SCOS 2010

Susan Harwood, PhD

Independent Researcher

Director Quality Consulting Services

PO Box 103 Northbridge Western Australia 6865

quality@iinet.net.au

PAPER[1]:

'Gendered Sight: there are none so blind as those who will not see'

28th Standing Conference on Organizational Symbolism

Lille France July 7th-10th 2010

Conference Theme: Motivation

Sub-themes: Blindness and Seeing

---

[1] This paper is based on and elaborates a presentation given by the author at the 28th SCOS Conference at Lille 2010.

'Gendered Sight: there are none so blind as those who will not see'

> With the new glasses the world was bigger and for the first time, space really had three dimensions where things could extend unhindered...But the world was a strain like that...when they became too much for him...he retreated behind the old lenses that kept everything at a distance...But he could not forget the new view either...he grasped the glasses and adjusted them. He was beginning to like them".
> Pascal Mercier (2008, p. 89): Night Train to Lisbon.

Contemporary organizations (replete with their gendered structures) are still being created, supported and developed in such ways as to determine what (or who) can be seen or not seen. In this paper I present my view, as both researcher and practitioner of a highly visible feminist intervention in a scientific research organisation that enabled male leaders to see for the first time the gendered practices of their densely masculinist workplace. I describe how these leaders learned to look differently, beyond prevailing stereotypes and adjust their collective view by reframing long-held beliefs about the absence of women from the senior levels of their organisation. The feminist participatory action research methodology outlined in this paper was in the first instance designed for a PhD project[2]. Completed over a three-year timeframe, the collaborative project between my university and a policing organisation engaged men and women looking together through a gender lens to conduct a forensic examination of the gendered culture of their workplace. Having successfully completed the research project, I adapted the methodology and applied it to the scientific research organisation. Different location – similarly masculinist workplace.

As Acker (1990:142) asserts, "organizations are imbued with a masculine view of the world, a view that obscures any other": Further, she tells us that "as a relational phenomenon, gender is difficult to see when only the masculine is present". Clare Burton (1991:10) similarly raises the issue of seeing and visibility by questioning why women are *seen* as the problem, rather than their workplace:

> Whenever I am told that women are not putting themselves forward for promotion, and this is usually said as if this fact demonstrates their lack of willingness to take on extra

---

[2] See Harwood (2006)

responsibilities, or career commitments, or that it is something to do with womanhood, I ask, what are the conditions prevailing in the organisation to make this so?

Calling for a different approach to understanding those prevailing conditions, Burton (1991: 23) suggests that a *clearer view* is needed of how gender works within organisations as a "central structuring principle". Such an understanding is critical, Burton argues, if we are to gain a greater insight into the gendered nature of how tasks and roles are allocated.

Almost two decades after Burton the prevailing view (with only a few notable exceptions) is still one of a *masculinist* leadership model. This lack of change to the status quo was demonstrated in a 2010 conference presentation by David Knights whose research supports the view that there is "institutionalised masculinity". Further, Knights and Tullberg (2010) suggest that "to be a senior manager involves conquest, competition and control" and that women in organisations are often viewed as failing these "3c's" and are therefore not seen as worthy of a place at the leadership table. All-male interview panels often fail to see the other [noteworthy] achievements of women applicants[3]. At the same conference Buckley, Linehan and Koslowski (2010)[4] suggest that "there is still a strong discourse around the concept of merit"; that "there is a framing of unequal outcomes as 'choice' rather than systemic discrimination"; and that these "unequal outcomes" are seen as "a feminine lack in relation to male norms".

In this paper I present a case study on a scientific research organisation where an "excess of men"[5] is the norm and where women are largely rendered invisible as they conduct their work out of sight, out of mind – or, whose exit from their organisation is barely noticed. I describe how the application of a "gender lens" to the gendered practices within this *densely masculinist*[6] workplace provides a clearer view, exposing

---

[3] David Knights and Tullberg (2010): "Managing masculinity, mismanaging the corporation". Unpublished paper delivered at EGOS Conference, Lisbon, Portugal July 2010.

[4] Joan Buckley, Carol Linehan and Nora Koslowski (2010) "The Lady Still Vanishes". Unpublished paper delivered at EGOS Conference, Lisbon Portugal July 2010.

