played out both in the redesigning of their work stations and in the aesthetics of their own bodies. However, women of different ranks have embodied these demands in different ways that reflect the interrelationship between their gender and class, as we detail below.

Senior diplomats. An examination of the bottom-up spatial work by senior female diplomats in the perceived space reveals that they were the most significant actors in reproducing gender-class hierarchies. Adopting the masculine and bureaucratic aesthetic imperative, they have chosen to style their work environment in a manner very similar to that of men of equivalent status: a formal and restrained design for their offices, an almost total lack of personal or family effects, neutral and non-gender-specific colors, and pictures and symbols that stress their senior professional status (see Appendix figure c). Moreover, they have internalized the new national image dictated by the architectural discourse, identifying it as an inherent part of their class and profession. They have been able to materialize their habitus by hanging formal photographs, such as pictures of Jerusalem, Israeli heads of state, photographs taken with various Western leaders, and large framed maps of the world (in 80 percent of the rooms). Like those of male employees, their rooms are full of symbols of power and status (similar to those that might be found in gift shops for men). In line with the “one of the guys” strategy described by Kanter (1977), they have adopted the bureaucratic ideal-type in order to position themselves as equal to men. For instance, stands for business cards, gadgets, various certificates, and souvenirs from overseas postings were all commonly found in these exceptionally tidy offices. Stereotypically feminine identity markers have been excluded from the aesthetic space of most of the female managers’ offices. “Feminine” artifacts (such as a bowl of candies for visitors) were found in only two offices (of female managers originally from the administrative sector).

Bodily spatial work has also contributed to the reproduction of gender-class inequalities, where bodies serve to communicate “appropriate” meaning; 90 percent of the female managers in this study translated the demand for new Israeliness into formal clothing, such as tailored suits (atypical of Israeli dress codes), or prestigious but restrained designer outfits. Only two of the female managers—both previously from the administrative sector—were seen in more casual wear, implying that bodily work is closely linked to class and cultural habitus.

Junior diplomats. As a result of the selection processes in the IMFA, all members of the diplomatic corps have a Western, middle-class habitus. Thus, despite their lower (temporary) professional status, they share a class background with the senior diplomats. Yet, due to the emplacement policy described above, junior diplomats share the same (often open) space with administrative workers. In a context in which diplomacy is seen as a masculine occupation, and in which junior female diplomats are often mistaken for secretaries, the need to construct boundaries through aesthetic markers is even more critical for junior diplomats. Our documentation of the spatial work carried

out by these women shows that in order to be promoted, they activate their habitus by submitting to the new discourse, especially to the masculine, spare design, and by identifying with the ideal-type of the devoted bureaucratic worker. Symbols of Westernness were mostly evident through bodily work (and dress code) rather than in redesigning their physical surroundings.

The rooms and cubicles populated by the women from this group contained very few personal objects or ornaments, and the gray, felt-covered walls remained bare. In these offices we found neither symbols of power nor domestication, and a large number of the cubicles appeared to be only temporarily populated. For instance, in 87 percent of the offices and cubicles we found a great deal of paperwork, boxes, cases, and files, such that the room unequivocally spoke of its inhabitant's enormous workload (see Appendix, figure b). The inhabitant of one of the offices explained that she keeps her personal items (such as makeup and a mirror) hidden in a drawer, since she does not want to show any sign of what she called "feminine weakness." However, because of the mess and overload, these women do not communicate a message of power, as their senior colleagues do, and this spatial work may even undermine their attempts to link themselves to the desired organizational identity, since their surroundings are as simple as those of the administrative staff.

In contrast to the heavy workload conveyed by their disorganized work areas, the junior diplomats perform much more meticulous bodily work that demonstrates that they have completely internalized the Western dress codes required for women in their class (which is rare among Israeli women of their age).

