Views from the top and below: An exploration of what intersectionality brings to sectoral research.

Abstract

The impact of gender and other embodied diversity markers is rarely mentioned in the burgeoning literature on careers. In contrast, feminist scholarship recognises the multiple ways gender, race/ethnicity, age, class and/or other diversity markers influence individual career choices. The research approach that examines the interaction of multiple categories of difference is known as intersectionality, and although the 'right way' to carry out intersectional research remains the subject of intense debate, scholars concur that it is complex and "messy" (Dhamoon 2011, 240).

This article focuses on the female dominated hotel sector in Aotearoa New Zealand. An intersectional multi-level analysis used memory-work and semi-structured interviews to explore the career experiences of long-term hospitality workers. At career entry, career consolidation and career arrival phases, the multiple ways privilege and disadvantage intersect are considered. Our overall intent is to highlight the extent that age, gender, ethnicity and class context, shape career choices in hotels.

Key Words: age, gender, class, ethnicity, privilege, penalty, intersectionality,

Introduction

Feminist scholarship has recognised the multiple ways gender, ethnicity/race, age, class and/or other diversity markers influence the career choices individuals make (e.g. Acker, 2006a; Bendl and Schmidt, 2010; Sang et al., 2013). The way to capture mutually intersecting points of socially ascribed categories of difference is known as intersectionality. The concept itself, its ontology and methodological implications are the subject of a continuing debate (Bilge, 2010; Broadbridge and Simpson, 2011; Davis, 2011; Dhamoon, 2011; Holvino, 2010; McCall, 2005; Woodhams and Lupton, 2014; Yuval-Davis, 2006). Intersectionality is aptly

1

described as an 'institutionalised intellectual project' (Nash, 2008: 13), 'messy' (Dhamoon, 2011: 240) and, a now well-travelled concept (Crenshaw, 2011). Despite this, the advantages or not, of intersectionality research and its emancipatory potential remain unclear (Davis, 2011; Woodhams and Lupton, 2014).

The contribution of this article is to demonstrate what a multi-level intersectional methodology offers to research exploring power relations at work. The setting is the hospitality sector in Aotearoa New Zealand (NZ), the specific focus being employees pursuing a career in hotel management. We aim to show how an institutionalised linear career path shapes the work experiences of individuals and in doing so, reproduces a system of privilege for certain groups of men and some women, while penalising most women and some men. Thus we contend that questions of privilege and penalty are as salient to men as women (Hearn, 2011; Tatli and Özbilgin, 2012), even though the focus of much feminist research would suggest otherwise. Furthermore, while privilege is a somewhat controversial use of intersectionality (Lutz et al., 2011), to juxtaposition privilege with penalty facilitates an explanatory framework that facilitates our understanding of different organisational outcomes for individuals distinguished by socially ascribed categories of difference. Attention to privilege raises its visibility, relevance and complexity. For example, those 'sometimes privileged' may also at times, be penalised through association with another identifiable, category of difference (Calas et al., 2014; Dhamoon, 2011).

To do so the article is structured as follows: we begin by giving a brief overview of the hospitality industry and how Aotearoa New Zealand (NZ) fits within industry-wide global trends. Following this we bring some conceptual clarity to age, ethnicity, gender, and class, given there are multiple meanings associated with each term. Privilege and penalty are also explained, as an intersectional approach confers new, deeper meanings to both. We then

2

briefly outline the methodology of the wider qualitative project and the two methods, memory-work and in-depth, semi-structured interviews. Then the article, in the findings and discussion section, draws on extracts from the data to give insights into how age, gender, ethnicity and class enabled or constrained participant's careers in hotel management. Finally, the article concludes by suggesting that gender is the principal marker of difference in such careers.

Context: The Hospitality Sector and Hotel Management

The hospitality sector covers a vast array of employment contexts. For example, approximately 8.3% of total jobs are found in the worldwide travel and tourism industry (Schlentrich, 2008: 192). In NZ, as is the case in most countries, labour turnover is high across the whole sector. Worldwide, the contributors to worker mobility are believed to include; bad working conditions; low pay; high vocational flexibility; poor human resource management practices; seasonality or a combination of these factors (Chalkiti and Sigala, 2010; Davidson et al., 2010; Marco-Lajara and Úbeda-García, 2013). As high labour turnover is regarded as inevitable in NZ (Williamson et al., 2012), unsurprisingly, a shortage of skilled labour remains the principal problem of hospitality employers (Neill, 2013) acerbated by ageist attitudes towards older employees (Poulston and Jenkins, 2013).

In a hotel career, there are low entry barriers and it is possible to enter and be successful without a degree (Harkison et al., 2011). For this reason and hospitality's overall association with servitude and femininity (Korczynski, 2002; Lucas, 2011) the status attributed to hospitality employment in NZ is low. The hotel industry as a whole appears to suffer from 'taint', even if some of the diverse occupations within it, such as Executive Assistant Manager, Financial Controller and Chief Engineer, are highly esteemed and well remunerated in other business sectors. Baum (2007) suggests that only the occupation of

3

General Manager of a large luxury hotel possess high status ranking commensurate with desirable occupations outside the hospitality sector.

The career pathway in hotel management is framed as a linear progression from entry level positions to senior management (Ladkin, 2002; Ladkin and Riley, 1996) the premise of which is full-time continuous employment with no external distractions (Durbin et al., 2010; Sabelis and Schilling, 2013). Progression is based on the attainment of specific career competencies and technical specialisation (Kong et al., 2011; Wang, 2013). To reach the position of General Manager, a breadth of experience in various departments is required (Yamashita and Uenoyama, 2006) and industry mentors facilitate the frequent geographical moves that demonstrate competency and flexibility, thus ensuring promotion (Mooney, 2009).