[5] Amanda Sinclair (2005) coined this term and used it in her presentation to a *Women Leading Change* trainers' course, Airlie Leadership Development Centre, Victoria Police, Melbourne, February 2005.

[6] Researcher Sue Lewis coined this term to describe those workplaces –such as policing, defence, fire and emergency services - where the gender ratio is so skewed towards men as to create a densely masculine demographic profile.

the differential impact of certain policies and processes on the profile, progress and place of women workers. Further, I show how such a feminist project methodology can provide men with a rare opportunity to engage in a dialogue about the gendered practices of their workplace.

In analyzing some of the project outcomes I focus on the ways in which the men and women who engaged in this dialogue began to develop a better understanding about the practices and processes that undermined the role and place of women in their authoritarian, densely masculinist workplace. To this end, I use some of the data gathered to highlight where and how we included some bold and highly *visible* 'critical acts' (Dahlerup, 1988) to bring these issues into sharper focus.

Through my formal facilitation role in this project I could also position myself as feminist ethnographer: I was able to see and map, watch and document. This positioning enabled me to see how the data gathering process engendered some resistance plays. As a consultant contracted to undertake this work I was able to share new ways of seeing as I described what lay beneath the metaphorical practices of this workplace.

The Research Site

I was contacted within the context of my consultancy work as a gender equity strategist by a colleague who also knew about my research work. She expressed grave concerns for her workplace, which was one of several Divisions within a publicly funded government scientific research organisation. In this organisation (hereafter referred to as the Division) women were all but absent from the executive team and the numbers of women research scientists who had achieved the status of 'senior scientist' had suffered a significant decline. My colleague was aware that the Division needed to do something different than what had been attempted previously – that is, there was a need to drill down into the organisation to examine those practices that appeared to advantage men and disadvantage women. There was an all-male senior executive team and at the next level down, just two "senior" women. There were multiple sites across the nation, resulting in considerable travel for executives to attend their regular meetings.

An internal audit conducted by a reference group six years previously had recommended some changes to existing practices to attract and retain more women. There was no measurable evidence that any positive changes resulted from this intervention. Further, while there was a belief that "a number" of senior women research scientists had left this Division in the intervening period, there was no data on the actual number of senior women scientists who had left over the previous six years.

The methodological framework

As indicated earlier, I based my methodological framework on one I had developed and successfully implemented for my doctoral research project within a policing organisation. For the policing project my methodological framework comprised a complex interplay between four qualitative models: participatory action research, Quality Management, a gender lens interventionist approach and feminist ethnography. That combination of feminist goals and action research techniques drew men and women into insider teams for the purpose of conducting a thorough, forensic examination of the gendered organization of their policing organisation. The goal was to develop recommendations for change, linked to a framework for successful implementation.

What I knew from my research project in policing was that working collaboratively with people inside organisations, facilitating dialogue about their experiences of their gendered workplaces, and enabling these insiders to define the problem and work on solutions is far more promising than conducting another review as an outsider. As part of the research methodology I engaged these insider teams in policing in a number of critical acts. The feminist intent of my research approach was to test and reframe current perceptions about the contributing causes of sexual harassment, discrimination and women's absence from positions of power. In Amanda Sinclair's (1998: 19) terms this means enabling both men and women to see from a different viewpoint, moving from the familiar position of seeing women as "the problem", and needing to change, to one where the problem is seen as belonging to the organisation (the organisation needs to change). Some of the middle to senior ranking men at the policing organisation were more than willing to participate in a research methodology that enabled them to redefine the ways in which they engage with women and men in their workplace and embraced

the gender lens approach as a means of gaining a new perspective. This approach had been finely honed by researchers affiliated with the Center for Gender in Organisations.

The CGO researchers developed their "gender lens" approach based on the notion of the "gendered organisation" formulated by Joan Acker (1990). Kolb and Meyerson, (1999: 129) suggest that this approach offers a tool for fleshing out "masculine definitions" and the "gendering" of job descriptions that work against women (Kolb and Meyerson, 1999: 141). People within the organisation have the opportunity to develop collaborative groupings to closely examine their own organisational processes and work out how they are gendered.