The administrative staff. Observations of the female administrative staff's work areas show that, in contrast to the planners' efforts to eradicate indicators of femininity and domesticity, the women who populate them have, through their spatial work, turned them into distinctly feminine, personal, and non-formal (and probably much more Israeli) spaces. The vast majority (90 percent) of the secretaries' open cubicles are filled with colorful pictures, accessories, toys and trinkets, mirrors, drawings by their children, and family photos (see Appendix, figure a). The overall impression is one of the thoroughgoing domestication of the workspace, resulting in a "maternal aesthetics" that starkly contradicts the organization's instructions.

Colorful rugs were hanging in some of the cubicles in an effort to cover up the gray walls. Some of the cubicles (35 percent) displayed sarcastic slogans, such as "We live to work," or signs that referred to the person sitting in the cubicle, such as "I'm not the secretary of the manager sitting next to me," "This is not the information desk," and so on. There were no maps of the world hanging in these areas, apart from in the cubicles of two deputy managers who were positioned in an open space by a window.

Bodily work varied: only a few of the women wore formal clothes, and most of them (80 percent) did not wear high heels or a jacket. Most of them were dressed as is customary in Israeli workplaces, and their makeup and hair were less meticulously attended to than among the diplomats, although without entirely undermining the dress code. However, as we shall demonstrate, this rejection of Western aesthetic codes and the attempt to challenge the formal bureaucratic ideal contribute to the perpetuation of these women's inferior class and mark them as lower-middle-class Israelis.

Emotional spatial work in the lived space

Focusing on the lived/emotional understanding of space, this section is based on the interviews we carried out with staff from the IMFA. Our analysis reveals significant differences between the emotional-interpretive spatial work of women from different ranks.

Senior diplomats. Since the expression of emotion and the blurring of work and home are seen as symptoms of “unprofessional femininity,” the emotional reaction of senior women toward the top-down design was of compliance, comfort, and even national pride. At the same time, they expressed a strong negative emotional reaction to the bottom-up, non-compliant material work performed by other women, describing it as contaminating what they think should be a purely professional space. Tanya from the diplomatic sector explained:

With all due respect, this is a place of work, and so I don't think that a manager can allow herself to put all sorts of personal knick-knacks on display. It's not the place for it. I'm not even talking about the fact that it looks bad to men who come to her office, I just think it's inappropriate. In my opinion, an office should look tidy and not drowning in paperwork and personal mess. Did you see the mess in my deputy's office [a woman]? I think it's awful. It doesn't look professional or classy.

Tanya's emotional-interpretive work seeks to neutralize her feminine identity and to distinguish her from other women whom she sees as unprofessional. Following Gagliardi's (1990) notion of pathos, her knowledge derives from an emotional processing of her aesthetic surroundings and enables her to distinguish between the feminine and the “classy,” while positioning herself at the “appropriate” and supposedly masculine end of the scale.

While Tanya's emotional-interpretive work was common among senior female managers, two other managers expressed more complex emotions, challenging both the idea that “good diplomacy” should be emotion-free. Not surprisingly, these two managers were from a small group of diplomats at IMFA who had been able to move from administrative positions to diplomatic ones.

Our interview with Relli, a former administrative worker who had taken up a senior diplomatic position, was particularly interesting, as she had just moved from a cubicle to a closed, prestigious office:

I'm spending lots of time at the moment thinking about what I should put in the new office. Loads of things I had here [in the cubicle] I won't have in the new office. For example, I really don't like the maps that people put on the walls. It's formal and cold, it broadcasts a lot of power, so I don't think I'll put up a map in my office. On the other hand, I really like patchwork, and once I made a lovely patchwork tablecloth of the world ... I don't think I'll put it in my new office. It's very feminine and I'm very exposed by it. Much too exposed. It's not appropriate.... [Why?] Because there's this expectation that you'll be professional, formal, elegant, not personal, and maybe you could even say “not too feminine.” It's not good for your status and they won't take you seriously.

