Gender, sexuality and violence in organizations the unspoken forces of organization violations

Jeff Hearn and Wendy Parkin.

Gender, Sexuality and Violence **in Organizations**The Unspoken Forces of Organization Violations

Jeff Hearn and Wendy Parkin



SAGE Publications London • Thousand Oaks • New Delhi

© Jeff Hearn and Wendy Parkin 2001

First published 2001

Apart from any fair dealing for the purposes of research or private study, or criticism or review, as permitted under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988, this publication may be reproduced, stored or transmitted in any form, or by any means, only with the prior permission in writing of the publishers, or in the case of reprographic reproduction, in accordance with the terms of licences issued by the Copyright Licensing Agency. Inquiries concerning reproduction outside those terms should be sent to the publishers.



SAGE Publications Ltd 6 Bonhill Street London EC2A 4PU

SAGE Publications Inc 2455 Teller Road Thousand Oaks, California 91320

SAGE Publications India Pvt Ltd 32, M-Block Market Greater Kailash - I New Delhi 110 048

British Library Cataloguing in Publication data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN 0 7619 5911 4 ISBN 0 7619 5912 2 (pbk)

Library of Congress control number 2001131803

Typeset by SIVA Math Setters, Chennai, India Printed in Great Britain by Athenaeum Press This book is dedicated to Sajid Khan (1974–99), a gentle man and friend, and to Anna and Sebastian

Contents

Li	sts of Figures and Tables	vii
A	cknowledgements	Ď
In	troduction: The Unspoken within Organizations	X
1	Gender, Sexuality, Violation and Organizational Worlds	1
2	Histories: Locating Organizations in Social Time	22
3	Recognition: From Sexual Harassment, Bullying and Physical Violence to Organization Violations	47
4	Theorizing: Organizations and Organization Violations	75
5	Enclosure: Organization Violations and Institutionalization with Lorraine Green	103
6	Globalization: Organization Violations, Multinationals and ICTs	120
7	Politics and Policy	144
Notes		162
Bibliography		174
Index		198

Figures and Tables

Figures

3.1	Levels of violations	74
1 .1	Poyner and Warne's model of violence in the workplace	80
1.2	Scenarios for incidents involving agents who have no legitimate nexus to the organization	80
4.3	Scenarios for incidents where the agent is the receiver of some service provided by the organization	81
4.4	Scenarios for incidents where the agent is in some form of employment relationship (past or present) with the affected workplace	81
4.5	Enabling, motivating and triggering factors in the work environment explaining workplace bullying	84
4.6	Types of organizational orientation to violation	92
Tab	ples	
2.1	The gender order, the economic and the political	26
3.1	Incidence of sexual harassment by country and by sex in north-west Europe	56
3.2	Studies on the prevalence of 'mobbing'/bullying	64
3.3	Conventional categories of violation in organizations	72
4.1	Main invariant/constrained and manipulable organizational contextual factors emerging from current literature and research	82

Acknowledgements

We are very grateful for a number of collaborations that have contributed to the development of this book — in particular, those with David Collinson, Margaret Collinson, Lorraine Green, Jalna Hanmer, Elizabeth Harlow, Marjut Jyrkinen, Anne Kovalainen, Mary Maynard and David Morgan. We are also indebted to Sari Carpentier for her assistance with the review of Finnish and Swedish research and policy literature. We thank Donna Hughes, Denise Salin and Pernilla Gripenberg for sharing ideas and information, Joanne Deakin for work on an early literature search, and Celia Davies, Jean Neumann and anonymous reviewers of *Human Relations* for detailed comments on an early presentation of some of these ideas (Hearn, 1994). We also thank anonymous reviewers of the initial proposal for this book for their helpful suggestions. A number of seminar, conference and other presentations have been made on this material, and we are grateful to all who have commented on these occasions. Thanks are offered to participants at the Gender Research Seminar at UMIST, January 1992, for their very helpful comments on some tentative first thoughts on this area.

The writing of the book was greatly assisted by generous research funds from the Donner Foundation of Åbo Akademi University (1997-8), the Academy of Finland (1997, 1998-9) and the University of Huddersfield Research Support Fund (1999). The second of these fundings was part of the research programme, 'Images of Women's Health: Social Construction of Gendered Health'. We thank all colleagues and students at the Universities of Bradford, Huddersfield, Manchester and Åbo Akademi who assisted in the development of this project. Particular thanks are offered to Elianne Riska, Solveig Bergman, Harriet Silius and all in the sociology doctoral research seminar at Åbo. The final stages of writing were completed whilst Jeff Hearn was Guest Professor at the Work Research Centre, University of Tampere, and the Swedish School of Economics and Business Administration, Helsinki, and additional thanks are extended to Emmi Lattu, Guje Sevón, Ingmar Björkman, Tuula Heiskanen, Päivi Korvajärvi and colleagues there. Anne Elton at the University of Huddersfield Library, and Teemu Tallberg and Hannele Varsa provided bibliographic assistance, for which we are very grateful.

Special thanks are offered to Karen Phillips, Lauren McAllister and all at Sage. We thank Liisa Husu and Malcolm Parkin for everything.

We are grateful to the following for permission to reproduce figures and tables from:

Poyner, B. and Warne, C. (1986). Violence to Staff: A Basis for Assessment and Prevention. London: Tavistock Institute of Human Relations/Health and Safety Executive.

x Acknowledgements

- Salin, D. (1999). Explaining Workplace Bullying: a Review of Enabling, Motivating, and Triggering Factors in the Work Environment. Helsinki: Meddelanden Working Papers, Svenska handelshögskolan.
- Standing, H. and Nicolini, D. (1997). Review of Workplace-related Violence, Contract Research Report 143/1997. London: HSE.
- Timmerman, G. and Bajema, C. (1999). Sexual harassment in Northwest Europe. The European Journal of Women's Studies, 6, 419–39.

Introduction

The Unspoken within Organizations

Organizations persist through unspoken forces. Many of these forces are *matters* of gender, sexuality, violence and violation. There is, without doubt, a very wide range of ways in which organizations and organizational worlds exist in relation to gender, sexuality, violence and violation. Indeed what we call organization is often infused with gender, sexuality and violation – hence the concepts of organization gender, organization sexuality (Hearn and Parkin, 1987, 1995) and organization violation.

So what is the unspoken? And how are these silences, silencings, recognitions, disappearings and surfacings maintained? To speak (of) the unspoken is to make concrete silences that persist in and indeed comprise organizations. These silences include the very conceptualization of organization itself; the general understandings of how organizations are gendered; the specific structuring of organizations; and construction of gendered subjects in organizations (Harlow et al., 1995). Noise, din, silence and silencing, as part of the unspoken forces of organizational worlds, are thus gendered. Both literally and metaphorically, they are part of the gendered domination of organizations:

... 'din' is literal and metaphoric, with the literal din of machinery being enhanced by the metaphoric din of ownership and supremacy through numbers and structures. Silence too is literal, though it is important to separate out silence through choice from being silenced through intimidation, threat, exclusion, marginalization and put-downs. Din and silence are not seen as exclusively opposite, for silence can be imposed through silent bullying and coercion, which is really din, and the din of oppressed groups whose grievances fail to be heard is actually silence. (Harlow et al., 1995: 96)

Silence may mean the absence of noise and be part of the plight of the oppressed but can also be part of domination, as in managerial silences to requests to be heard and demands for change.