At first glance, the progression structures in hotels do appear at entry level to be conducive to career focused individuals regardless of their sex. This goes someway to explain why in NZ, the majority of undergraduates in hospitality management degree courses are young women, (Stokes et al., 2010), replicating the situation in other countries (Chuang and Dellmann-Jenkins, 2010; Pizam, 2006). Previous research has suggested that in time, women will move through management ranks and assume senior hotel management positions (Woods and Viehland, 2000). Yet, although there appear to be equal numbers of women and men at department head level, there are few senior female executives in hotel management in NZ or Australia (Mooney and Ryan, 2009). Horizontal and vertical segregation remains entrenched in the hierarchical structures of large hotels globally (Baum, 2013), in Hong Kong (Ng and Pine, 2003), Australia (Knox, 2008), Spain (Campos-Soria et al., 2009) and the United Kingdom (Guerrier, 2008). In the NZ hotel sector, women are concentrated in

4

housekeeping jobs that are perceived to require a lower level of skills and allow for part-time work and casual employment (Statistics New Zealand, 2013).

Research Design

Explanations as to the high turnover in hospitality have dominated the research agenda in this sector. There is little attention given to making overt the power relations in hospitality workplaces or the intersections of various constituent parts when seeking to understand questions of difference, privilege and penalty (Lutz et al., 2011; Tatli and Özbilgin, 2012).. For this reason, the aim of the wider research project was to assess the effects intersecting identities had on career longevity and the varying degrees 'difference' conferred penalty and/or privilege in career outcomes. An intersectional methodology was chosen because it prompts the exploration of the multifaceted relationships between socially constructed difference groupings and structures in varied contexts (Dhamoon, 2011). However, methodological tussles around intersectionality continue unabated (e.g. Bilge, 2010; (e.g. Bilge, 2010; Lutz et al., 2011; Woodhams and Lupton, 2014). One key area surrounds the confusion in how to implement a workable framework upon which to build an empirical study (McCall, 2005; Winker and Degele, 2011).

In seeking a feasible framework, Winker and Degele's (2011) model of multi-level analysis was adapted by the first author to show the links between the micro, meso and macro levels of hotel employment and uncover organisational processes that reinforce degrees of privilege and penalty for individuals differentiated by age, gender, ethnicity and class. While this model is one of the few approaches to intersectional research that offers a clear sequence of steps, how these were translated and the actual 'doing' of the project evolved over the research process. We briefly outline three key decisions that were integral to the wider research process.

5

First, the origins of intersectionality are grounded in oppression (Crenshaw, 2011) not organisational privilege. A recent tenet of the debate has seen calls to shift beyond binary categories of privilege (advantage) and penalty (disadvantage) (Atewologun and Sealy, 2014; Ozbilgin et al., 2010). Notions of privilege and penalty are complex and contentious. However, viewing different categories of people as *only* attracting privilege or *only* suffering penalty cannot capture the complexity of multiple intersections of points of difference, the oppressor can also be the oppressed (Dhamoon, 2011). By focusing on the structures that perpetuate organizational processes which reproduce inequality (Dhamoon, 2011; Walby et al., 2012), it was possible to see how the privileges and penalties attached to being a certain age, gender, ethnicity and occupational class contributed (or not) to career progression and longevity of employment within large hotels in NZ.

Second and equally contentious, is the identification of difference categories, justifying their salience to specific contexts and, clearly signalling how each difference category is conceptualised (Britton and Logan, 2008; McCall, 2005; Yuval-Davis, 2006). This study involved career longevity within the hierarchical structures of large hotels. The choice of difference categories, gender, age, ethnicity and occupational class as dimensions to investigate was central to meeting the purpose of a study juxtapositioning privilege and penalty. Importantly, while each difference category is analytically distinct, they are interconnected through socially ascribed understandings that can vary in different institutional contexts and at specific points in history (Brah, and Pheonix, 2004; Gatrell and Swan, 2008; Tatli and Özbilgin, 2012).

In this study, age was interpreted as 'body-age'; a term that describes an individual's chronological age and associated suitability for a particular job that encompasses desired appearance and life stage (Winker and Degele, 2011). Age in this sense, is an

6

unusual difference category in that it is in constant flux through the ageing process (Hearn, 2011). Furthermore, notions of performance do not solely apply to the way individuals look and perform physically, but how they fulfil (or not) societal and organizational expectations associated with a certain time in life (Hearn, 2011; Perry and Parlamis, 2006).

Similarly, gender was theorised as a social practice manifested in everyday life practices (Acker, 2006b; Calas et al., 2014). Gender as performativity takes the perspective that particular social assumptions are associated with male or female roles (Manager vs Housekeeper); there are conscious and unconscious expectations that men and women will play specific roles in the workplace (Lewis and Simpson, 2010). Ethnicity, as a difference category (ethnic minority), is more commonly used in NZ rather than race and is associated with cultural affiliation (Ethnicity - Statistics New Zealand, 2013). Ethnicity suggests 'an apparently equal, multicultural juxtaposition of cultures which tolerate and respect each other' whereas race tends to be associated with historic norms of a racial hierarchy and inequality (Lutz et al., 2011:8).

Occupational class, aligns with organisational privilege and power, in terms of 'where class is constructed and enacted *and* where the invisible work of marginalised classes is consumed by elites' (Scully and Blake-Beard, 2006: 446). Class differences are seen in terms of difference categories (e.g. male over female; white over minority ethnicity; younger over older), hierarchical position and professional status (Acker, 2006a; Atewologun and Sealy, 2014). In hotel career paths with advancement dependent on a prescribed hierarchical system, occupational class is so visible, it is normalised. Without a prescribed hierarchical pathway, there would be no career structure.

The third decision and area of contention was whether or not to address concerns on how intersectional analysis decentres gender (Broadbridge and Simpson, 2011). We concur

7

with such concerns and endeavour to show that gender is the enduring nexus of exclusionary organisational processes. In examining the processes of privilege and penalty, we looked at how these play out within each category and then, the ways they intertwine *with* gender as the central core. We ask, what does it mean to be privileged by one social category, for example occupational class, and simultaneously penalised by age, ethnicity and gender in organisational processes? By asking such questions an intersectional approach exposes the 'soft social underbelly' of organisational life (Zander et al., 2010, p. 462) revealing the workings of power and influence in the career patterns of individuals.