While I was aware that the project at the scientific research organisation would be of much shorter duration (six weeks) than the PhD project at policing (three years) I was nonetheless confident that I could adapt and modify the methodological framework and the tools to this new site.

Adapting the methodology to the scientific research organisation

After some delays, a framework was developed and agreed, a contract settled and I was invited to meet with the chief executive in his national office to discuss his concerns about the absence of women and to begin what I had named as a "gender equity audit". I briefed the CEO on the "gender lens" approach, explaining to him that I already knew from my previous research experience in a highly masculinist workplace that it was imperative to engage men – particularly senior men – in this investigative process if we were to have any prospect of ownership of outcomes and any change in the current status quo. The CEO stated that he was very keen to adopt a new approach as there needed to be measurable outcomes from this intervention. He readily agreed to my suggested framework. I would conduct separate interviews with each member of senior executive, and engage men and women across the organisation in focus groups; I would also undertake separate, structured interviews with a large representative sample of men and women research scientists [and others]. Later, when increasing numbers of people expressed interest in being interviewed, the CEO agreed to my developing an on-line survey for use across the multiple work sites.

Prior to commencing the surveys and interview process, I examined existing documentation, including the report on the previous internal audit, and a more recent series of discussion points that were raised through the CEO's blog. From this data I developed two questionnaires – one for men, one for women – to use as prompts during the interview and focus group data gathering process. Site visits were undertaken in three capital city locations, where I collected qualitative data through a series of interviews, focus groups, and phone discussions. One-on-one interviews were conducted with approximately 23 people, each interview comprising 1-1.5 hours' duration. The majority of men interviewed were at executive and senior management levels, and this group also included the Chief Executive and his Deputy.

Six focus groups were conducted: two in each of three state capitals comprising a total of approximately 40 people. Telephone interviews were conducted with both former and current staff, including staff at two regional locations. To encourage greater participation from these locations in particular, the customized on-line version of the survey was sent out to those people who had missed out on the opportunity to participate in focus groups and interviews. Forty-eight women responded to the on-line survey; overall, the results of the survey supported the findings of the interview process. Interviews were also conducted with women who had left the organisation over the previous three years; these included women who at the time of interview held senior management positions elsewhere, some senior women within the wider organisation but outside this Division, as well as women who had been at a relatively senior level prior to leaving the Division.

I encountered some initial reticence amongst women to engage in the focus groups and separate interviews. I was told by other women who did participate that some of their female colleagues were anxious about exposing the true state of their working lives; that it would be too confronting for some, who would rather believe that "one day" their turn [for promotion and recognition] "would come". Some of the more confident women who attended the initial focus groups were in effect an advance party, checking on the credibility of the researcher, the process, the proposed outcomes and the veracity of the CEO's support for this intervention. Once assured that my report would be presented, by me, to the senior executive, these front-runners enlisted other women to attend further focus groups and/or to participate in the on-line survey. It became evident that women needed to feel "safe" before they could expose what they considered to be

discriminatory practices. Some expressed great fears about confidentiality, saying that if their comments were attributed to them that their careers could suffer a detriment. Those men who spoke up in mixed focus groups, and those interviewed separately did not express these same fears to the researcher.

Having completed the data gathering and collated and analysed the results I turned my attention to planning a very strategic approach to the presentation of what I knew to be contentious and challenging findings.

A critical act: the presentation

As I had done at the conclusion of my policing project, I deliberately subverted the normative practice of presenting a report on my findings *prior* to the delivery of my presentation. I met only with the CEO before the official presentation, to brief him on the key findings and to present him with a copy of the report. Then, at the appointed hour I was invited into a large, executive conference room, where the Executive team members sat around a "u"-shaped conference table, each person busily working away on their respective laptops. I was able to arrest their attention immediately when I told those present [some 23 men and two 'stand-in' women] that they could not have a copy of the report until the end of the presentation – and, I would first of all be subjecting everyone to a short "test" (including the CEO).

I distributed individual forms and asked each person to complete the test without consulting anyone else. I told them that there was only one correct answer to each question. They needed to read each of 20 statements on the sheet, one-by-one, then make a decision for each statement as to whether it was more likely to have been made by a woman or a man.

