An Investigation of Silence and A Scrutiny of Transparency: Re-Examining Gender in Organization Literature through the Concepts of Voice and Visibility

Ruth Simpson
Brunel Business School
R.Simpson@brunel.ac.uk

Patricia Lewis
University of kent
P.M.J.Lewis@kent.ac.uk

Abstract

This paper presents a review of the literature on gender and organizations through the twin concepts of 'voice' and 'visibility'. In gender studies, as in other areas, the concepts have been used at different levels of abstraction to analyse inequality and exclusion. However, we argue that their potential richness has not been fully exploited and we accordingly produce a 'framework' which is based on 'surface' and 'deep' conceptualisations. These conform broadly to liberal feminist and post-structuralist interpretations respectively. With 'voice', we therefore distinguish between the 'surface' act of speaking/being heard as discussed within 'women's voice' literature and, at a deeper level, the power of silence as discursive practices eliminate certain issues from arenas of speech and sound. Similarly, we can see visibility as a 'surface' state of exclusion and difference while, at a deeper level, conceptualisations can usefully explore the power of 'invisibility' and the battle for the (male) norm. Through the concepts of voice and visibility, and through exploring commonalities and tensions between and within the two conceptual levels, we throw new light on the increasingly diverse field of gender and organizational studies.

Key words: gender, visibility, voice, silence, transparency

Introduction

This article presents a different perspective on gender and organizations by drawing on two interrelated concepts of voice and visibility and by examining their respective 'absences' (silence and transparency) in terms of how they contribute to an understanding of gendered processes at work. The concepts of voice and visibility have been used in diverse ways in the gender/organization literature and are potentially rich in analytical content. While illuminating in the specific contexts in which they have been applied, we argue that their richness has not been fully exploited and that the rather 'haphazard' way in which they have been utilised means they lack strength as more general organizing principles. By exploring gender in organizations through these twin concepts and by using voice and visibility at different levels of abstraction, we create a framework which is based on a distinction between 'surface' and 'deep' conceptualisations. These we locate within liberal feminist and post-structuralist perspectives respectively. Accordingly, we suggest a distinction be drawn between 'surface states' of absence and neglect which underpin much of 'women's voice' literature, itself a product of the liberal feminist desire to address that gap by acknowledging women's voices and experiences, and the 'deep processes' of silencing that occur, from a post-structuralist perspective,

around different discursive regimes. Equally, we argue for a differentiation between 'surface states' of exclusion and difference that run through much of the broadly liberal feminist work on visibility associated with 'token' status and deep processes, described by many post-modern and post-structural theorists, of maintaining power through the dynamic relationship between invisibility and the norm. In applying these distinctions, we throw new light on the growing and increasingly diverse field of gender and organization studies (GOS) - a field which has, in turn, grown out of a desire to acknowledge and redress the absence and silence of women in the development and content of organizational theory (Mills, 2002; Alvesson & Due Billing, 1992; Wilson, 1996; Martin & Collinson, 2002). Our paper is organised as follows. After an examination of the ways in which voice and visibility have been used in the social sciences, we focus more specifically on their usage, together with the concepts of silence and transparency, within GOS. In so doing, we make the distinction between 'surface' and 'deep' conceptualisations of voice and visibility, described briefly above, and present our analysis of work within each area. This we summarise in our framework. We then explore possible connections and tensions within and between the two conceptual levels and suggest that it is in these interfaces that potentially rich understandings of gender processes in organizations can be developed. We conclude by drawing attention to the usefulness of the framework in furthering our understanding of the gendering of organizations and the theoretical development of the field as well as its value as a foundation for further theoretical and empirical work.