Methods

Two methods of data collection, memory-work and semi-structured interviews, were used in the wider study. Memory-work is a group research method that involves the collective analysis of individual written memories (Onyx and Small, 2001). In this study, memory-work explored the remembered experiences of those who had spent at least 10 years in hospitality operations in various departments and achieved managerial level. The group was educated and articulate, from European or New Zealand European backgrounds (with one exception), their ages ranged from 30 to 62 years old, four participants were female and eight were male. In contrast, nineteen semi-structured interviews that followed were with current large hotel employees and enabled the examination of the subjective meanings that participants ascribed to their career experiences (Savickas, 2013). The length of participants' careers ranged from 16 to 41 years and roles held alternated between chef, kitchen porter, room attendant, assistant housekeeper to a variety of managerial positions. Interviewees were aged from 38 to 70 years and included those of New Zealand European, Maori, Pasifika (Fijian Indian, Samoan-Chinese, Samoan) and European ethnicity. Ten interviewees were female and nine were male.

Analysis

In common with Dhamoon's (2011) experience, the primary researcher, the first author, encountered problems when the analysis was initially based on participants' individual identities as the data sets became unmanageable. To illustrate, a woman working in housekeeping could have multiple distinct and separate identities, as woman, mother, migrant, wife, New Zealander/Pacifika ethnicity, department head, middle-aged, and be professionally qualified. To counter this, the first phase of analysis focused on the identification of symbolic norms in participants' accounts. The representations identified aspects of hospitality careers that participants considered important, such as their beliefs about requirements for promotion. For example, some representations of the promotional process were clearly visible, such as, "it's who you know that gets you good jobs". Others were more opaque; "you have to transfer to get good jobs" or "hard work is always rewarded". Altogether eleven main categories of symbolic representations were identified because of their relevance to the focus of the wider research project. Phase two involved identifying social structures, either organisational or institutional, the third phase sought to isolate the points where references to social structures (e.g. the hospitality hierarchy) and symbolic representations (e.g. General Managers are all the same) interconnected. In total there were 35 intersections) which then enabled the primary researcher to overlay aspects of age, gender, ethnicity and class at the intersections identified. In the next section, we illustrate the possibilities a multi-level intersectional methodology offers to research exploring power relations at work, our specific focus being employees pursuing a career in hotel management. The findings and discussion explore privilege and penalty through the intersectional lens of gender, ethnicity, age and class. To do so, three specific points of careers in the large hotel sector are examined: 1) career entry, 2) career consolidation and, 3) the career 'arrival' point.

Findings and discussion

For individuals interested in a managerial pathway in the hospitality industry, the position of General Manager of a large hotel represents the pinnacle of career success. However, the subjective notion of career 'success' if measured by longevity within the sector did not necessarily mean making it 'to the upper levels' of the occupational hierarchy.

Entry into a career in hotel management

The findings show significant connections between age, gender, ethnicity and occupational level at career entry point, even in this notoriously 'easy entry' industry (Baum, 2013, 2007). Many of the study participants, male and female, entered the industry because of convenience of hours or location and the work was considered easy as a room attendant, cleaner or kitchen hand. The availability and level of entry positions was influenced by the qualifications of participants and/or beliefs based on age and gender stereotypes.

Younger workers appeared to be 'privileged' by their youth. Winker and Degele (2011) suggest that an employer's perception of ideal performance is linked with age norms and the energy and appearance of young people is desirable, particularly for physically demanding hospitality work (Furunes and Mykletun, 2005; McIntosh and Harris, 2012). Participants, looking back, linked their youth with the willingness to complete the long hours and physically arduous work necessary at the early career stages.

Paul (General Manager): "I was pretty young and gullible so I was pretty keen to grab those opportunities." [Interview participant]

Conversely, young people were also penalised by managers and supervisors because of their youth. There was evidence of interpellation, a phenomenon that occurs when employees in a workplace adopt management's vision of the ideal worker (McDowell et al., 2007). The positioning of young people as irresponsible, unreliable and unrealistic by many

10

interview participants illustrated the ageist contradictions between the desire for commitment, a 'perfect' employee and, 'potential problem'.

> *Ryan (Former Restaurant Manager): "I just found it interesting that the partying and the fun (of young people) was linked to some kind of juvenile delinquency. The management move is linked to a kind of snap into reality, be responsible and move on." [Memory-work extract]*

Further organisational processes reinforced the disposable, temporary 'casual worker' status of many young workers. Attitudes to youthful newcomers by management were not encouraging and acceptance only came when an individual was recognised as worthy of respect.

Just as there were penalties attached to being young in hospitality employment, there was evidence that privilege was associated with being older in hospitality. Replicating more positive attitudes towards older workers in previous studies (Jenkins and Poulston, 2014; Magd, 2003) interviewees considered older workers to be more knowledgeable and reliable, due to adult responsibilities such as mortgages and children. However, comments from interviewees suggests that a women's 'motherhood' status defines expectations that family priorities drive her career decisions, for example:

> *Amelia (Telephonist/Former Housekeeper): "I find the younger ones are the fluctuating fringe because they move on, they have babies. My solid core were the more mature women, the kids have grown up a bit, they're at school, they need school uniforms." [Interview participant]*

Career building and the consolidation stage

Overlaying ethnicity on hierarchical, gendered, ageist bureaucratic processes and practices enables insights into the pattern of progression in hospitality careers. The literature, (for example, Joppe, 2012; McDowell et al., 2007) confirms the concentration of ethnic minority women in badly paid, precarious jobs in hospitality. Many participants reached at least departmental management level after a career spent in the industry. Being male appears

11

to be linked to the privilege of quicker promotion, as all men in the research had achieved or been offered supervisory positions. Housekeeping (the laundry, room and public areas cleaning) was a popular entry point for women, as the shift pattern facilitated family responsibilities. Many women remained within the housekeeping departmental for the span of their careers.