The "test" was unexpected, aroused some derisive comments and proved to be something of a challenge for some. As this group was completing the questionnaire, I walked around the room and checked some of the responses. I looked at the responses completed by their CEO and stated in a loud voice – "no, this one is not correct" and did the same with several others in the room. The two women in the room smiled at me, knowingly. They had got it. I then asked participants to turn to the person on their right

and share their responses with them. This instruction produced a flurry of exchanges between everyone in the room, as some participants' answers were clearly at odds with those of their partners in this activity. After allowing sufficient time for discussion I asked if anyone would like to volunteer their answers. One man, considerably younger than his colleagues (and by all accounts highly regarded for his intellect) responded by saying that he had worked out that there was a "trick" in this test – and that "probably" the statements had all been made by one gender. He asserted that it was most likely that women had made these statements, not a mix of men and women.

He was half right. All of the statements had been made by one gender – in response to a question put to them about what it is like to work in an organisation where there is an "excess of men". I had collated these responses from my individual interviews with members of the all-male Executive Team – and now I was giving them back their collective responses. And it was immediately evident that most had no idea that other men felt the same way as they did about working in this highly masculinist workplace.

Many of those present in the room expressed surprise to hear that these responses were all from men; and indeed, some found it somewhat of a challenge to conceive that their male colleagues would make statements that on the surface appeared to have been made by women. How could this be? Why would men be saying things about the lack of women that sounded like the kind of statements that women would make?

Having successfully arrested the attention of this group from the outset, I could now deliver the findings from the gender equity audit. I began my presentation by praising the Division for taking the lead in this difficult arena – for having the courage to closely examine the gendered practices of this workplace and for being prepared to listen to the feedback from employees at all levels of the organisation.

> Through this Audit, the Division has provided a clear signal to women in the organisation that senior managers recognise their concerns…the wide range of people who have contributed to the Audit data-gathering process have named and discussed possible changes needed to redress those organisational policies, practices and behaviours that have a differential impact on women and men in this Division.

The Findings

In the article *Men, Women, Ghosts and Science*, Peter Lawrence (2006) refers to the not uncommon practice of women's contribution to their team's output not being acknowledged. Lawrence uses the phrase "*annexation of credit from others*" (2006:0014) to refer to the more overt and discriminatory practice of removing women's ownership from their research. According to my interviewees, this practice occurs to (lower ranking) men as well as women, and was apparently occurring within this Division of their organisation at this time. However, one of the key findings from my analysis of the data was the historical impact of this practice on women's careers over a sustained period of time.

The covert practice uncovered through the audit – of women's work being claimed by others (including their male supervisors) - reduced the capacity of women in this Division to be appropriately acknowledged and rewarded for their efforts. Because this was reported by a number of women, from various locations and at various stages of their careers, I was able to appropriately describe this unofficial but apparently entrenched practice as being an example of *systemic discrimination*. Several women reported that supervisors or others have "passed off" their work as their own; a significant number of other interviewees reported that after completing the majority of the work it is not unusual for them to discover that their names have been relegated to third or fourth author status. In one example provided at interview, a woman who had completed 80% of the work discovered upon publication of the final report on her project that she had been relegated to third author status.

Some women reported that such "passing off" has happened consistently to them over a significant period of time; given the cultural emphasis on the numbers of papers published as a measure of performance, this practice had serious repercussions for those women whose performance is seen as lacking when compared with men they are competing with for promotion, and/or when going for tenure.

In relation to the more senior levels of women, some of the data provided to me by human resources officers indicated that a total of eight (8) women research scientists had left the Division over the previous six years. These figures on the attrition of mid to

senior level women research scientists should not be analysed in the context of an overall attrition rate for the Division, but rather, comparative to and within the context of the small numbers of women research scientists. Importantly, prior to my seeking out this information it had not been known in the organisation exactly how many of the senior women had departed.

The detrimental impact of workplace bullying was outlined in a significant number of survey and interview responses by both women as well as some of the men. The range of responses on this topic suggested that in some locations, workplace bullying had become an "acceptable" means for managing people's performance. Some examples provided were as follows:

"[There is] bullying, intimidation in public forums";
"[The senior executive group has] a pack mentality – [they] tear strips off people";
"[They act like] gladiators in the ring";
"Cyber-bullying: "shouting" by email";
"[They engage in] Combative behaviours – women will not engage";
"Body language used is the language of bullying".