Our emphasis on the reproduction of organization through silence stands in tension with those social constructionist approaches that have come to interpret discourse as talk, speech and text. Whereas Michel Foucault, whatever the gendered inadequacies of his texts (Hearn and Parkin, 1987: 169), was at pains to describe and explore the intricacies of discourse as power/knowledge and power/resistance, some subsequent writers have tended to reduce discourse to that which is spoken and hearable, written and readable. This book is about the speaking of those unspoken forces, the making of the invisible visible and the less known more fully known. We are interested in the reconstruction of the silent,

unspoken, not necessarily easily observable, but fundamentally material reality of organizations. We do not take the view that silence means either consent or absence of ideas or idealism. There is no sense of 'spirit' in our concern with silence.

The exact ways in which this silent materialism operates are clearly rather different for different facets of social reality. Let us take the example of violence. The occurrence of violence, that is, the doings of violence, in the past or the present or as future threat, are material in their practice, their effects, their structurings and their 'accumulations' over time. Violence not only brings the direct effects of direct damage, it also brings less direct effects, simply through the memory of previous actual or possible violences. Once violence has been done, including being threatened, an innocence has been lost - so that mere reference to that violence (verbally, by a look, or a slight movement or some other cue or clue) may be enough to invoke and connote violence, and thus the modification of material behaviour. Violence, like violation more generally, exists also in its recognition. But the more recognized violences of harassment, bullying and physical violence are only part of the wider violations of organizations. These also include more structured oppressions and more mundane violations of everyday organizational worlds.

Furthermore, the social and technological changes that appear to be affecting what we may call the gender-sexuality-violation complex in work organizations are changing and in somewhat contradictory ways: they may produce workplaces that are ever more like fortresses; they may produce calming environments within them; and workers may be increasingly given the responsibility to monitor their own behaviour in the most minute ways. Perhaps violence and potential violence at workplaces are paradoxically creating both more docile workers and more active citizens.

These matters demand attention to a very diverse set of concerns, including cultural and historical recognitions; diverse discursive representations; methodological problems; social scientific explanations of phenomena; and political agendas to reduce and stop violation in and around organizations.

This book is organized in seven broad chapters. Eight sets of focus material on specific examples of 'violations in organizations' are included. The first two chapters provide a conceptual and historical background. Chapter 1 includes a critical introductory overview of current thinking around organizational worlds, gender, sexuality and violence, and their relations to each other. It explores the ways in which organizations are gendered, sexualed and made arenas of violence and violation, and how these in turn relate to other social divisions. In Chapter 2 we outline the historical location of organizations in time, and the relevance of this for understanding organizations as gendered, sexualed, violent and violating. This emphasizes the context of the structural power of (certain) heterosexual men and their relationship with the dominant social, economic and political orders. We thus critically examine, first patriarchy, then capitalism, and third the nationstate, as sedimented historical frameworks for understanding gender relations within contemporary organizations. This is illustrated by two sets of historical focus material: on organizational heterosexualities in the nineteenth-century

Industrial Revolution, and state and other organizational responses to men's violence to women and children.

Chapters 3 and 4 address respectively the practical and the theoretical recognition of violation in organizations. In Chapter 3 we discuss the recent growth of practical concerns about and recognition of sexual harassment, bullying and physical violence within organizations. This draws on a range of sources, including journalistic ones, to demonstrate the tension between the unspokenness of the forces of gender, sexuality, harassment, bullying and violence and attempts to speak out about them. Harassment, bullying and physical violence have usually been categorized separately without reference to each other, and this itself contributes to resistance to their being heard. Sexual harassment is clearly perceived as gendered, but bullying and physical violence do not necessarily involve recognition of gendered dimensions. Four sets of focus material are provided here - on the police, business, the military and air travel. The links between gender, sexuality, harassment, bullying and violence are examined as part of the more general concept of organization violation. Organization violations are conceptualized as spanning structural oppressions and mundane everyday violations in organizations. This recognizes that all these categories are violations of the person. Organizations provide an important key to the maintenance, reproduction and silencing of such violations. Chapter 4 examines theorizing on violence and violation in organizations. Organization violations are examined at macro, meso and micro levels, in relation to patriarchal social relations, capitalist social relations and relatively local cultural, nationalist, ethnic and other exclusionary social relations, as introduced in Chapter 2.

Chapters 5 and 6 examine two contrasting forms of organization that cut across these macro, meso and micro levels: the closed organization in relative isolation, and the transformation of organizations in the globalizing world. Thus Chapter 5 focuses on the closed organization in comparative isolation, with given boundaries and the intensification of internal organizational processes. Extended focus material on children's homes and other institutions demonstrates how such institutionalized settings may facilitate the regular violations of the person combined with their silencing through the stigmatized status of resident. By contrast, Chapter 6 focuses on the transformation of boundaries, boundarylessness and pervasive, expanding organizational forms, which in turn demand new ways of understanding. This is illustrated by focus material on the global 'sex industry'. These two chapters are not simply a restatement of the established contrast between closed and open organizations or systems; it is a contrasting of difference, of two forms that are not opposites.

The final chapter addresses the implications of these matters for politics and policy, in social theory and knowledge formation; organizational, management and legal policy, including cyberpolicy; and the politics of risk and of oppression. We conclude with a discussion of the need for violation-free organizations and workplaces.

This book can be read in several ways. After the first chapter, there are several options. If your main interest is history, then proceed to the next chapter; if it is

xiv Introduction

the contemporary processes of recognition of violations in organizations, then Chapter 3 might be a place to begin; if it is theory that interests you most, then Chapter 4 is suggested. Those concerned with total institutions and similar organizations or with globalization and ICTs might prefer Chapters 5 or 6 respectively. Or you can begin at the end with politics and policy and work backwards! We hope you find the book useful, whatever your concerns, and we welcome feedback (jeff.hearn@man.ac.uk, p.w.parkin@hud.ac.uk).

1

Gender, Sexuality, Violation and Organizational Worlds

How Did We Get Here?

Organizations are gendered; that much we know. When we started researching and writing together on organizations in the late 1970s our primary interest was on gender relations in organizations. We first began to assemble information on the gender division of labour, the gender division of authority and, to a lesser extent, sexuality in and around organizations. At the time we drew on almost whatever sources we could find (Hearn and Parkin, 1983, 1992). In familiarizing ourselves with what had and had not been studied, we gradually became aware of the inadequacies in much literature of the time. These can be characterized through a number of tendencies:

- to consider gender, if at all, in rather simple, dualist ways, most obviously in the use of sex/gender role models of gender relations that have since been subject to overwhelming critique;¹
- to focus primarily, often exclusively, on the division of labour;
- to consider organizations out of the context of their societal relations, including the domestic relations of organizational members; and
- to neglect or ignore sexuality.

Since then, the field of gender relations, sexuality and organizations has expanded greatly, indeed so much so that now we have filing cabinets full of the stuff. In a rather strange way, the development of the field, the state of our filing cabinets and our own biographies have changed in parallel. Our recent lives have mirrored the fields we have chosen to study.² Thus the task now is not to establish the field of gender relations, sexuality and organizations. That is already done – even though the supposedly non-gendered, but in fact gendered, mainstream keeps remembering to forget the fact. Rather we see our current task as developing and clarifying the field, in terms of specific concepts and issues – in effect trying to move it on, one more time.

Why Organizations?

Organization, singular, refers to the acts and process of social organizing. Organizations, plural, are those particular social collectivities that result from

those acts and processes. But organizations are not to be thought of as mere outcomes. Instead they themselves should be understood as social processes that are in a state of becoming something else. Thus organizations, and indeed actions within organizations, are always embodied in social contexts. This contextembeddedness means that it is necessary in conceptualizing, analysing and writing about organizations to bear in mind that attempts to characterize organizations are limited and provisional.