Relli clearly feels that she should take steps to neutralize her gender identity in order to strengthen her organizational status, and she shows that she is conforming to the organization's expectations of people of her status. At the same time, her class habitus prevents her from feeling comfortable with what management deems to be the appropriate aesthetics for the office of someone in her position. As Gray and Kish-Gephart (2013) suggest, class (and gender) dispositions tend to shape to a large extent the “work” people do in situations that cross classes. While most middle-class professional diplomats are socialized from an early age to be comfortable in a non-personal environment that does not have what she herself defines as feminine markers, Relli's own professional experience and socialization did not prepare her to feel comfortable in such an environment. Relli reacts to the space in emotional terms, rather than in the rational terms expected of workers in her position. She feels that the symbolic artifacts she would like to put in her office are markers of her class; however, they do not reflect a gender-neutral identity and violate the requirements for an “appropriate” range of colors (“no red or pink whatsoever,” as another female diplomat explained to us), suitable artifacts (no personal effects), and status symbols that reflect her professional

experience (photographs of her with famous political personalities from around the world). When asked what she meant by the word “elegant,” she answered: “everything that is not Israeli ... formal, European, classy, not too many feminine accessories.”

Somewhat similarly, Aviva, a more established senior manager who had also started her career in the administrative section, had hung a very large collage of family photos by the entrance to her office. When we asked her about it, she said:

That collage is a serious ice-breaker. People start talking with me about personal stuff straight away, and that’s fitting for my role, but in any case I’m not afraid of showing that I’m a woman ... [However] I won’t put children’s drawings up, and I make sure to keep the room tidy ... but I do want things that show that this is my office and not someone else’s. Something that will give me a bit of a feeling of home and that will make me feel more comfortable.

Aviva’s self-proclaimed feminine identity is more visible than that of typical female diplomats, who usually try to neutralize their gender identity. Nonetheless, since Aviva began her career as a clerk and had not gone through the regular selection process for the diplomatic training course, her uncharacteristic behavior might be construed as the result of her different class habitus and as inappropriate class work.

Junior diplomats. Though junior diplomats and senior managers often have similar class backgrounds, their emotional-interpretive work is different. While senior diplomats were slightly open to the expression of emotions and/or “feminine markers,” it seems that the junior ones have completely internalized the norms of the restrained bureaucratic aesthetics. As Abigail put it:

I feel very comfortable in this working environment. Maybe it’s the home I came from ... I won’t put anything personal here. It’s inappropriate for this kind of work ... I don’t think that women should put up too many pictures of the children. When a man does it, it seems sensitive, but when a woman does it, it’s as if she’s saying that home is more important than work. That’s not a good message for someone of my level, but when I’m higher up maybe I’ll let myself put up one or two framed pictures.

Abigail represses her own emotions by internalizing the managerial aesthetic imperative that the diplomats are expected to adhere to. She attributes this internalization to her background. Her choice to suppress emotional responses should be seen as part of her gender-class work aimed at distinguishing herself from anything “unprofessional” and as part of the reproduction of the identity of the organization’s ideal worker.

Other junior diplomats expressed similar opinions: they had extremely clear rules about what they should or should not put in their offices, and some explicitly expressed their disapproval of the display of personal and family pictures by other women. One of them spoke stridently about items that were “overly feminine” and another tied femininity with nationality by saying “it is much too Israeli to overload the cubicle with personal items.”

This spatial work is also carried out in relation to emotions regarding the body, making junior staff the target of subjectification and objectification. Data show that from the meanings they attribute to bodily gestures and clothing, they reconstruct a gendered, professional, and Western identity that is manufactured, manifested, and sustained. The outcome is that young women at the IMFA feel they have to choose between two scripts: being a woman, or being a valued professional Western diplomat. They end up embodying an extreme performance of masculinity by reining in their femininity for the sake of Western professionalism and their desire to be promoted. By exaggerating their masculine performance (even more than senior diplomats do), they ratify professionalism as masculine.