Findings reflect double career penalties associated with being a women and a member of an ethnic minority, much as previous research describes (Adib and Guerrier, 2003; Adler and Adler, 2004). The lack of confidence that women frequently exhibit in putting themselves forward for promotion is compounded by migrant or ethnic minority status and led this room attendant to refuse promotional opportunities:

Emily (Room Attendant): "Working shift work, it's too much responsibility. I
thought - Ah, I'm too innocent - you know, some tough girls in New
Zealand, Kiwis, you know what I mean. I thought I couldn't handle it, so I
thought I'm better here (at a lower level)."[Interview participant]

Findings highlighted that although the industry is female dominated at entry level, the cumulative effects of ageing and gender stereotyping played a role in managerial decisions on suitability for promotion. It was recognised women who aspired to climb the career ladder did need to begin their career in areas other than housekeeping, as it has a limited career path. Not only men conveyed that it was an area reserved for women, as the following quote indicated:

Lauren (Laundry Supervisor): "The supervisor was not that good because he's a
man. I said – I think the laundry needs women in there." [Interview
participant]

Simultaneously, the well documented sexist and discriminatory practices in some Food and Beverage areas, for example, the kitchen (Ineson et al., 2013; Young and Corsun, 2010), did not make it easy for some female participants to work in male dominated areas of the hotels.

12

The literature notes that in areas where an exaggerated form of masculinity is prevalent, men are under considerable pressure to conform to exaggerated images of masculinity (Ashforth and Kreiner, 2013; Simpson, 2014).

Ella (Former Chef): "Every time I was working in the kitchen, on my bench there was porn …being in an all-male environment that was fine-it did not put me up nor down, but hard core porn right on my desk, my God." [Memory-work discussion]

Men, as well as women, perceived the kitchen 'hypersexual' environment as challenging; they had to conform and became one of the boys, or left that particular career path:

Levi (Operations Manager): "The kitchen did bring out a side of me which I didn't really like that much either, you know, angry, temperamental chef sort of thing and it's like – oh, this is not really me. I came out the front – much more dealing with people and building relationships." [Interview participant]

As indicated earlier, at senior levels, men dominate hotel management roles. This affects promotional processes as the more closely individuals conform to the prevailing male norms, the more likely individuals are to receive the associated privileges (Lewis and Simpson, 2010). Not only do those who possess privilege rarely acknowledge or understand the basis of their privilege, but there is a strong self-interest associated with maintaining privilege in the workplace (Lewis and Simpson, 2010). Thus, masculine norms of behaviour are propagated and promoted. Age also influenced occupational class, comments by a chef illustrate the cumulative effect of gender (masculinity), age and occupational class:

Daniel: "How old is the GM? If he is 45, try telling a 55-year-old exec chef with 10 years more experience in the industry how to do his job. He knows it all, but a 45 year old can bully a 28 year old" [Interview participant]

Aspiring women are in this sense, further penalised at the career building stage because of gender differences in how they circumnavigate promotional processes compared to men. For example, women were disadvantaged by their unwillingness to push themselves forward:

Sophie (Front Office Manager): "And that's interesting you say that because I almost feel now like I could have done it, you know. If I had a little bit more confidence…" [Interview participant]

Interviewees also discussed how for career progression in hotels individuals were required to demonstrate their flexibility by 'jumping' to departments and positions beyond their present skill set. Women are disadvantaged by such promotional processes as they prefer to apply for jobs where they feel they have a high level of proficiency (Anderson et al., 2010; Martin, 2003). Binns (2010) additionally observes how society penalises female leaders who draw attention to their own achievements, and women's opportunities are further limited because their leadership strengths remain as 'invisible' to themselves as to their male counterparts. One female interviewee noted the reluctance of women to act like men and by not doing so, reinforced the prevailing gendered norms.

Eva (General Manager): "Whereas men spend a lot of time – on what women would see as show-boating or bragging, is just a normal part of them getting ahead. And women are very reluctant to do that." [Interview participant]

Eva, a General Manager, ascribed her own career success to *'luck'* rather than her undoubted leadership qualities. To this extent she conformed to the "hidden masculine construct" of a leadership role where masculinity is downplayed as an essential element (Binns, 2010, p. 170).

While links between aspects of age and occupational class could prove instrumental in a hospitality career, further intersections between age and different aspects of gendered relationships became visible during the analysis of the findings. Masculine norms and gendered promotional processes that privilege unencumbered women (Acker, 2006a; Lyng, 2010) can restrict career opportunities for all women. In this study, wider societal expectation of male and female roles proved to be a further penalty for women. The expectation that

14

women would primarily fulfil their biological role of mother thwarted career aspirations for all women. The following comment reinforces commonly held assumptions:

Daniel (Executive Chef): "Gender makes a big difference. I have one female in the kitchen and she's my last apprentice – very, very good. I also know when she's maybe 27, 28 years old, she'll get married, have kids, drop out and it's like that talent, that knowledge is lost in the industry…".[Interview participant]

Family commitments did not appear to affect men to the same extent as working women, although men were conscious of the effect of their career choices on their families and the need for spousal support.

Justin (Sales Manager): At that time, one was almost two, and the other one was six, starting school. Big step! I said to my wife that I didn't want to go there but she pushed it. She said – no, we'll do it. Whatever you need, we'll do this, because it will change your career, and it did." [Interview participant]

Some male interview participants also found hospitality work family friendly, though that reflected their gender and class privileges. Frequently, General Managers lived on work premises and correspondingly had greater access to their families and the benefit of using hospitality facilities. However, gender stereotypes do not protect fathers whose parenting responsibilities are obvious (Lyng, 2010) and not concealed by class privilege, men with obvious care-giving duties are disadvantaged. For example, Matthew the kitchen hand was unable to handle the demands of "being a right-hand man" and solo parent when he unexpectedly became sole caregiver for his daughter, after he and his wife separated. He relinquished his supervisory role and resumed his entry-level position.

Matthew (Kitchen Porter): "The only reason why, because I realise it … that my daughter is going to University and I'm getting old and I say – alright, I'll give the opportunities to my daughter towards University. I'm getting too old – it's too late for me." [Interview participant]

It is notable that Matthew was the only non-European, non-managerial man among the participants. The intersection of three categories of difference may have influenced how his

15

care giving responsibilities were viewed, as well as the resources he had available to conceal

the extent of his care giving duties. In a similar way to the female participants, he could not

handle the dual demands of a primary caregiving role and a supervisory role.