One complication is that organizations are both social places of organizing and social structurings of social relations, whose interrelations are historically dynamic. Another is that organizations are not collectivities formed simply by the individual, intentional action of their founders and members. Rather, organizations always occur in the context of pre-existing (organizational) social relations. The search for any tabula rasa is in vain. To paraphrase Marx: 'organizations make history but not in the conditions of their choosing.'3

The notion of 'the organization' is thus itself somewhat problematic. At its simplest, the notion of an organization conjures up the picture of a factory, an office, even a university - something that can be seen, something that appears to function within four walls. But of course such an idea of an organization is a fantasy. The picture of the visible organizations does not even come from the heyday of the Industrial Revolution; it stems if anywhere from the eighteenth century, with the relatively isolated industrial mill that could be seen. It was with the passing of this organizational form to the multiple-unit 'organization' that could not be fully seen that, rather paradoxically, the idea of the organization, and thus organization theory, became constituted and more popularly available. By the height of the nineteenth-century Industrial Revolution in Great Britain and many industrialized countries, the isolated organization was already to a considerable extent decomposing and anachronistic. It was indeed its decomposition that was at the same time accompanied by its diffusion and expansion. As organizations 'grew in size' and became more consolidated, and indeed more powerful concentrations of resources, they also became more diffuse and less concentrated at particular times and places. Part of the reason for this was the mode of expansion of some organizations. Their expansion was not just upwards and outwards on the same site (within four walls or expanding those four walls), but it was also through horizontal and vertical connection and integration, and above all through geographical and temporal expansion and diffusion. The organization was no longer a simple place – or indeed a simple time.

The notion of organization, and hence organizations, has thus become progressively more complex. It still refers to the individual organization, but it also encompasses the conglomeration of organizations, as in multi-organizations. In this sense, 'the state', like the transnational corporation, is itself an organization even though it comprises many different organizations within it. And so within each organization (within such multi-organizations) there are of course further smaller sub-units that might often reasonably be called organizations too. At its simplest, one might therefore distinguish: (i) large complex multi-organizations of many other organizations; (ii) intermediate individual organizations; and (iii) small organizational sub-units. There is additionally a

fourth category: (iv) cyber or paper organizations that do not exist in a specific time-place reality.

Whereas previously most organizations could be relatively geographically and spatially isolated in a particular place, this is increasingly becoming problematic, as organizations become organized across time, space and even cyberspace and cybertime. This means that the rather rapid change in the relationship of time and space - the so-called space-time continuum - makes it increasingly necessary to question the equation of organization and place. Accordingly, this in turn makes the distinction between organizations as places and organizations as the structurings of social relations more important. Thus, the once relatively stable equation of organization and place, the assumed placing of organizations in a specific place, is now being disrupted, and is probably to be disrupted further in the future. This means that the single place-based organization becomes reconceptualized as just one temporary organizational form (of social relations), not the major or most persistent form.

Organizations are commonly seen and understood as places of discourse, of activity, of communication, even of noise, rapidity and speed. Yet what happens in organization often also involves silence, not just in the sense of quietness, but in the sense of that which is not spoken. Organizations are continually structured and practised through the unspoken. Accordingly, one might re-understand organizations as very much (subject to) unspoken forces. These forces include gender, sexuality, violence and violation.

Why Organizational Worlds?

The concept of organization is far from unproblematic. While it may be increasingly difficult to define an organization in a fixed, absolute way, people do live and work in organizational worlds. The use of the term 'worlds' facilitates engagement with the perceptual worlds of organizational members and outsiders, such as customers. If an organizational member or outsider finds something gendered or sexual (or sexualed or sexualized), or harassing, violent or violating in an organization, then it is - for their purposes and in their reality. The concept of 'worlds' also conveys the way in which organizations often carry a sense of (dis)continuity, culture, discourse(s), life-world and moreover hegemonic domination of the 'definition of the situation'. Thus part of organizational worlds is the world of recognition (or lack of recognition) - be it of gender inequalities, sexuality, violence or violation. This can be reinforced for some, especially those within total institutions, as the organization is the world of residence. Yet the notion of organizational worlds also speaks to the socio-spatial and globalizing tendencies of organizations and organizational life - a different and indeterminate organizational world of the global. For these reasons, and especially with contemporary and likely future economic, social, technological and spatial changes, we talk of organizational worlds rather than reifying organizations. The discrete, separate organization may become less meaningful, in some senses ceases to exist. Organizational worlds may be a more accurate description of late modern organizational life.

Why Gender?

Gender and gendered power relations are major defining features of most, perhaps all, organizations. What we call 'organizations' are not just embedded in gender but entreated, soaked in, pervaded and constituted by and through gender; and furthermore at the same time organizational realities themselves construct and sometimes subvert dominant gender relations and even gender itself. When gender is referred to it may be usual to think of 'men and women' and the 'relations between them'; this is certainly part of gender, but it is only a part. For one thing, gender is just as relevant in relations between women and between men. These are still very much gendered relations. This is somewhat similar to the way questions of race and racialization are often relevant in understanding what is happening in situations and organizations that appear to only involve white people. More generally, gender has now taken on a mass of other more complex meanings; and some discussion of this is now necessary. These differential meanings and understandings of gender are themselves both contested and central to the analysis of (gendered) organizations.

The debate about the meaning of gender has continued to develop rapidly. The distinction between sex and gender was recognized in the 1960s and 1970s by feminists and others attempting to develop a more critical account of women's and men's relations and positions in society. It was a way of making it clear that what was often thought of as natural and biological was in fact social, cultural, historical and indeed political.⁴ Oakley (1972, 1985) set out this differentiation between 'sex' as biological sex differences and 'gender' as the social and cultural constructions of those differences. This kind of sex/gender approach has been very important in generating greater attention to studies of sex differences and their relative absence, sex/gender roles, sex role socialization and masculinity-femininity scales. Much of this work in the 1960s, 1970s and even the 1980s, particularly within psychology and social psychology, was, however, itself placed within the context of relatively positivist understandings of gender. This applied especially to the development of maculinity-femininity scales, their empirical refinement and use to correlate with other measures of the person.⁶

There are many complications in conceptualizing gender and defining what gender is, particularly so within positivist paradigms. One difficulty is: it depends on who is asking the question, and why; and it depends on who is answering the question, and why. For example, feminists are likely to have very different concerns from most men when talking about masculinity. Another pervasive constraint is the persistence of dualisms and dichotomies, for example, female/male; woman/man; feminine/masculine; femininity/masculinity; girls/boys. While clearly these are important differentiations, there is a sense in which they only speak to part of the possibilities of what gender is or might be in different situations and societies. Indeed, no longer is it possible to reproduce the dichotomous separation of sex and gender that characterized sex role theory of the 1960s and 1970s. Indeed, the sex/gender approach to gender somewhat paradoxically takes us back to biology. It rests on the assumption that a woman is someone who is a socially constructed member of the 'female sex', and a man is likewise a socially

constructed member of the 'male sex'. The notion of 'sex' used here is usually shorthand for a number of physiological features, particularly primary sex characteristics and secondary sex characteristics.⁷

However, all the various primary and secondary features are not always so easily described as simply 'female' or 'male', and indeed may be further complicated by a range of biological, cultural and bio-cultural factors and conditions. Thus both 'females' and 'males', and 'women' and 'men' are variable categories. including old/young, (in)fertile, presumed females/males. Other complications to any simple sex/gender model arise from the existence of considerable crosscultural variations in usual somatypes between cultures, following from working practices, diet and hereditary patterns.8 Even with these and other difficulties, the sex/gender model has undoubtedly prompted a mass of path-breaking work on gender, gender relations and gendered power relations. Within this general perspective, there are many different approaches - some drawing on the notion of behaviour and developing the notion of sex/gender role; some attending to attitudes, self-concept and gender identity; some focusing on social categories and structural relations, as in the concept of collective sex/gender class. In many of these approaches gender has been understood as a way of moving away from biology and of recognizing a relatively autonomous set of social and cultural relations. Females are not simply 'women', as males are not 'men'; none of these is a unified category; female/male and women/men are not all inclusive of people and furthermore this varies greatly in different societies.