Practices of bodily discipline could also be seen in relation to eating and drinking habits, use of restrooms, and bodily gestures made in direct response to the spatial arrangements. Hila put it as follows:

I don't feel comfortable eating in the cubicle ... Women and food—it's complicated. Every biscuit I eat, every piece of chocolate, I'd rather do it in private, not in my cubicle, where everyone can see you. It's especially problematic at my status, because it might be interpreted as a lack of self-control ... and the cafeteria is problematic too. I like dairy foods, but it's mostly secretaries there ... so if I want to develop relations with important people then I have to go to the meat restaurant ... [Author's note: In Israeli state institutions, for religious dietary reasons, meat and milk products are kept separate.] ... Because I wear heels and everyone recognizes the way I walk, I don't go very often to the restroom, and sometimes I keep it in for ages because I can't be bothered with everyone's comments about my walking and my high heels ... I've found a weird way of walking that makes less noise.

In line with Trethewey's findings (1999), Hila seems to feel that the female body represents an uncontrolled "otherness" in a masculine, bureaucratized space. Hila's comments also expose her experience of the ways in which the design of space constructs her body in gender terms that even include the type of food a "professional woman" should eat. Threatened by the chance revelation that her bodily habits are too feminine, Hila has learned to walk quietly, to adhere to concealment, to eat with women of her status, and to represent a fit and controlled body.

The administrative staff. Compared to the two groups just described, this group of women would seem to experience the space allocated to each of its members in the most troubling manner, with one third of them reporting serious depression since the move to the new building. This may be because their jobs are by definition "feminine," or because feminine aspects have been eradicated from their space. As Miriam related:

I've been really depressed since we moved here ... This work environment, where you are just one out of a thousand, it breaks you ... On the one hand, they can always hear you and see every movement your body makes, but on the other hand, you're invisible ... There's no privacy, no room, all day long "sit in your cubicle," and you can't move ... It's to do with gender, because most of the people sitting here are women. The whole organization is built on men saying to themselves, "I'm the manager, so I get an office, my deputy will get an office with a window, and everyone else, who are mostly women, will get something that isn't as good." That's how men think, and all the design here is masculine, with those neutral and depressing colors, so I put up lots of pictures of the children.

Similar feelings were expressed by Rachel:

These areas are mainly for women, and because everything is open, a dynamics is created between them that is not always pleasant. For example, there is a middle-aged woman here who is having hot flushes. She wants to have the air conditioning on all the time, while other women are freezing. People start to shout at her ... They are angry and even resentful.

Miriam's and Rachel's troubled feelings, as well as those of many other secretaries, derive from the ostensive neutrality of the formal design and the uniformity of the cubicles: on the one hand, this produces a constant sense of surveillance of one's work and body, while on the other it produces an experience of invisibility and unimportance. However, these emotions, unlike those described by Elsbach (2004), are not gender-neutral. Miriam sees her spatial invisibility as the result of a deeply gendered structure, and so she chooses to perform an exaggerated femininity and to disrupt her

space by domesticating it. She signifies her femininity through color and by highlighting her maternal role, which helps her cope with the anonymity and masculinity of her environment. She sees no tension between her feminine and her professional identity—probably because she does not have the habitus required to perform Western restraint and a formal aesthetics.

Her clear and public expression of emotion and her reported sense of depression should also be seen as acts of resistance to the message latent in the designed space. The open expression of her feelings contradicts the constant demand for restraint, and her gendered reading of the space exposes the role of an ostensibly neutral aesthetics in the reproduction and stabilization of gender distinctions.

However, this spatial work is often turned against these women when they are criticized, especially by female managerial diplomats, for inappropriately “feminizing” the space. While these performances of femininity may challenge the masculine design, they also highlight the women’s “low” cultural habitus and position them every more strongly within the confines of their social class.