Career arrival

For older workers, organisational processes reveal combined privilege and penalty.

Although young workers were penalised by the perception they were immature and

unreliable, there were penalties as well as privileges associated with the ageing process.

Feelings of insecurity did not appear to depend on whether positions were guest facing or

linked to specific departments. Rather it appeared to be connected to one's position in the

hierarchy; managers expressed the greatest anxiety as an occupational class:

*Sophie (Front Office Manager): "I'm 53, so my feeling is that people are looking for
people younger than me… It never used to really worry me I suppose, but
maybe you do get to a stage where you just sort of think, 'Oh gosh, am I too
old to be doing this'." [Interview participant]*

Although privileges are associated with higher positions in the hierarchy, such as

increased pay and status, intersections between age, gender and managerial penalty emerged

from participants' accounts. Career arrival is signified by reaching a General Manager's

position and a variety of metric performance indicators have become the way hierarchy and

status are justified, reflected in the organisational pecking order. Hoepfl (2010) argues that

the current organisational obsession with measurement reveals a masculine orientation. In

contrast to senior executives, younger managers were disadvantaged by long hours,

inadequate recompense and limited control, as suggested by this memory-work account:

*Luke: "You had to get a certain food margin and a certain beverage margin
[murmurs of agreement]. I would do the stocktakes on a Sunday night,
produce the results, take them to the GM and he'd say, you know I want a
different margin, a higher margin. And you'd go back and you'd try to
squeeze what you could, without actually trying to falsify records and he'd
say look, I want 66% . You'd redo the stocktake; so it's that whole drive of*

profit and that's when you start going crazy (laughs). Because you are so
driven-oh no-I'm actually not going to make 66%!" [Memory-work extract]

However, aging was a career penalty for senior managers, there was a widespread perception that by remaining too long at one property they were failing to optimise their performance. They must remain geographically mobile throughout their careers.

Samuel (General Manager). "I'd been here seven years, old dog, no new tricks. I'm
going – I don't know what I'm bringing here and maybe it would be better
if there was a new guy who came in." [Interview participant]

Although career success is generally identified with outward manifestations of status, there are subjective elements of success that manifest themselves in areas such as enjoyable personal relationships and life style grounds (Volmer and Spurk, 2010). Ironically, many individuals at lower positions in hospitality while not experiencing the superior financial reward and higher status of the higher ranks were privileged by job security and satisfaction, even after 30 years in the same job for example, as indicated by Scarlet's observation:

Scarlet (Motel Receptionist): It wasn't something that I imagined I would still be
doing at 55, but I'm still enjoying it... I keep saying they will carry me out
in a coffin, but I do hope I retire first". [Interview participant]

Concluding discussion

The intersectional research process can be compared to an artist who applies layer after layer of paint on canvas, to capture a fleeting impression of what is seen in the mind's eye. The preceding discussion of intersecting dimensions illustrates the challenge in attempting to understand how, for the purpose of this paper, age, gender, ethnicity and class individually and cumulatively influence hospitality career pathways. As one social category is brought to the foreground, the implications of the others hover like shadows in the background shading the subjective meanings of the participants' experiences. The central question asked was, what does it mean to be privileged by one social category, for example occupational class, and simultaneously penalised by age, gender and ethnicity in

organisational processes? Our aim has been to show how an institutionalised linear career path reproduces a system of privilege for some men and a minority of women, but penalises most women, or men who do not conform to the ideal vision of an unencumbered heter-normal man of European origin yet aspire to expectations on entry of an upward career. In this way, we argue questions of difference, privilege, penalty and intersection are as to applicable to men as to women (Hearn, 2011; Tatli and Özbilgin, 2012).

Further while privilege as observed earlier is a somewhat controversial use of intersectionality (Lutz et al., 2011), it does as Hearn (2011) notes, make it possible to name men as men rather than the 'invisible norm' against which 'difference' is judged. It can be seen that age, gender, ethnicity and class affects career progression in a hotel management career due to gendered role expectations that present challenges to women, in particular of child bearing age. The structure of roles meant most women stayed in lower positions in the hierarchy, unable or unwilling to sacrifice the privilege of work life balance for the penalty of being available to the demands of a 24/7 type of business. The one man in the study with obvious family responsibilities was unable to retain a supervisory role. Organisational norms ensured a pattern of privilege and penalty for men and women, although significantly, with the lack of educational entry criteria, women remained concentrated in the lowest paid sectors of the industry. However, whether tertiary qualified or not, gender and ethnicity combined with age / ageing within the occupational class hierarchy of large hotels, produced similar outcomes for most women and some men. The demographic profile of senior managers who took part in the study suggests that being Pakeha and male privileges ambitious individuals. For men being seen as 'other', either because of ethnicity or visible parenting responsibilities, is a career penalty.

We argue, therefore intersectional research offers significant advantages in exploring organisational processes, as it exposes the full extent of gender or ethnicity based penalty and privilege. Once educational criteria are fulfilled, individual ability or merit is not a predictor of occupational class, availability based on gendered and ageist norms limit the pool considered ready for promotion. Viewed through this lens, class processes are based on gendered, ageist stereotypes and should be considered not as a separate and parallel dimension of difference; but a symptom of women's 'difference'. A woman's perceived unsuitability for senior roles, at a particular life stage (which cannot be separated from childbearing/child rearing age), is another manifestation of an exclusionary mechanism. Only by being as available and unencumbered as the 'ideal' male manager (Acker, 2006b; Lyng, 2010), can women succeed in a sector structured on masculine norms. Care-giving responsibilities remain women's responsibilities, well into the 21st century; the face of the ideal worker has not changed. Even in today's dual career family, men are able to concurrently achieve career success and fulfil family responsibilities, ostensibly without penalty.