Of special significance has been the elaboration of distinctly sociological and social structural approaches to gender. These include the articulation of structural concepts of gender relations in patriarchy, gender systems and dominant gender orders. Such analyses were a major point of theoretical and political attention in the 1970s. However, by the late 1970s, at about the same time as sex role approaches were themselves being criticized, there were growing critiques of the concept of patriarchy. Similar arguments have also been made with regard to the critique of categoricalism⁹ in conceptualizing gender (Connell, 1985, 1987). These developments can also be seen as part of the general critique of positivist social science that has gathered pace since the 1960s.

The outcome of these simultaneous, if somewhat separate, critiques of, first, social psychological concepts of gender as sex role and, second, overly structuralist concepts of gender as determined within patriarchy, has been a movement to a more differentiated, more pluralized, yet still *power-laden*, approach to gender. This is encapsulated in the notion of gendered power relations. An example of such an approach is that on masculinities by Carrigan, Connell and Lee (1985). This investigated relations between men and between men and women, resistance, social and intrapsychic constructions; and hegemonic, complicit, subordinated forms of masculinities. This reformulation of gender fits closely with revisions of patriarchy (or patriarchies) as historical, multiple structures. In recent years, there has been increasing attention to gendered practices, processes of gendering, masculinity/ies; gendered material/discursive practices; gendered discourses and discourses of gender; plural/multiple/composite masculinities and femininities; the interrelations of gendered unities and gendered differences

(Collinson and Hearn, 1994; Hearn and Collinson, 1994); and life stories and subjectivities.

Another difficulty, that is receiving increasing attention even in the last few years, lies in the very distinction between 'sex' and 'gender'. Perhaps the greatest challenge to a simple, dualist view of gender is represented by transsexualism and transgenderism, in its widely different social and cultural forms. This has itself prompted a significant expansion of transgender studies and studies of transgenderism in recent years.11 The sex-gender distinction has itself been subject to critical interrogation and deconstruction in recent years. Bondi (1998) has recently clarified the following three major problems with the distinction:12

- First, there is no convincing evidence that gender itself carries a necessary liberatory potential; just because gender is socially constructed does not mean that it can be changed any more easily than sex.13
- Second, the sex-gender distinction is closely linked to other dichotomies, most obviously nature-culture and body-mind. If gender corresponds, it might be asked why a concept of gender is necessary; if gender involves the transcendence of mind over body, then the question remains why should this 'unsexed' mind correspond to gender if it is wholly disconnected from sex. It can thus be argued that the sex-gender distinction reinforces its own dichotomies and even repositions the male/masculinity as the norm.14
- Third, the sex-gender distinction implies that sex and biology are pre-social or free of the social; but biology is itself constituted in the social.¹⁵

An influential commentator in this respect has been Butler (1990) who has argued cogently that the sex/gender distinction is itself a social and cultural construction; it is not that gender is the cultural arrangement of sex difference, but that the sex/gender difference is a cultural arrangement, dominantly constructed in terms of the 'heterosexual matrix'. Thereby our attention is directed to the social and cultural construction of the sexed body. This kind of approach has been a major way of reformulating the sociology of the body.¹⁶ On the other hand, there is a danger in such an approach that the physical, biological, material body may be lost in the search for social inscription and performativity. In the light of this, a more measured movement may be made towards recognizing both the socio-cultural formation of the gendered body and its physical, biological, material existence; thus there is not just one possible relation of the biological sex/ gender and the social sex/gender, but rather many possible such relations and interrelations in different societal and social situations.

Thus gender is not one 'thing'; it is contested, very complex and differentiated. It is necessary now to provide an open-ended definition of gender. A very useful definition of gender has been produced by Joan Scott in the context of historical research into gender relations:

My definition of gender relationships has two parts and several subsets. They are interrelated but must be analytically distinct. The core of the definition rests on an integral connection between two propositions: gender is a constitutive element of social relationships based on perceived differences between the sexes, and gender is a primary way of signifying relationships of power. Changes in the organization of social

relationships always correspond to changes in representations of power but the direction of change is not necessarily one way. As a constitutive element of social relationships based on perceived differences between the sexes, gender involves four interrelated elements: first, culturally available symbols that evoke multiple (and often contradictory) representations. Second, normative concepts that set forth interpretations of the meanings of symbols, that attempt to limit and contain their metaphoric possibilities. These concepts are expressed in religious, educational, scientific, legal and political doctrines and typically take the form of a fixed binary opposition, categorically and unequivocally asserting the meaning of male and female, masculine and feminine. In fact, these normative statements depend on the refusal or repression of alternative possibilities, and sometimes, overt contests about them take place (at what moments and under what circumstances ought to be a concern of historians). The point of new historical investigations is to disrupt the notion of fixity, to discover the nature of the debate or repression that leads to the appearance of timeless permanence in binary gender representation. This kind of analysis must include a notion of politics as well as reference to social institutions and organizations - the third aspect of gender relationships....

The fourth aspect of gender is subjective identity.... Historians need ... to examine the ways in which gendered identities are substantively constructed and relate their findings to a range of activities, social organizations and historically specific cultural representations. The best efforts in this area so far have been, not surprisingly, biographies. (1986: 1097-8)

Connell (1998) has suggested the following summary of conclusions from recent historical and contemporary empirical studies of masculinities: plurality of masculinities (and thus other gendered forms); hierarchy and hegemony; collective masculinities (and thus other gendered forms); bodies as arenas; active construction; contradiction; and dynamics. These points seem to us to apply equally well to the conceptualization of gender more generally. All of these aspects of gender relations are to be found in organizations, and organizational structures and processes. Organizations are indeed gendered in a number of distinct ways. The movement towards the recognition of such gendered organizations has been gradual rather than sudden; and the development of more gendered organization theory has to be placed in the context of some of the preoccupations of mainstream/malestream theory and theorizing.

Towards Gendered Organization Theory

The early modern development of organizational analysis is typically presented as agendered. Yet the analyses of, say, Classical Theory and Scientific Management were overwhelmingly by men, about men, for men. These prescriptions could also be interpreted as attempts by men managers to control growing numbers of women or migrant workers in particular commercial and state sectors in the early twentieth century. Classical Theory and related theories carry implicit, and sometimes explicit, conceptualizations of gender and sexuality (see Hearn and Parkin, 1987: 17-21). Within those theories and managerial practices are detailed statements on the way men are assumed to manage and be managed, the control of the body and sexuality, and many other relevant questions. On the other hand, even Frederick Taylor was well aware of the importance of morale, motivation

and indeed the emotions. He thus proposed the appointment of the 'functional foreman' whose duties included attending to the morale of the workers he controlled (Taylor, 1947). In a different sense, Taylorist management can be understood as an intensely emotional process for men managers themselves. This hinges on the contradictory effects of excessive control, of both others and the self, and the ways in which those most committed to control experienced 'loss of control' and 'anxiety' through their lives.17

Similarly, while bureaucratic organizations and Weberian theories thereof are often seen as emphasizing rationality or instrumentality rather than emotions, in practice bureaucracies are often intensely emotional. Weber himself saw the social construction of affectivity in bureaucracies and elsewhere as central. This was made clearer by Merton (1952) in describing bureaucracies as organizations where 'timidity, defensiveness, harshness and resentment are part of the daily round' (Albrow, 1992: 319).