Furthermore, the communal space, which was supposed to enhance communication and proximity, has not empowered the clerks, but rather has given rise to aggression and hostility that further add to their oppression and inferior status. Their inability to control the temperature, for instance, reveals assumptions that standardized organizational space is suited to an apparently homogeneous body. Moreover, the body of the middle-aged woman becomes visible and marked in this uniform space, creating a sense of discomfort both for her and those around her, emphasizing her “incompatibility” and reinforcing inferiority by means of a bothersome physical experience. As reported by many of the clerks, such experiences heighten a sense of distress and helplessness regarding their environment.

Kanter (1977) has discussed the role of secretaries as office wives who maintain a homely environment and add feminine touches to the office. According to her, this gendered act represents women’s dispositions and goes hand in hand with organizational expectations. In our case, however, the organization strictly forbids the “feminine touch,” presenting it as inappropriate and unprofessional. The addition of feminine touches is an act of resistance that is intertwined with the open discussion of emotions and emotional responses to space.

Discussion

The findings of this study shed new light on the role of design and spatial work in the reproduction of gender and class hierarchies; they point to the importance of understanding the organizational space as part of any organization’s inequality regime, both in imposing a hierarchical order upon its users and in shaping their gender and class work within it. While much of the research on gender, class and space tends to treat architecture and spatial design and planning as a top-down process that imposes architects’ tastes on users, disregarding their taste or their gender or class, our study turns the spotlight on the role of users in enacting, practicing, and shaping the space in the construction of their gendered identities.

Existing studies have often treated gender and class as internally coherent categories, seeing “men” and “women” as homogeneous groups; some attention has been paid to sexual orientation, but not to the intersection of gender and class or racial identities. Our study points to the importance of the exploration of such intersectionality for understanding space not only as a “regime of identity formation” (Hancock & Spicer, 2011), but also as a site in which actors perform and work while struggling to position themselves within the organization. Our focus on the spatial work conducted by different groups of actors within the organization allows us to promote a theoretical understanding of the role of space in shaping gender-class intersectionality in several ways.

First, studies of organizational “inequality regimes” have already pointed to aspects of organizations, such as their bureaucratic practices (Britton, 2000), their structure (Acker, 2006), and their diversity policies (Holvino, 2010), that contribute to the way that gender and other social hierarchies are reproduced in the organization. Our study, however, points to the importance of the designed organizational space as contributing to such reproduction, mostly in a latent manner. We have shown that although space is allegedly conceived and designed around an abstract bureaucratic ideal-type that glorifies gender and class neutrality, it is neither conceptualized as neutral nor interpreted and experienced as such by users.

More specifically, in the case of IMFA, the new building was intended to improve performance by constructing a new professional diplomatic identity for its employees. Managers and architects have never referred to the design and the new professionalism in gendered terms. However, in line with Acker’s (1990) and Britton’s (2000) arguments, their conceptualizations of “better performance” and the ideal worker are inherently masculine. Thus, while the new ideal diplomatic identity could have been conceived in terms associated with stereotypical femininity, highlighting the maintenance of informal social ties with local people in the host country and the fostering of warm emotional reactions towards Israel, the ideal diplomat was instead defined in terms associated with middle-class masculinity, such as formality and rationality. This vision was then translated into an architectural design that was later experienced by workers as masculine and class segregated.