The impact of informal mentoring and sponsorship was also highlighted by respondents; examples were provided of how mainly men, and very few women, get "tapped on the shoulder" for leadership roles [such as leading a project] at post-doctoral level. There appeared to be a lack of transparency about this process, with examples provided of how some men appear to be nurtured into these roles, and strategically positioned for them. One woman commented that "the "done deal" is done a lot. She suggested that the key projects "are mainly about who is already working on them…people are tapped on the shoulder…there is very active promotion of men in the team".

Women described the lack of equality in access to the meetings that matter, citing these meetings as being the forums where aspirational junior staff could make an impression on the senior decision-makers. While women interviewees stated that they aspired to leadership roles, they felt that they were unable to compete on the same basis as men if they did not have the same access to those forums where topical and strategic issues are discussed. As one woman suggested, this lack of engagement meant that people lower down, and particularly women, do not get exposed to the "tricks in the trade".

Women reported that even when women are physically present at decision-making meetings they feel excluded: by the dominating meeting behaviours of their male colleagues, by the language and code in use and by not being allowed to put their point of view across. One woman stated in this regard that she didn't ever "get the culture" in the room: "I'm the odd one out anyway…the temperature in the room is often cold…it is a foreign territory". Reflecting on her experiences in mixed meetings another woman stated that she hardly ever got to finish a sentence in meeting. This woman spoke about the off-putting and embarrassing behaviours of her male colleagues in meetings: "I have seen really poor behaviours among men in meetings… attacking each other, undermining each other in front of the whole room. It's really embarrassing".

Another woman interviewee outlined how the masculinist culture prevails outside of the organisation when she has had to accompany male colleagues to social events with [male] clients:

> "We have dinners with clients but I feel uncomfortable the whole time. I am usually the only woman. The men drink and talk about footy. It is how people rate you – they ignore you the next time they want to engage with a client. I need to make more noise…I do a lot of the research but the client would not know that".

Overall my analysis of the data from the interviews demonstrated that women in this organisation were expected to conform and comply. That it is women who are expected to change, to accommodate to the prevailing masculinist culture. As Sinclair (1998) suggests, the lack of women within executive levels of organisations leads to misconceptions about and constraints on how women conduct themselves. Those who do engage in more masculinist behaviours find that they still do not "fit", and are more often described by both men and women as "aggressive" if they breach accepted practices of femininity. One woman commented thus: "women engage in accommodating behaviours but are still not members of the [boys'] club." Another referred to the importance (and the difficulties for women) of being visible in this organisation: "The criteria are fairly limited. Opportunities are guided by visibility – how visibility is measured – rather than seeking out the qualities of people. Women don't like to self-promote or push themselves forward". This woman interviewee speaks of the

frustration of apparently being the wrong gender when she had something to contribute that she considered to be of value:

> "I have recently offered advice that went unheard. This proved in hindsight to be excellent advice. I believe that if I was a male this advice would have been more fully considered at the time"

From their own accounts women in the scientific research organisation were used to engaging in resistance plays to avoid the behaviours of their male colleagues. Some of this was passive resistance, while for others it meant resisting the temptation to become one of the men. The latter women indicated that they resisted the temptation to apply for promotion on the grounds that they did not want to become one of a group of immature people who engage in "chest-beating" and mutual "back-slapping" behaviours. These were just a few acts of resistance reported; time did not allow for the kind of deep analysis of resistance plays that Wodak refers to:

> Foucault (1980), Hooks (1990) and others have suggested that to truly do liberating research we should study acts of resistance rather than acts of power. Feminists have long understood this concept (Wodak, 1997: 49).