Much subsequent organization theory, and, par excellence, Human Relations Theory, can be read as attempts by men not just to reorganize social relationships in organizations, but to incorporate gendered and sexual relations into organizational analysis in an agendered and asexual way. Gender and sexuality continued to be made implicit, neutered within neutral language. This is both a theoretical issue and a practical managerial issue, as Human Relations Theory has been used to legitimate increased managerial surveillance and control of workers; and particularly women's emotional and even sexual lives. 18 These themes are clear in the work of Elton Mayo (1960) and his associates but they also appear later in the work of Talcott Parsons and Robert Bales (1955). Their structural functionalism provided a very clear gendering not only of women's and men's roles in the family, groups and other social systems, but moreover in the very separation of the instrumental and the socio-emotional. Parsonian theorizing can be understood as a male attempt to translate a normative set of gendered social relations to a theoretical analysis and thence to future normative prescriptions, through the incorporation of gender, sexuality and emotions into agendered, asexual conceptualizations.

In the UK, the Tavistock 'School' with its own particular version of 'human relations' has been very influential in the development of organizational analysis and the conceptualization of gender and sexuality. While the extent to which it is a specific and identifiable school at all may be contentious (Miller, 1992), the emphasis that it brought to the fore was primarily the extension of psychoanalytic insights from individual to group and organizational dynamics through the development of problem-focused consultancy and intervention. This approach is necessarily gendered and sexualed in many ways. Assumptions about gender and sexuality are a fundamental part of psychoanalytic theorising, not just a contingent addition. In some cases, sexuality was a direct concern; more usually, sexuality was a present yet relatively minor component of analysis. The Tavistock programme's work has addressed the unconscious preoccupations of members of groups and organizations, including unconscious sexual preoccupations. This was seen in Bion's (1948, 1949, 1950) analysis of pairing in groups manifesting underlying sexual dynamics; Jaques's (1955) and Menzies's (1960) studies of defences against paranoid and depressive anxiety; and Bowlby's (1953) attention to the interrelation of institutional dynamics, and personal and sexual well-being. In so doing, the Tavistock programme has contributed significantly to 'the government of subjectivity and social life' (Miller and Rose, 1988).

Importantly, Human Relations Theory, Parsonian structural functionalism and the Tavistock 'School' have all, albeit in different ways, contributed to the establishment of the system as the prime paradigm for the analysis of organizations. In one sense, the system reduces social divisions, including gender and sexuality, to systemic language; in another, systems thinking often reproduces gendered dualities between goal attainment and system maintenance. Systemic theorizing can thus be used to either obscure gender and sexuality or to justify and perpetuate the 'maintenance' roles of women in lower organizational positions. Even so, Human Relations and related traditions have shown glimmerings of the development of the field of gender, sexuality and organizations. Organizational analysis has often been centrally concerned with human relations rather than social structures. When links have been made between 'human relations', gender and sexuality, it has usually been in terms of interpersonal, emotional relationships rather than social structural relations of power and dominance.

Why Gendered Organizations?

Recent research and literature on the gendering of organizations has been strongly influenced by debates in and around feminism. During the 1970s and 1980s, the two most prolific feminist or feminist-influenced sets of literature on gender and organizations have come from Marxist and socialist feminism; and writing on 'women in management', especially from North America. As already noted, sexuality was not generally the central focus of interest of these studies. More recently, there have been increasing numbers of feminist and pro-feminist studies on gender, and on particular divisions of labour, in organizations, which in turn address sexuality to a greater or lesser extent.¹⁹ Furthermore, in some radical and anarchist feminism the very idea of organization(s) is held to be dominated by men, and so subject to critical theory and practice.20

The fabric, texture and existence of organizations, both in their formation in the context of external social relations and in their internal structures, documentations and social texts, are gendered. Thus most organizations are doubly gendered, in the sense that the public domains and organizations within them are dominantly valued over the private domains, and that within organizations the structure and processes are themselves gendered. The internal workings of organizations are gendered in both the distribution of women and men, and the distribution of gendered practices. It is important to recognize the gendering of organizations even when they totally or almost totally consist of women or men.

While the number of different ways in which organizations can be gendered is immense, it may be helpful to build up a picture by focusing on a limited number of some typical differences:

1. The gendered division of labour, both formal and informal. Women and men may, through processes of inclusion and exclusion, specialize in particular

- types of labour, so creating vertical and horizontal divisions within organizations.
- 2. Gendered divisions of authority, with men typically exerting more authority over both women and other men. These interactions of gendered divisions of labour and gendered divisions of authority produce, when consolidated in a formalized structure, gendered bureaucracy.21
- 3. Gendered processes between the centre and margins of organizations. These may be literally or metaphorically spatial in terms of the distribution of power and activity between the centre and the margins of organizations. The 'main aim' of organizations tends to be dominantly defined by men and men's interests (Cockburn, 1991). 'Front-line' activities are often staffed by women, while 'central' activities may be more often performed by men. The casualization, and hence implicit dispensability, of employment may also affect women workers more just as it may affect black workers and, in different ways, young and older workers.
- 4. The gendered relationship of organizational participants to their domestic and related responsibilities. Women typically continue to carry the double burden of childcare and other unpaid domestic work, and may carry a triple burden of care for other dependents, including parents, older people and people with disabilities.
- 5. Gendered processes in the operation of sexuality and violence within the organizations, including the occurrence of sexual harassment and the dominance of various forms of sexuality over others. Sexual processes interrelate with gendered violence in organizations.22

These five elements can be understood as part of a picture of how gendered organizations are constructed. In particular organizations these elements interact with each other in ways that may reinforce or contradict each other. Frequently these interactions are ambiguous, paradoxical and open to multiple interpretations. Thus, these gendered processes and their interrelationships should not be seen as monolithic. Indeed, of particular importance is the impact of atypical gendered positionings, either in terms of women or men occupying atypical positionings or in the use of atypical gendered practices. While atypical gendering may be a means of organizational change, not least in the transformation of the discourses of and on organizations, the positioning of 'women managers', 'women doctors', 'men secretaries', 'male nurses' and so on should not be seen as necessarily subversive. Indeed it is quite possible that the production of atypical gendering can reproduce dominant gendered patterns within organizations, albeit in more subtle ways (Oerton, 1996a).

This leads to two final issues in this section. First, there is the question of how gendered processes are reproduced in organizations. The elements and their interactions are above all occurrences in change, flux and becoming. Thus, although men's dominance is profound, it is neither monolithic nor unresisted. It has to be continually re-established, and in the process it can be challenged, subverted and destabilized. For these reasons, linguistic and discursive processes of differencing in organizations, for example, in definitions of what is and is not 'legitimate'

or 'illegitimate', are crucial (Cockburn, 1990). Second, there is a need to be alive to the likely cross-cultural and historical inapplicability of particular gendered concepts, that may appear to be appropriate to the analysis of society and organizations here and now. These issues are explored further in later chapters.

Why Sexuality?