However, men do pay a penalty for career success. They sacrifice family time at a significant stage for building a career. Men who are judged to put family before career are compromised, in the same way as working mothers. Men's career penalty is that they frequently do not have the 'luxury' of choice. It is socially acceptable for women to occupy less senior positions, yet a man who chooses not to further his career ambitions runs the risk of being evaluated as un-masculine. By provoking anxiety in other men, they may be sidestepped for promotion. We argue that, therefore, gendered role associations, form the nexus of women's failure to thrive in a hospitality working environment, further acerbated by 'outsider' status when women belong to a minority ethnic group. Age/biological age/reproductive age/age body defines women - it is difficult to be positioned as committed

19

manager after that point, unless individual women are perceived as exceptionally talented. Viewed from this perspective, Broadbridge and Simpson (2011) need not be concerned that intersectional research will obscure gender issues, ultimately gender trumps everything else, even ethnicity and class. Ethnicity adds a further layer of penalty to women's careers and occupational class is the visible expression of career penalty.

In the same way, that class processes do not influence women's career progress by virtue of women's (in)visibility in organisations, class processes differentiate men. Hoepfl (2010) observes that organisational life is really a man's game. We have already suggested that while hospitality overall is deemed as female-dominated, large hotels as a majority employer in this sector, have a masculine orientation. What we observe in NZ is that organisational systems are self- perpetuating. There has been no fundamental change in hotel hierarchy over the last twenty years, as the elite continue to protect their privileges by marginalising those who challenge the organisational cultures. A heightened display of masculinity is one such response thereby accentuating the differences between masculine (Management) and feminine (Housekeeping) occupations (Ainsworth et al., 2014). Privilege is upheld by masculine values with management holding the power by virtue of the class-based employer – employee relationship (Janssens and Zanoni, 2014). As with other sectors in the economy, the 'level playing field' on entry, soon disappears as the workings of power and influence within the context of an organisation take hold: privilege and penalty intertwine.

References

Acker, J., 2006a. Class questions-feminist answers, The Gender Lens Series. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc, Lanham, Maryland.

Acker, J., 2006b. Inequality regimes gender, class, and race in organizations. Gend. Soc. 20, 441–464. doi:10.1177/0891243206289499

Adib, A., Guerrier, Y., 2003. The interlocking of gender with nationality, race, ethnicity and class: The narratives of women in hotel work. Gend. Work Organ. 10, 413–432. doi:10.1111/1468-0432.00204

20

Adler, P.A., Adler, P.H., 2004. Paradise laborers: Hotel work in the global economy. Cornell University Press, Ithaca, NY.

Ainsworth, S., Batty, A., Burchielli, R., 2014. Women Constructing Masculinity in Voluntary Firefighting. Gend. Work Organ. 21, 37–56. doi:10.1111/gwao.12010

Anderson, D., Vinnicombe, S., Singh, V., 2010. Women partners leaving the firm: Choice, what choice? Gend. Manag. Int. J. 25, 170–183. doi:10.1108/17542411011036383

Ashforth, B., Kreiner, G., 2013. Dirty Work and dirtier work: Differences in countering physical, social, and moral stigma. Manag. Organ. Rev. 569, n/a–n/a. doi:10.1111/more.12044

Atewologun, D., Sealy, R., 2014. Experiencing privilege at ethnic, gender and senior intersections. J. Manag. Psychol. 29, 423–439. doi:10.1108/JMP-02-2013-0038

Baum, T., 2007. Human resources in tourism: Still waiting for change. Tour. Manag. 28, 1383–1399. doi:10.1016/j.tourman.2007.04.005

Baum, T., 2013. International perspectives on women and work in hotels, catering and tourism (Working Paper No. 1/2013). International Labour Organisation, Geneva, Switzerland.

Bendl, R., Schmidt, A., 2010. From "glass ceilings" to "firewalls"— Different metaphors for describing discrimination. Gend. Work Organ. 17, 612–634. doi:10.1111/j.1468-0432.2010.00520.x

Bilge, S., 2010. Recent Feminist Outlooks on Intersectionality. Diogenes 57, 58–72. doi:10.1177/0392192110374245

Binns, J., 2010. Leadership and the (in)visibility of gender, in: Lewis, P., Simpson, P. (Eds.), Revealing and Concealing Gender: Issues of Invisibility in Organisations. Palgrave Macmillan, Hampshire, England, pp. 158–174.

Brah, A., Pheonix, A., 2004. Ain't I a woman? Revisiting intersectionality. J. Int. Womens Stud. 5, 75–86.

Britton, D., Logan, L., 2008. Gendered organizations: Progress and prospects. Sociol. Compass 2, 107–121. doi:10.1111/j.1751-9020.2007.00071.x

Broadbridge, A., Simpson, R., 2011. 25 years on: Reflecting on the past and looking to the future in gender and management research. Br. J. Manag. 22, 470–483. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8551.2011.00758.x

Calas, M., Smircich, L., Holvino, E., 2014. Theorizing gender-and-organization: Changing times, changing theories, in: Kumra, S., Simpson, R., Burke, R.J. (Eds.), The Oxford Handbook of Gender in Organizations. Oxford University Press.

Campos-Soria, J.A., Ortega-Aguaza, B., Ropero-García, M.A., 2009. Gender segregation and wage difference in the hospitality industry. Tour. Econ. 15, 847–866. doi:10.5367/000000009789955152

Chalkiti, K., Sigala, M., 2010. Staff turnover in the Greek tourism industry: A comparison between insular and peninsular regions. Int. J. Contemp. Hosp. Manag. 22, 335–359. doi:10.1108/09596111011035945

Chuang, N.-K., Dellmann-Jenkins, M., 2010. Career decision making and intention: A study of hospitality undergraduate students. J. Hosp. Tour. Res. 34, 512–530. doi:10.1177/1096348010370867

Crenshaw, K., 2011. A black feminist critique of antdiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics, in: Lutz, H., Vivar, T., Supik, l (Eds.), Framing Intersectionality: Debates on a Multi-Faceted Concept in Gender Studies. Ashgate Publishing Company, England, United States, pp. 25–42.