Second, our findings also contribute to the understanding of intersectionality in organizations by pointing to the spatial work involved in the construction of gender-class identities. This work takes place both top-down and bottom-up. Accordingly, managers and architects were not the only actors responsible for reproducing gender and class hierarchies. Women from different occupational groups were also actively engaged in different forms of discursive, material, embodied, and emotional work through which they either reinforced or challenged the notions of femininity and professionalism as identified with middle-class performance. In line with theories of gender and class practicing (e.g., Bruni, Gherardi, & Poggio, 2004), our findings suggest that the gender/class habitus internalized and embodied by workers outside of the organization have largely determined the ways in which they experience the organizational space and operate within it. Highly educated middle-class women feel comfortable in the new space and know how to “fit in” and comply with the organization’s image of the ideal worker, despite experiencing the space as masculine. Women from lower-class backgrounds, however, experience the space as more oppressive and marginalizing, and lack the cultural capital to adapt themselves to the newly imposed organizational identity. In line with Gray and Kish-Gephart’s (2013) notion of “class work,” the enactment of space by these women is predetermined by their habitus and cultural capital; however, this also gives them the agency to resist a space in which they do not feel comfortable. Through the different ways in which women from the three different groups talk about the space, design their personal spaces, dress, move, talk, and express their emotions within the space, the IMFA’s workers have, for the most part, reproduced the stereotypical associations between masculinity, middle-class habitus, and professionalism on the one hand, and between femininity, lower-class habitus, and professional marginalization on the other. At the same time, using different modes of aesthetic work, a few successful women have been able to enact their feminine lower-class identity in a way that challenges the organizational image of the ideal worker and to advance an alternative model of feminine professionalism.

Our third contribution consists in providing a gendered perspective on Lefebvre’s spatial theory. While Lefebvre’s theory is deployed by scholars to understand power relations regarding class, his theory has not been used to research gender relations in organizations. This study shows that even if we consciously try to avoid stereotypical and one-dimensional thinking about gender symbols, users themselves nonetheless experience and interpret space in a way that perpetuates gendered

symbolism. The fact that all of the users—men and women alike—experience the IMFA’s aesthetics as masculine has a direct impact on their professional and gender identity. While men are able to identify with the “masculine” design, and thus do not experience it as contradicting their self- or professional identity, women clearly sense a conflict between their gender identity and the masculine/professional space, and many of them even report feeling uncomfortable with “overly feminine” symbols or with feminine bodily performances. Hence, they feel obliged to negotiate their identities and adopt various aesthetic strategies in order to align their gender and professional identities.

Moreover, while most OA scholars who use Lefebvre’s theory refer to the conceived and the perceived spaces as structural constraints imposed on employees from above by architects and managers, and see the lived space as the only space where bottom-up resistance or counter-interpretations may emerge, our data show that power and gender-class identities can be forced on employees in all three Lefebvrian spaces, and that they may all be the site of spatial work that undermines social hierarchies as well. Our study shows that, in the conceived space, architects and managers lean on professionalism as the most appropriate platform for the conceptualization of the ideal worker, but that employees may either internalize the superiority of professionalism or expose its non-neutrality and offer another conceptualization of space. In the perceived space, employees can either accept class and gendered segregation or disrupt it through “guerilla architecture” (Clegg & Kornberger, 2006), that is, through alternative spatial arrangements. In the lived space, female employees may perpetuate their inferior status by accepting their gender role, or they may resist it through alternative interpretations.

To conclude, in recent years the bureaucratic model has been a target of growing criticism, both as a management and as an architectural style. In many organizations, teamwork and matrix authority structures have replaced the classic bureaucratic structure, and creativity has often been celebrated as a more important feature of the ideal worker than efficiency and discipline. Reflecting this shift, many organizations have adopted a spatial design that aims at encouraging such creativity, bringing in colors and shapes less closely associated with traditional masculine, middle-class taste. Future research should look at the gender and class spatial work that has led to the emergence of these new designs and that is performed within them. Would a less bureaucratic and stereotypically middle-class masculine design generate less segregating, bottom-up, gender-class spatial work? Would an organization operating in such a space be automatically more egalitarian?

Acknowledgements

The authors wish to thank Gili Drori, Micki Eisenman, Sharon Gilad, Tamar Yogev, and Limor Samimian-Darash as well as the anonymous reviewers for extremely helpful comments and suggestions. We also thank session participants of the EGOS workshop 2013 in Rhodes and of the WU workshop in Vienna on “Giving visual and material form to ideas, identity and imagination” for the opportunity to present these ideas and the useful conversations that followed.

Funding

Support for this study was provided by the Research Authority of the Open University.