The recognition of sexuality as a central feature of organizations is relatively recent. While sexuality has been studied in organizational contexts from a wide range of disciplinary and theoretical positions, there have been a number of specific historical developments over the last thirty years or more that has led the increase of interest in organizations. Foremost amongst these is the development of Second Wave feminism, which highlighted gendered concerns with women's control over their own bodies and their sexuality and the specific naming of and opposition to sexual harassment. Women's control of their bodies, reproductive rights and sexuality lead to both a political and an academic agenda around sexuality in organizations. A second major stimulus to the examination of sexuality in organizations overlaps to some extent with the first. The modern lesbian and gay movements, that grew from the late 1960s, have been influential in a great many ways, though often at a deeper (post-)structural level than at the level of immediate action, remark or policy-making. While there have of course been surveys of and actions against lesbian and gay harassment and discrimination, the more profound impact has been in problematizing sexuality, especially heterosexuality, and, in recent years, 'homosexuality' too. Current perspectives on sexuality in organization are influenced by a wide variety of theoretical approaches, including poststructuralism, often following on the work of Michel Foucault; Marxism, feminism, especially radical feminism; psychoanalysis; and postmodernism.

A strong empirical focus on sexuality and organizations has developed in at least three main ways. First, the study of sexuality in organizations developed initially from journalistic and political interventions in and naming of sexual harassment in the mid-1970s. The first book analysing the problem was Sexual Shakedown produced by Lin Farley in 1978. This naming should not of course obscure the fact that sexual harassment was not new at all, merely that in the past it had often been taken for granted, was unnoticed, ignored or defined in other ways previously (see pp. 50-7). Since then studies and surveys of, action against and policies on sexual harassment have mushroomed. There followed general social analyses, detailed examinations of legal cases (MacKinnon, 1979) and broad social surveys (Gutek, 1985), all establishing the pervasiveness and frequency of sexual harassment by men. In 1987 the Ministry of Health and Social Affairs in Finland published a survey and bibliography, giving details of 341 publications and ten bibliographies on sexual harassment (Högbacka et al., 1987). The work of Kauppinen and Gruber, and Haavio-Mannila and colleagues has introduced a stronger comparative element to analysis, and connected sexual harassment to broad questions of gendered organizations and work (Kauppinen and Gruber, 1993a, 1993b; Haavio-Mannila, 1994, 1998).

Secondly, there has been a smaller development of empirical studies of heterosexual relationships and sexual liaisons in organizations.²³ Though some of the early examples of these studies cannot be said to have been particularly critical, they can, in a general sense, be understood in the context of the growing attempts to develop explicit social theorizing on heterosexuality (Wilkinson and Kitzinger, 1993), 'compulsory heterosexuality' (Rich, 1983), 'hierarchic heterosexuality' (Hearn, 1987) and 'hegemonic heterosexuality' (Frank, 1987).

Thirdly, another important strand of empirical studies developed in the 1980s on lesbians' and gay men's experiences in organizations, particularly, though not only, experiences of discrimination and violation.²⁴ As with sexual harassment surveys, these were often initially part of campaigns or other political interventions.²⁵ Recent studies have examined the wider experiences of lesbians and gay men throughout organizations, including business (Woods and Lucas, 1993; Signorile, 1994), the public sector (Skelton, 1999; Humphrey, 2000), the police (Burke, 1993), the military (Cammermeyer, 1995; Hall, 1995) and the community sector (Oerton, 1996a, 1996b).

These empirical studies have been accompanied by general reviews of the place of sexuality within organizations. The book 'Sex' at 'Work' (Hearn and Parkin, 1987, 1995) outlined ways in which organizations construct sexuality, sexuality constructs organizations, and organizations and sexuality may occur simultaneously - hence the notion of 'organization sexuality'. In describing this simultaneous phenomenon, we noted how this may occur in terms of movement and proximity, feelings and emotions, ideology and consciousness, and language and imagery. This work also pointed centrally to the problem of the power of men and the pervasiveness of the 'male sexual narrative' (Dyer, 1985) in organizations. These themes have been explored in much greater detail in The Sexuality of Organization (Hearn et al., 1989) and other case studies (for example, Cockburn, 1991; Collinson, 1992). The Sexuality of Organization book was a diverse collection. However, in different ways, the contributors placed sexuality as an important element in the understanding of organizational process, and not just something that is added on to the analysis. For example, Deborah Sheppard (1989: 142) argued that 'The notion of organizational structure as an objective, empirical and genderless reality is itself a gendered notion', partly through the presence of sexuality and sexual(ized) process in organizations. The book explores through both theoretical reviews and empirical case studies the intimate overlap between sexuality and organizations/organizing. It emphasizes the pervasive dominance of heterosexuality in most organizations.

Cynthia Cockburn has also taken up these themes in a number of publications, including Brothers (1983), 'Equal Opportunities' Intervene (1990) and In the Way of Women (1991). Her work is wide ranging in considering the variety of ways that men maintain and reproduce power over women, particularly in paid work organizations. This variety extends to the place of sexual domination alongside and in relation to, say, labour market domination; the interrelation of different oppressions and social divisions; and indeed the variety of actions and interests of different groups of men, for example, by 'class', 'race' and indeed sexuality.

Rosemary Pringle makes her prime focus gender and sexuality, particularly in analysing bureaucracies and the boss-secretary relationships there (1988, 1989). She is insistent on the need to record the extent of gender and sexual power and domination in organizations, and she is also especially concerned to analyse the pervasiveness and complexity of power. In doing so, she draws critically on poststructuralist theory to chart the ways in which gender/sexual power relations operate in multiple directions and may be only understood more fully by resort to psychodynamic, unconscious and fantasy processes. One potential difficulty of this kind of development is that the analysis of complexities and power can be read, we would argue, falsely, as diluting power analysis.

These general and detailed empirical studies and surveys have emphasized the interconnection of sexuality and power in organizations, and the pervasiveness of the power of men, particularly heterosexual men (Cockburn, 1991; Collinson, 1992). They have also shown how sexual processes and organizational processes are intimately connected, in both the general structuring of organizations and in the detail of everyday interaction. '(Re-)eroticizations' of organizations have been expounded and critiqued (Brewis and Grey, 1994; Brewis and Linstead, 2000). Organizations, like discourses, are sexually encoded (cf. Grosz, 1987), both for organizational members in organizational cultures and organizational analysts of organizations (Calás and Smircich, 1991). Attempting to make sense of these issues brings us back to some of the basic questions of organizational analysis; in other ways, it raises quite novel questions.

In much of this broad literature on organizations, gender and sexuality, two sub-perspectives may be recognized, often in some kind of tension. However, this tension may be seen not as a problem but rather as dynamic and (re)productive. These two sub-perspectives may be characterized as, firstly, that which focuses on material oppressions, and, secondly, that which focuses on discursive constructions. These two are sometimes seen as in opposition, as in some debates between modernism and postmodernism, or they may be seen as converging. Material oppressions are being understood in increasingly complex, differentiated and multiple ways, just as the (re)production of discourse and discursive constructions is a material, organizational and technological accomplishment. Perhaps the main lesson of discursive perspectives is the need to look beyond and deconstruct the obvious, the dominant taken-for-granted, by which organizations are constructed and analysed. This entails the deconstruction of those perspectives that hold, or seek to hold, dominant control within organizations, often those of the modernist project(s) and paradigm(s). In so doing, emphasis is shifted to the sub-texts of organizations, such as sexuality and forms of sexual process. Discourses of and around organizations are themselves sexually encoded. Similarly, violence and certain forms of violent process constitute other subtexts of organizations; and discourses of and around organizations are violently-encoded, as, for example, in notions of threat.