Both men and women commented on the apparent focus on age in the Division. Women who are either younger, or older, have two counts against them: age and gender. As one interviewee asserts, older men can see younger women as being both a threat and not up to the job:

> "Some men, especially the older ones, do not see women as equal partners in science. They are considered as less able to do the job. It seems that men think it is a bad reflection on them if a woman is in a position of leadership"

The wide use of the term "boys' club" (by both men and women) in survey responses signals an awareness that age and gender are relative – the diminutive "boys" generally perceived in this organisation as a positive for men, while "girls" is a term used to denote women's lack of maturity. Women who responded to the on-line survey wrote lengthy, reflective responses to questions about whether they had applied for promotion, and if

not, what had stopped them. There were a range of interesting answers that generally challenged the prevailing perceptions that women were just not ambitious, did not have what it takes to be top scientists. Significantly, many of these women commented on their exclusion from, or indeed their avoidance of "the boy's club":

> "The few times I have considered further study to try and climb the science ladder I quickly remind myself that I couldn't be bothered with blokey crap. The boys' clubs and the slaps on the back, and the ego competitions".

> "I think there are women who don't want to go through the process of trying to get into the boys' club and figure it is easier to move out of the organisation… why would I want to stay if all I hear are the horror stories of women who have tried and have been pushed out?"

> "Smart women go elsewhere. It would be hard to push through the boys' club atmosphere here".

Learning from the gender dialogue

The methodological framework and specifically the gender lens approach, created the space for an individualised gender dialogue that until this point at least had not ever been possible in this organisation. It was evident from their responses that some men in the senior executive group had observed their colleagues engaging in practices that were discriminatory. Further, individual men had been prepared to say a lot more in one-on-one meetings with the researcher about how they separately felt about the discriminatory practices for which they were collectively responsible. In their separate interviews many of the senior men used visual terms to describe what it was like to be a member of an all-male executive. The following responses appeared and on the "test" sheet and each are examples of statements provided by men when the researcher engaged them in a dialogue during the interviews, asking each person to describe what it was like to work amongst an "excess of men" in the executive group:

"We are blind men sitting around trying to discuss colour";

"There is a lack of perspective at executive level…when you look you can see that women are missing all the way down into the organisation";

"It's a poor environment for women";
"If women don't see other women ahead of them they are not represented";

"It's a very combative culture";

"Look at the behaviours that get rewarded: highly personally driven; selfish; self-promoting; [men] can sell themselves".

It was clear from these gender dialogues that the *mental models* in this organisation reflect what Kolb and Merrill-Sands (1999) found at their agricultural research site: "Masculine experience, masculine values and masculine life situations" that sustain "cultural assumptions about decision- making and reward systems". The difference here is that the men in this scientific research organisation felt safe enough within the context of a one-on-one interview to recognise their own mental models and to name them. Later, when I collated and produced this information in a format that showed the collective knowledge of this group, it was both powerful and empowering. Now we could move forward as one, without having to further debate the issue of whether or not there were discriminatory practices in this organisation. There had been collective ownership of the outcomes and there was a substantial set of comprehensive data from all of the interviews, focus groups and the on-line survey to underpin the recommended actions.

Impact of the methodology on the ownership of outcomes

In summary, there were a number of critical ways in which the methodological framework impacted on the capacity of the organisation to see with new eyes, to have sufficient clarity to accept the findings. The presentation was of itself a critical act: I had to ensure that the findings were simultaneously made visible to all senior managers. A further critical act was to have a strategy in place to ensure that the executive group would take responsibility and ownership for implementing the recommended actions. Prior to the presentation I had worked with several of the more senior women and some of the men to identify possible champions to take on the role of implementation. The names of these champions appeared on the overhead slides next to the list of

recommendations and senior managers had each been allocated to one key recommendation. This highly visible critical act helped to "lock in" those who would now sponsor (and then report progress on) the implementation process.

This senior executive group was comprised largely of research scientists; therefore, it was crucial that the report and the presentation "spoke" to their knowledge and framework. Accordingly, the report and the presentation on the outcomes from the gender equity audit included both quantitative as well as qualitative data. I was also careful to reframe the language of discrimination and sexist behaviour into "unlawful practices", using examples from the data to show where and how "gender blindness" led to scientific fraud. I ensured that the organisation understood the importance of shifting the blame from "the problem is women" (Sinclair 1998) to "the problem is the culture of the organisation". Then, I provided an implementation model with appropriate measures.