References

- Acker, J. (1990). Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: A theory of gendered organizations. *Gender and Society*, 4, 139–158.
- Acker, J. (2006). Inequality regimes: Gender, class, and race in organizations. *Gender and Society*, 20, 441–464.

- Alvesson, M., & Billing, Y. D. (2009). *Understanding gender and organizations*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Baldry, C. (1999). Space—The final frontier. *Sociology*, 33, 535–553.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Brah, A., & Phoenix, A. (2013). “Ain’t I a woman?” Revisiting intersectionality. *Journal of International Women’s Studies*, 5, 75–86.
- Britton, D. M. (2000). The epistemology of the gendered organization. *Gender & Society*, 14, 418–434.
- Bruni, A., Gherardi, S., & Poggio, B. (2004). Doing gender, doing entrepreneurship: An ethnographic account of intertwined practices. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 11, 406–429.
- Clegg, S., & Kornberger, M. (2006). *Space, organizations and management theory*. Copenhagen, Denmark: Liber.
- Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, 3, 1241–1299.
- Dale, K., & Burrell, G. (2008). *The spaces of organisation and the organisation of space: Power, identity and materiality at work*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Douglas, M. (1966). *Purity and danger: An analysis of concepts of pollution and taboo*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Elsbach, K. D. (2004). Interpreting workplace identities: The role of office décor. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25, 99–128.
- Elsbach, K. D., & Pratt, M. G. (2007). The physical environment in organizations. *Academy of Management Annals*, 1, 181–224.
- Ely, R. J. (1995). The power in demography: Women’s social constructions of gender identity at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 589–634.
- Ely, R. J., & Meyerson, D. E. (2000). Theories of gender in organizations: A new approach to organizational analysis and change. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 22, 103–151.
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and power*. New York: Pantheon.
- Gagliardi, P. (1990). *Symbols and artifacts: Views of the corporate landscape*. Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter.
- Gherardi, S. (1994). The gender we think, the gender we do in our everyday organizational lives. *Human Relations*, 47, 591–610.
- Gherardi, S., Nicolini, D., & Strati, A. (2007). The passion for knowing. *Organization*, 14, 315–329.
- Gilboa, S., & Rafaeli, A. (2003). Store environment, emotions and approach behaviour: applying environmental aesthetics to retailing. *International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer Research*, 13, 195–211.
- Gray, B., & Kish-Gephart, J. (2013). Encountering social class differences at work: How “class work” perpetuates inequality. *Academy of Management Review*, 38, 670–699.
- Grosz, E. A. (2001). *Architecture from the outside: Essays on virtual and real space*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Guillén, M. F. (1997). Scientific management’s lost aesthetic: Architecture, organization, and the Taylorized beauty of the mechanical. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42, 682–715.
- Halford, S., & Leonard, P. (2006). Place, space and time: Contextualizing workplace subjectivities. *Organization Studies*, 27, 657–676.
- Hancock, A. M. (2007). When multiplication doesn’t equal quick addition: Examining intersectionality as a research paradigm. *Perspectives on Politics*, 5, 63–79.
- Hancock, P., & Spicer, A. (2011). Academic architecture and the constitution of the new model worker. *Culture and Organization*, 17, 91–105.
- Hancock, P., & Tyler, M. (2000). The look of love, gender and the organization of aesthetics. In J. Hassard, R. Holliday, & H. Willmott (Eds.), *Body and organization* (pp.108–129). London: SAGE Publications.
- Hancock, P., & Tyler, M. (2007). Un/doing gender and the aesthetics of organizational performance. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 14, 512–533.