By focusing on material oppressions, organizations are seen as sites and structures of oppression. That is not to demonize organizations, nor is it to ignore the positive or facilitative or creative aspects of organizations. Oppression can be conceptualized as shorthand for a series of social processes, by and through

which particular dominant groups and classes oppress others in various ways. It is difficult to reduce oppression to one single explanation. In speaking of the oppressed and oppression, we refer to the way certain constructions or categories of people may be relatively consistently treated in ways that denigrate or undervalue or hurt or proscribe more favoured courses of action for them as individuals and/or collectivities. The variety of ways and areas in and through which men (may) oppress include biological reproduction; sexuality; caring and nurturing; and violences. These can be thought of as types of reproduction of social life; other forms include paid employment and cultural forms. The forms that oppression may take range from direct violence and force to the indirect use of violence through hierarchy and the unfair allocation of resources, as in most organizations. For such patterns of oppression to continue, men oppress each other - in the making of 'men', especially when boys and young men engage in competition, violence, resistance and oppressing themselves. Thus in both sub-perspectives, organizations can be seen as structured, gendered/sexualed, sexually encoded (though not necessarily sexualized) and indeed violenced reproductions. Organizations may be analysed through cultural reproductive materialism that is simultaneously discursive and material (Hearn, 1992b, 1993).

Another contentious element in the field is the very meaning of sexuality. Though few would restrict 'sexuality' to physical sexual contact or even sexualsocial relations, some commentators tend to limit sexuality to social practices that relate to desire and its social construction while others hardly distinguish sexuality from gender.26 Another dimension of difference that in some ways cuts across the first is whether sexuality is understood primarily in conscious even intentional terms, less conscious terms or even unconscious terms. For example, a heterosexual primary text may be underlain by a homosexual/homosocial subtext. This in turn suggests different models of organizations and organizing - as actionbased structures or sub-structures of unconscious processes.

Why Sexualed Organizations?

In the light of these debates, some authors have attempted to distinguish a sexuality paradigm and a gender paradigm in organizational analysis. We remain extremely doubtful about this possibility. While organizational analysis focusing on sexuality is often neglected and needs to be more fully developed, this is not to be understood in any way that is competitive with 'gender'. Whilst we have written at length on the neglect of sexuality in organizations, and have attempted to rectify this omission, we do not think that the establishment of any separate 'sexuality and organizations' field or 'sexuality paradigm', in competition with the analysis of gendered power relations, should follow. To be absolutely clear on this: we do not advocate a separate paradigm for sexuality and organizations. We would make similar arguments on any would-be paradigm of violence, violation and organizations.

A challenge is how to increase the focus on sexuality whilst not creating a separable object of analysis. We have previously discussed extensively the

relationship of sexuality, gendered power relations and organizations.²⁷ Sexuality can be understood as both a foundation of gender (MacKinnon, 1982) and a focused aspect of gender relations. There is no necessary connection between studying sexuality and anti-modernism/postmodernism or studying gender and modernism. Sexuality is a fundamental material aspect of the reproduction of patriarchies and patriarchal relations. The social (re)production of sexuality is a major, but not of course the only, element in the formation of the gendered body. Likewise, sexuality constitutes one of the (many) effects of the body. The body is a material foundation, a social formation and a site of social effects of patriarchies and patriarchal relations.

Having said that, we do argue that it is necessary to understand organizations, or at least most organizations, as sexualed. This is for several reasons. First, sexual arrangements in the private domains provide the base infrastructure, principally through women's unpaid labour in families, for the public domain organizations. Second, in many organizations the concept of sexual work is a useful element in analysis. This addresses the relationship of work/labour to sexuality. Rather than seeing work as something that can then be sexualized, we argue that a much closer relationship between work and sexuality is possible. This entails the very definitions of sexuality and work. In some contexts sexuality in organizations, and indeed elsewhere, is a form of work. Organizations can be seen as arenas of sexual labour, just as they are of emotional labour and other forms of labour. Accordingly, an important concept in much of our own and others' work is that of sexual work and sexual labour.²⁸ These concepts are also developed elsewhere (for example, Hearn, 1987). For this we are indebted to Lucy Bland and her colleagues (1978) who had previously written on the selling of sexuality as part of labour power: 'sexuality is thus both officially incorporated (in the body) and literally marginalised' (Hearn and Parkin, 1987: 102).

Third, and linked closely to these debates is that more generally around the status of 'the economic', and specifically capitalism, in the construction of sexuality and sexual harassment. 'Organization sexuality'29 is not a specific product of capitalist labour processes, though they are relevant, along with many other processes. Sexual harassment cannot be 'explained' by capitalist labour market processes. In 'Sex' at 'Work' (Hearn and Parkin, 1987: 84-9), we discussed ways in which dominant patriarchal constructions of organizations could be said to construct sexuality. These included the extension of capitalist labour process theories in that direction. This was followed by a counter-argument that sexuality can be understood as constructing organizations: that organizations are constructed by sexuality. This was followed by a further chapter on 'organization sexuality' - the simultaneous operation of organizations and sexuality. Sexuality, sexual harassment and organization sexuality are thus analysed in a complex way that builds an argument step by step. The dominant framework for understanding all of this is patriarchal social relations: capitalist labour market processes are one instance of patriarchal relations, not the explanation of organization sexuality. Or to put this slightly differently, '(p)roductive relations, including capitalist ones, are after all also forms and matters of sexuality, procreation, nurture and violence' (Hearn, 1987: 101). Capitalism is one form of patriarchy.

Fourth, most organizations continue to exist with and through dominant heterosexual norms, ideology, ethics and practices. In our own and others' work on sexuality, gender and organizations, a central theme has been the question of heterosexuality and the movement of debate away from essentialized, naturalized views of sexuality (see Hearn et al., 1989). We have thus addressed heterosexuality and particularly men's heterosexuality as the dominant form of sexuality; and subjected compulsory heterosexuality to critique.30 (Hetero)sexual harassment is seen as wide-ranging sexualized activities, including unwanted touch, joking and invasion of space, so problematizing heterosexuality and recognizing its manifestations as power in organizations.31

Fifth, there is the general interrelation of gender and sexuality, as intimately, indeed definitionally, connected with each other (Bondi, 1998: 186). Gender occurs along with sexuality, and vice versa. It is rather difficult to conceive of gender and sexuality without the other. As Sedgwick (1991: 31) notes, 'without a concept of gender there could be, quite simply, no concept of homo- or heterosexuality'. On the other hand, while sexuality and gender are clearly far from co-extensive and should not be conflated with each other, we cannot know in advance how they will be different nor their exact relation to each other (Sedgwick, 1991: 27).

Sixth, despite the links between sexuality and gender, it is possible to make clear empirical distinctions between the sexual and gender dynamics in organizations or parts of organizations, for example in terms of the presence or absence of organizational members with different sexualities. In Sarah Rutherford's (1999) study of an airline company, the presence of gay men in some of the organization's divisions appeared to have clear impacts on the reduction of a harassing culture there.

Thus to argue that organizations are sexualed is not to say that sexuality is predominant.

Why Violences? Why Violation?

Violence has not been a central concern of mainstream organization theory. The recognition of the importance of gender and sexuality in organizations has provided groundwork for analysing violence in organizations and organizations through the perspective of violence. In this, feminist theory and practice on gender, sexuality and violence, in and outside organizations, have been central. The link between gender, sexuality and violence is most obvious with the recognition of sexual harassment, sexual violence and sexual abuse in and by organizations. Sexual harassment studies demonstrate both the power of male heterosexuality and men's violence in organizations. The complexities of interrelations of sexuality, violence and organizations remain relatively underexplored.³² Our focus on organizations through violence is not only because of the recognition of sexual harassment as a form of (sexual) violence but because feminist work more generally, particularly on sexuality, has increasingly acknowledged the underlying importance of men's violence. The overlap between sexual harassment and 'normal' heterosexual relations has been highlighted (Thomas and Kitzinger, 1994).