Davidson, M., Timo, N., Wang, Y., 2010. How much does labour turnover cost?: A case study of Australian four- and five-star hotels. Int. J. Contemp. Hosp. Manag. 22, 451–466. doi:10.1108/09596111011042686

Davis, K., 2011. Intersectionality as buzzword: A sociology of science perspective on what makes a feminist theory successful, in: Lutz, H., Vivar, T., Supik, l (Eds.), Framing Intersectionality: Debates on a Multi-Faceted Concept in Gender Studies. Ashgate Publishing Company, England, United States, pp. 25–42.

Dhamoon, R.K., 2011. Considerations on mainstreaming intersectionality. Polit. Res. Q. 64, 230–243. doi:10.1177/1065912910379227

Durbin, S., Fleetwood, S., Tomlinson, J., Durbin, S., 2010. Female part-time managers. Equal. Divers. Incl. Int. J. 29, 255–270. doi:10.1108/02610151011028859

Ethnicity - Statistics New Zealand [WWW Document], 2013. URL http://www.stats.govt.nz/methods/classifications-and-standards/classification-related-stats-standards/ethnicity/definition.aspx (accessed 1.17.14).

Furunes, T., Mykletun, R.J., 2005. Age management in Norwegian hospitality businesses. Scand. J. Hosp. Tour. 5, 116–134. doi:10.1080/15022250510014390

Gatrell, C., Swan, E., 2008. Gender and diversity in management a concise introduction. SAGE, Los Angeles.

Guerrier, Y., 2008. Organisational studies and hospitality management, in: Brotherton, B., Wood, R. (Eds.), The Sage Handbook of Hospitality Management. Sage Publications ltd, London, UK, pp. 257–273.

Harkison, T., Poulston, J., Kim, J.-H., 2011. Hospitality graduates and managers: The big divide. Int. J. Contemp. Hosp. Manag. 23, 377–392. doi:10.1108/09596111111122541

Hearn, J., 2011. Neglected intersectionalities in studying men : Age/ing, virtuality, transnationality. pp. 89–104.

Holvino, E., 2010. Intersections: The simultaneity of race, gender and class in organization studies. Gend. Work Organ. 17, 248–277. doi:10.1111/j.1468-0432.2008.00400.x

Höpfl, H., 2010. A question of membership, in: Lewis, P., Simpson, P. (Eds.), Revealing and Concealing Gender: Issues of Visibility in Organization Research. Palgrave Macmillan, Hampshire, England, pp. 39–53.

Ineson, E.M., Yap, M.H.T., Whiting, G., 2013. Sexual discrimination and harassment in the hospitality industry. Int. J. Hosp. Manag. 35, 1–9. doi:10.1016/j.ijhm.2013.04.012

Janssens, M., Zanoni, P., 2014. Alternative diversity management: Organizational practices fostering ethnic equality at work. Scand. J. Manag. doi:10.1016/j.scaman.2013.12.006

Jenkins, A., Poulston, J., 2014. Managers' perceptions of older workers in British hotels. Equal. Divers. Incl. Int. J. 33, 54–72. doi:10.1108/EDI-10-2012-0096

Joppe, M., 2012. Migrant workers: Challenges and opportunities in addressing tourism labour shortages. Tour. Manag. 33, 662–671. doi:10.1016/j.tourman.2011.07.009

Knox, A., 2008. Gender desegregation and equal employment opportunity in Australian luxury hotels: Are we there yet? Asia Pac. J. Hum. Resour. 46, 153–172. doi:10.1177/1038411108091756

Kong, H., Cheung, C., Song, H., 2011. Hotel career management in China: Developing a measurement scale. Int. J. Hosp. Manag. 30, 112–118. doi:10.1016/j.ijhm.2010.07.003

Korczynski, M., 2002. Human resource management in service work. Palgrave, London.

Ladkin, A., 2002. Career analysis: A case study of hotel general managers in Australia. Tour. Manag. 23, 379–388. doi:10.1016/S0261-5177(01)00092-9

Ladkin, A., Riley, M., 1996. Mobility and structure in the career paths of UK hotel managers: a labour market hybrid of the bureaucratic. Tour. Manag. 17, 443–452.

Lewis, P., Simpson, R., 2010. Revealing and concealing gender: Issues of visibility in organization research. Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke.

Lucas, K., 2011. Blue-collar discourses of workplace dignity: Using outgroup comparisons to construct positive identities. Manag. Commun. Q. 25, 353–374. doi:10.1177/0893318910386445

Lutz, H., Vivar, T., Supik, l (Eds.), 2011. Framing Intersectionality: An introduction, in: Framing Intersectionality: Debates on a Multi-Faceted Concept in Gender Studies. Ashgate Publishing Company, England, United States, pp. 1–24.

Lyng, S., 2010. "Mothered" and othered, in: Lewis, P., Simpson, P. (Eds.), Revealing and Concealing Gender: Issues of Invisibility in Organisations. Palgrave Macmillan, Hampshire, England, pp. 77–99.

Magd, H., 2003. Management attitudes and perceptions of older employees in hospitality management. Int. J. Contemp. Hosp. Manag. 15, 393–401. doi:10.1108/09596110310496033

Marco-Lajara, B., Úbeda-García, M., 2013. Human resource management approaches in Spanish hotels: An introductory analysis. Int. J. Hosp. Manag. 35, 339–347. doi:10.1016/j.ijhm.2013.07.006

Martin, P., 2003. "Said and done" versus "saying and doing": Gendering practices, practicing gender at work. Gend. Soc. 17, 342–366. doi:10.1177/0891243203017003002

McCall, L., 2005. The complexity of intersectionality. J. Women Cult. Soc. 30, 1771–1797. doi:10.1086/426800

McDowell, L., Batnitzky, A., Dyer, S., 2007. Division, segmentation and interpellation: The embodied labors of migrant workers in a greater London hotel. Econ. Geogr. 83, 1–25. doi:10.1111/j.1944-8287.2007.tb00331.x

McIntosh, A., Harris, C., 2012. Critical hospitality and work: (In)hospitable employment in the hospitality industry. Hosp. Soc. 2, 129–135. doi:10.1386/hosp.2.2.129_2

Mooney, S., 2009. Children and a career: Yeah right! Barriers to women managers' career progression in hotels. N. Z. J. Hum. Resour. Manag. Special Issue 3 Work, Family & Gender.