- Harding, N. (2002). On the manager's body as an aesthetics of control. *Tamara: Journal of Critical Postmodern Organization Science*, 2, 63–76.
- Harvey, D. (1996). *Justice, nature, and the geography of difference*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hofbauer, J. (2000). Bodies in landscape: On office design and organization. In J. Hassard, R. Holliday, & H. Willmott (Eds.), *Body and organization* (pp. 166–191). London: SAGE Publications.
- Holvino, E. (2010). Intersections: The simultaneity of race, gender and class in organization studies. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 17, 248–277.
- Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Men and women of the corporation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Lefebvre, H. (1974/1991). *The production of space*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Linstead, S., & Hopfl, H. (2000). *The aesthetics of organization*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Markus, T. A. (1993). *Buildings and power*. London: Routledge.
- Martin, P. Y. (2006). Practising gender at work: Further thoughts on reflexivity. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 13, 254–276.
- Minahan, S., & Cox, J. W. (2007). *The aesthetic turn in management*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.
- Neuman, I. B. (2005). To be a diplomat. *International Studies Perspectives*, 6, 72–93.
- Özbilgin, M. F., Beauregard, T. A., Tatli, A., & Bell, M. P. (2011). Work-life, diversity and intersectionality: A critical review and research agenda. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 13, 177–198.
- Poggio, B. (2006). Editorial: Outline of a theory of gender practices. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 13, 225–233.
- Rosen, M., Orlikowski, W. J., & Schmahmann, K. S. (1990). Building buildings and living lives: A critique of bureaucracy, ideology and concrete artifacts. In P. Gagliardi (Ed.), *Symbols and artifacts: Views of the corporate landscape* (pp. 69–84). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Shields, S. A. (2008). Gender: An intersectionality perspective. *Sex Roles*, 59, 301–311.
- Siggelkow, N. (2007). Persuasion with case studies. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50, 20–24.
- Spain, D. (1992). *Gendered spaces*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Spicer, A., & Taylor, S. (2006). The struggle for organizational space. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 27, 2–27.
- Strati, A. (1999). *Organization and aesthetics*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Styhre, A., & Eriksson-Zetterquist, U. (2008). Thinking the multiple in gender and diversity studies: Examining the concept the intersectionality. *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, 23, 567–582.
- Taylor, S. S., & Hansen, H. (2005). Finding form: Looking at the field of organizational aesthetics. *Journal of Management Studies*, 42, 1211–1231.
- Trethewey, A. (1999). Disciplined bodies: Women's embodied identities at work. *Organization Studies*, 20, 423–450.
- Tyler, M., & Cohen, L. (2010). Spaces that matter: Gender performativity and organizational space. *Organization Studies*, 31, 175–198.
- Wasserman, V. (2012). Open spaces, closed boundaries: Transparent workspaces as clerical female ghettos. *International Journal of Work Organisation and Emotion*, 5, 6–25.
- Wasserman, V., & Frenkel, M. (2011). Organizational aesthetics: Caught between identity regulation and culture jamming. *Organization Science*, 22, 503–521.
- Watkins, C. (2005). Representations of space, spatial practices and spaces of representation: An application of Lefebvre's spatial triad. *Culture and Organization*, 11, 209–220.
- Yanow, D. (1995). Built space as story: The policy stories that buildings tell. *Policy Studies Journal*, 23, 407–422.
- Yanow, D. (2006). Studying physical artifacts: An interpretive approach. In A. Rafaeli & M. G. Pratt (Eds.), *Artifacts and organizations: Beyond mere symbolism* (pp. 41–60). London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Author biographies

Varda Wasserman is a senior lecturer at the Open University of Israel in the Department of Management & Economics. She is an organizational sociologist, and specializes in organizational aesthetics, Lefebvre and

organizational studies, organizational resistance, embodiment and gender identities. Her recent publications are in *Organization* and *Organization Science*.

Michal Frenkel is a senior lecturer of sociology and organization studies at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. Her studies focus on the role of management discourse and organizational practices in the shaping of gender, ethnic, religion, class and national identities in the context of uneven globalizing dynamics. She has published in *Academy of Management Review*, *Organization Studies*, *Organization Science*, *Organization* and other journals. She serves on the editorial board of *Organization Studies*.



Appendix. Pictures of rooms of three different ranks. (a) An administrative staff cubicle. (b) A junior diplomatic staff office. (c) A senior diplomatic staff office.