Conclusion

When I first began the gender equity audit there were many women (and some men) in this Division who were rightly cynical about any prospect of change from this intervention. I could only attempt to allay their fears by quoting the outcomes from my doctoral project, which had specifically engaged men with women to examine the gendered practices of their workplace. I had a wealth of data from that project demonstrating that this key objective had been realized; that men had a new understanding and commitment to changing the gendered practices of their masculinist culture. Edley and Wetherall (1996) suggest that while it may be unusual for men to join with women on a project of this kind, such collaboration should not be seen as necessarily problematic. Indeed, their research on masculinities suggests that assumptions should not be made in this regard:

> But while we must recognize that patriarchy naturalizes men's power and privilege (especially) in the eyes of men themselves, it is wrong to assume that they are incapable of changing the culture that defines them (Edley and Wetherall, 1996: 108).

The interviews I had conducted with the all-male senior management team at the policing organisation had already demonstrated to me that most welcomed the

opportunity to discuss gender issues. However, in the first instance many of this group indicated that they had neither the language nor the experiences to describe or understand the gendered practices of their workplace. Thomas and Davies (2002: 181) suggest there is a need to understand "the many and complex ways" in which individuals respond to the dominant discourse in the organisation. Further, while Hearn and Parkin (2001) examine gendered processes in organizations through the lens of violence and violations, they suggest

> 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 (Hearn and Parkin, 2001: 10).

There is still a lot more that could be said and done about changing the cultures of organisations to provide an equal space and place for both men and women. What I have learned from working with the highly masculinist organisations of policing and scientific research is that in order to bring about change, there must be a new way of seeing. To be able to see differently men and women must be prepared to engage in a gender dialogue that focuses on the prevailing practices in their organisation. Like Gregorius (Pascal Mercier's protagonist) in *Night Train to Lisbon* there must also be a preparedness to look through the new lens to see a different view. Once seen, the new view is hard to forget, even when the lens is adjusted back from time to time to a more comfortable vision.

References

Acker, J. (1990) Hierarchy, Jobs, Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organizations. *Gender and Society,* 4*,* 139-158.

Buckley, J Linehan, C and Koslowski, N (2010) "The Lady Still Vanishes". Unpublished paper, EGOS Conference, Lisbon Portugal July 2010.

Burton, C. (1991) *The Promise and the Price. The struggle for equal opportunity in women's employment,* Sydney, Allen and Unwin.

Dahlerup, D. (1988) From a Small to a Large Minority: Women in Scandinavian Politics. *Scandinavian Political Studies,* 11*,* 275-298.

Edley, N. & Wetherell, M. (1996) Masculinity, power and identity. In Mac an Ghaill, M. (Ed.) *Understanding Masculinities. Social Relations and Cultural Arenas.* Buckingham, Philadelphia, Open University Press.

Harwood, S (2006) Gendering Change: An immodest manifesto for intervening in masculinist organisations. *Doctoral Thesis.* Available on line through the University of Western Australia.

Hearn, J. & Parkin, W. (Eds.)(2001) *Gender, Sexuality and Violence in Organizations. The Unspoken Forces of Organization Violations*, London, Sage.

Knights, D and Tullberg (2010): "Managing masculinity, mismanaging the corporation". Unpublished paper EGOS Conference, Lisbon, Portugal July 2010.

Kolb, D. M. & Merrill-Sands, D. (1999) Waiting for Outcomes: anchoring a dual agenda for change to cultural assumptions. *Women in Management Review,* 14*,* 194-202.

Kolb, D. M. & Meyerson, D. (1999) Keeping Gender in the Plot: A Case Study of the Body Shop, in Rao, A., Stuart, R. & Kelleher, D. (Eds.) *Gender at Work. Organizational Change for Equality.* West Hartford, Connecticut, Kumarian Press.

Lawrence, P (2006) Men, Women and Ghosts in Science, PLoS Biology, January 2006 Volume 4 Issue 1 e19, pp. 00130015.

Mercier, Pascal (2008) *Night Train to Lisbon*; translated from the German by Barbara Jarshav. Atlantic Books, London.

Sinclair, A. (1998) *Doing Leadership Differently. Gender, Power and Sexuality in a Changing Business Culture,* Melbourne, Melbourne University Press.

Thomas, R. & Davies, A. (2002) Restructuring the "old bill": policing identities and commitment. *Women in Management Review,* 17**,** 180-189.

Wodak, R. (Ed.) (1997) *Gender and Discourse,* London, Sage Publications.