Mooney, S., Ryan, I., 2009. A woman's place in hotel management: Upstairs or downstairs? Gend. Manag. Int. J. 24, 195–210. doi:10.1108/17542410910950877

Nash, J.C., 2008. Re-thinking intersectionality. Fem. Rev. 89, 1–15. doi:10.1057/fr.2008.4

Neill, L., 2013. Hospitality report: Reporting on New Zealand's hospitality industry. AUT University, Auckland, New Zealand.

Ng, C., Pine, R., 2003. Women and men in Hong Kong: Perceptions of gender and career development issues. Int. J. Hosp. Manag. 22, 85–102. doi:10.1016/S0278-4319(02)00077-4

Onyx, J., Small, J., 2001. Memory work: The method. Qual. Inq. 7, 773–786. doi:10.1177/107780040100700608

Ozbilgin, M., Beauregard, T.A., Tatli, A., Bell, M., 2010. Work-life, diversity and intersectionality: A critical review and research agenda. Int. J. Manag. Rev. 1–22. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2370.2010.00291.x

Perry, E., Parlamis, J., 2006. Age and ageism in organisations: A review and consideration of national culture, in: Konrad, A., Prasad, P., Pringle, J. (Eds.), Handbook of Workplace Diversity. Sage, London, pp. 345–370.

Pizam, A., 2006. Editorial: The New Gender Gap. Int. J. Contemp. Hosp. Manag. 25, 533–535.

Poulston, J., Jenkins, A., 2013. The persistent paradigm: Older worker stereotypes in the New Zealand hotel industry. J. Hum. Resour. Hosp. Tour. 12, 1–25. doi:10.1080/15332845.2013.723252

Sabelis, I., Schilling, E., 2013. Editorial: Frayed careers: exploring rhythms of working lives. Gend. Work Organ. 20, 127–132. doi:10.1111/gwao.12020

Sang, K., Al-Dajani, H., Özbilgin, M., 2013. Frayed careers of migrant female professors in British academia: An intersectional perspective. Gend. Work Organ. 20, 158–171. doi:10.1111/gwao.12014

Savickas, M., 2013. The theory and practice of career construction, in: Brown, S., Lent, R. (Eds.), Career Development and Counseling: Putting Theory and Research to Work. Wiley, Hoboken, N.J, pp. 147–183.

Schlentrich, U., 2008. The MICE Industry: Meetings, incentives, conventions and exhibitions, in: Brotherton, B., Wood, R. (Eds.), The Sage Handbook of Hospitality Management. Sage Publications Ltd, London, UK.

Scully, M.A., Blake-Beard, S., 2006. Locating class in organisational diversity work, in: Prasad, P., Pringle, J. (Eds.), A Handbook of Workplace Diversity.

Simpson, R., 2014. Doing gender differently: Men in caring occupations, in: Kumra, S., Simpson, R., Burke, R.J. (Eds.), The Oxford Handbook of Gender in Organizations. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK, pp. 480–499.

Statistics New Zealand, 2013. Skill levels of New Zealand jobs - Statistics New Zealand [WWW Document]. Stat. N. Z. URL http://www.stats.govt.nz/browse_for_stats/income-and-work/employment_and_unemployment/skills-employed-people.aspx (accessed 3.20.14).

Stokes, F., Norman, D., Nana, G., 2010. Hospitality industry employment and training profile (No. 4806). Business and Economic Research Ltd, Wellington, New Zealand.

Tatli, A., Özbilgin, M.F., 2012. An emic approach to intersectional study of diversity at work: A Bourdieuan framing. Int. J. Manag. Rev. 14, 180–200. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2370.2011.00326.x

Volmer, J., Spurk, D., 2010. Protean and boundaryless career attitudes: Relationships with subjective and objective career success. Z. Für Arbeitsmarkt Forsch. 43, 207–218. doi:10.1007/s12651-010-0037-3

Walby, S., Armstrong, J., Strid, S., 2012. Intersectionality: Multiple inequalities in social theory. Sociology 46, 224–240. doi:10.1177/0038038511416164

Wang, Y.-F., 2013. Constructing career competency model of hospitality industry employees for career success. Int. J. Contemp. Hosp. Manag. 25, 3–3. doi:10.1108/IJCHM-07-2012-0106

Williamson, D., Harris, C., Matthews, S., Parker, J., 2012. Golden opportunities? A decade of exit interviews and turnover in the New Zealand hotel industry. CAUTHE 2012 New Gold. Age Tour. Hosp. Book 2 Proc. 22nd Annu. Conf. 675.

Winker, G., Degele, N., 2011. Intersectionality as multi-level analysis: Dealing with social inequality. Eur. J. Womens Stud. 18, 51–66. doi:10.1177/1350506810386084

Woodhams, C., Lupton, B., 2014. Transformative and emancipatory potential of intersectionality research. Gend. Manag. Int. J. 29, 301–307. doi:10.1108/GM-12-2013-0139

Woods, R., Viehland, D., 2000. Women in hotel management. Cornell Hotel Restaur. Adm. Q. 41, 51–54.

Yamashita, M., Uenoyama, T., 2006. Boundaryless career and adaptive HR practices in Japan's hotel industry. Career Dev. Int. 11, 230–242. doi:10.1108/13620430610661759

Young, C., Corsun, D., 2010. Burned! The impact of work aspects, injury, and job satisfaction on unionized cooks' intentions to leave the cooking occupation. J. Hosp. Tour. Res. 34, 78 –102. doi:10.1177/1096348009349816

Yuval-Davis, N., 2006. Intersectionality and feminist politics. Eur. J. Womens Stud. 13, 193–209. doi:10.1177/1350506806065752

24

Zander, U., Zander, L., Gaffney, S., Olsson, J., 2010. Intersectionality as a new perspective in international business research. Scand. J. Manag. 26, 457–466. doi:10.1016/j.scaman.2010.09.011