Forms of sexuality, especially men's heterosexuality, not usually constructed as sexual harassment or sexual violence, may be understood in terms of their relationship to or reconstruction as sexual violence (Dworkin, 1979; MacKinnon, 1983). Hierarchy and dominance, in organizations as elsewhere, have been explored as subject to eroticization, for many men at least.³³ Domination by men is clearly and characteristically associated with violence. Homicide and most other violence is primarily perpetrated by men. While men's collective, institutional and interpersonal domination of violence is immense, it is important to also recognize women's and indeed children's violence. An emphasis on violence as a fundamental part of the gendered analysis of society is part of feminist theory and practice. Opposition to men's violence is a major personal and political focus within feminism. For men to respond positively to feminism, to be profeminist, necessitates direct attention to men's power and violence. Men's violence is a major element in the perpetuation of that power and a necessary object of analysis and intervention in feminist and profeminist theory and practice.

Violence is an especially complex and contested term. This is clear from an historical analysis of the changing recognition of what counts as (forms of) violence (see pp. 65-70). The use of the term 'violence' also usually implies recognition that a problem exists: that something is seen as unacceptable or threatening, and that the actions and practices labelled as 'violent' have at least some characteristics in common with others similarly labelled. In this sense, it is a concept with shifting moral referents. Violence in and around work organizations is an area of analysis that is especially complex and contested. Indeed contestations over the definitions (in particular what is included and excluded) are especially intense in the case of violence, and are central in the social construction, social experience and social reproduction of violence in and around organizations. Debates and dilemmas around the definition of violence include those on: intention to harm; extent of physical contact; harmful effects and damage; differential perceptions, for example of violator and violated; and interpersonal and structural violence.

Definitions of violence can thus vary greatly. Let us consider three possibilities. First, violence is often equated with physical violence, or certain kinds of violence that are seen as 'serious' (see Hearn, 1998). This can apply in everyday definitions, especially of those being violent, and in official definitions. In criminal law this generally means the 'unjustified' use of physical force. The 1995 British Crime Survey defined 'work-related violence' as: 'Incidents of violence (wounding, common assault, robbery, and snatch theft) occurring while the victim was working. Incidents while travelling to and from work are excluded. Incidents not arising directly from the work are included. Incidents perpetrated by relatives or partners (domestic) are excluded.' This definition thus excludes harassment and bullving.

A second alternative, which is particularly relevant in organizational contexts, is to expand 'violence' to also include harassment and bullying. This view brings together debates on different forms of violence that are usually kept separate. Violence then includes sexual, racial and other harassments (unwanted, persistent physical or verbal behaviour of a sexual/racial nature);34 and bullying (exposure repeatedly and over time to negative actions from one or more persons such that victims have difficulties defending themselves, as well as physical violence. Bullying includes, for example, isolation (people refusing to listen to you, people refusing to talk to you), slander (gossip behind your back, spreading false and groundless information), negative glances and gestures, laughing, sneering (Björkqvist et al., 1994; Vartia, 1995).

A third way is to adopt a broad, socially contextualized understanding of violence as violation. Accordingly, we define violence as those structures, actions, events and experiences that violate or cause violation or are considered as violating. They are usually, but not necessarily, performed by a violator or violators upon the violated, Violence can thus be seen as much more than physical violence, harassment and bullying. It can also include intimidation, interrogation, surveillance, persecution, subjugation, discrimination and exclusion that lead to experiences of violation. This is close to what Judith Bessant (1998) calls 'opaque violence'. As she comments, 'In relationships where significant long-term power disparities exist, then inequality can easily slip into violence. This occurs regularly in workplaces as well as many other institutions' (p. 9). This raises the question of how violence and violation relate to broad questions of oppression, inequality and (gender and other forms of) equity.³⁵ Violations, including oppressions and discriminations, are likely to have negative effects on physical and mental health and well-being.36

Violence and violation are thus social phenomena. Violation usually, though not always, includes some kind of force or potential force: force by the violator; forced violation of the violated. Violence as violation includes structured oppression, harassment, bullying and violences, and mundane, everyday violations within organizational worlds. Dominant forms of violence as violation in organizations are by men to women, children or other men. They range across verbal, emotional, psychological, cognitive, representational and visual attacks, threats and degradation; enactment of psychological harm; physical assaults; use of weapons and other objects; destruction of property; rape; and murder. These distinctions may in practice break down, as in the understanding of all forms of violence from men to women as sexual violence (Kelly, 1987). There are also several standpoints from which to define violence as violation: the violator; the violated; those of other social actors involved in dealing with violence, for example lawmakers or enforcers; and those of analysts, who may or may not be involved in such intervention. In some situations the position, observation and sometimes relatively passive participation of audiences is especially important (Gabriel, 1998). These perspectives are, however, not always distinct; someone may occupy all locations simultaneously. All are mediated through representations and perceptions, usually differently for violators and violated, men and women. Violence involves violation; but violation is a broader, more useful concept for our purposes. This focus on violation has important methodological significance. Just as sexuality is not a fixed thing or even simply a set of acts, but a process of desiring, so similarly, a focus on violation refers to a process of damaging. These processes involve the desiring or damaging event and responses to desire/damage, and are, moreover, embodied, material and discursive.

Why Violenced Organizations? Why Violations in Organizations?

Violence and violation figure in relation to organizations in many ways. The developing focus on organizations through sexual/gendered violence and violation comes from a number of directions - from harassment studies; from feminist work on men's violence as a major element of men's social power; from work on violence by organizations, on bullying and physical violence in organizations and on organizational responses to violence, usually men's violence. Organizations can be seen as sites or structures of violence and violation, and be understood as constellations of violent/violating, potentially or threatened violent/violating actions, behaviours, intentions and experiences.

Violence and violation can be more or less institutionalized in particular organizations, and even in whole societies, such as the Third Reich. Violation may also include the creation of the conditions of violence, whether social structurally or when someone's presence is violating. Violation can be dramatic or subtle, occasional or continuous, chronic and endemic (as in slave workplaces), generally invisible and 'unnecessary' (as inequalities are so entrenched), normalized and naturalized (as in the acceptance of sexual harassment as part of some jobs), an indication of changing power relations (perhaps through challenging previous power relations) or a reassertion of power by dominant groups (as in men's responses to women's power). Violence and violations in and around organizations can be ways of reinforcing relations of domination and subordination; of developing resistance; of refining gradations of status and power; and facilitating alliances, coalitions, inclusions, exclusions and scapegoating (cf. Gabriel, 1998). Violences and violations can in turn be ways of maintaining subtexts and multiple oppressions in particular organizations, in organization and in society more generally. However, it should also be emphasized that violence and violations are not simply means for or structurings of other forms of power, domination and oppression. They are forms of power, domination and oppression in themselves that structure organizations. While such a perspective can mean that violence as violation may blur into power relations (Hearn, 1992a, 1998), a key distinction is that power relations are not necessarily violating. The very existence of organizations can also be violating.

From Gender to Sexuality to Violation? Towards the Gender-Sexuality-Violation Complex

The critical edge of organizational analysis has appeared to move from agendered approaches, to those implicitly incorporating gender and sexuality, to those recognizing social divisions (of which gender is one example), onto the more explicit recognition of first gender and gender relations, then sexuality, and now violence and violation. Such a 'progression' is not a narrowing of focus in organizational analysis but a series of theoretical repositionings. Assumptions that agendered approaches are broader than gendered approaches, and gender relations are broader than sexuality or violence, carry with them hierarchical assumptions on reality