'Voice' and 'Visibility' in the Social Sciences

The concepts of voice and visibility have been widely used in the social sciences. Sociology and gender studies have drawn on the concept of visibility to explore the absence of women from certain organizational contexts and from organizational theorising. Seminal work by Kanter (1977), for example, has highlighted the problems for 'token' women arising from their visibility as members of a minority group while writers such as Hearn (1994), Morgan (1992) and Gherardi (1995) have challenged the gender neutral stance of early work in organization studies which rendered gender differences invisible. In psychology, Gilligan (1982; 1993) and Belenky et al (1997) use women's voices as well as the concept of 'voice' to challenge current psychological theories of human (i.e. male) development and to include women's stories and experiences while, in a different vein, politics has made use of 'voice' to analyse complaints processes. Hirschman (1970), for example, applies the concept to describe how, in a political or market context, citizens and consumers articulate their critical opinions. In organization studies, other work has adopted a similar conceptualisation of 'employee voice' as an act of complaint, in reaction, for example, to perceived injustices in the employment relationship (e.g. Turnley & Feldman, 1999), or as 'speaking out' on issues of concern (e.g. Pinder & Harlos, 2001; Bowen and Blackmon, 2003; Edmonson, 2003; Milliken, Morrison & Hewlin, 2003).

Drawing on some of the above work, voice and visibility have been used in GOS to analyse inequality and exclusion. It is in reviewing and revisiting this work that we apply 'surface' and 'deep' conceptualisations. We can accordingly distinguish between voice as

the 'surface' act of speaking and being heard, as discussed by the broadly liberal feminist 'women's voice' perspective (e.g. Rosener, 1990; Ferrario, 1991; Gilligan, 1982; Tannen, 1991; Belenky et al, 1997) and the processes that lie behind silence as, from a post-structuralist standpoint, discursive practices eliminate certain issues from arenas of speech and sound. Similarly, looking at the concept of visibility, and at a 'surface' level, liberal feminists have focussed on problems which relate to numerical imbalance and the visibility of the 'token' worker (e.g. Kanter, 1977; Ely, 1994; Simpson, 1997; 2000) while, at a deeper level and with strong post-structuralist associations, conceptualisations can usefully explore the power of 'invisibility' that accompanies the norm. In this respect, as Collinson and Hearn (1994) suggest, men's universal status and their occupancy of the normative standard state has rendered them invisible as objects of analysis, interrogation or academic theorising. On this basis, invisibility can be seen as a condition of male dominance and, as Robinson (2000) argues, masculinity can be seen to have retained its power as a signifier and as a social practice because of its transparency and invisibility. These different conceptualisations of voice and visibility are explored in more detail below.

A Surface Conceptualisation: Women's Voice Literature

A surface conceptualisation of voice seeks to explore the different states of absences and neglect that accompany certain groups. Women's voice literature, for example, developed to highlight the absence and neglect of women from organizational and social theorising and to include their experiences and values. As Mills (2002) suggests, by foregrounding issues such as productivity, efficiency and growth, organizations have been conceived primarily as arenas for masculine endeavour. This has created a silence over issues of

gender (Martin & Collinson, 2002; Calas & Smircich, 1992) so that women's voices have gone unheard. In an attempt to 'speak out' for women, the women's voice perspective (e.g. Rosener, 1990; Ferrario, 1991; Gilligan, 1982; Tannen, 1991; Belenky et al, 1997) has sought to show that women manage, speak, learn or negotiate in a different (but not inferior) way and that they encounter different problems from men.

Rosener (1990), for example, has focused on the different ways in which men and women approach leadership. Women are seen to adopt a 'transformational' style, based on enabling and empowering, while men prefer a 'transactional' approach which associates leadership with direction and control. Similarly, women in management (WIM) literature has placed women at the centre of analysis and examined the difficulties they face in organizations from work/family conflict and caring responsibilities (e.g. Davidson & Cooper, 1992), from 'old boy's' networks (e.g. Coe, 1992; Ibarra, 1993) and from work orientations that are different from men's (e.g. Nicholson & West, 1988; Sturges, 1999). From a psychological perspective, Gilligan (1982) has addressed the repeated exclusion of women from the critical theory building and explored implications of this silence for models of adult development:

> *"We have listened for centuries to the voices of men and the theories of*
>
> *development that their experiences informs, so we have come more recently to*
>
> *notice not only the silence of women but the difficulty of hearing what they say*
>
> *when they speak… The failure to see the different reality of women's lives and to*
>
> *hear the difference in their voices stems in part from the assumption that there is*
>
> *a single mode of social expression and interpretation"* (Gilligan, 1982: 173)

Gilligan argues that while men describe themselves using adjectives of separation (e.g. independent, logical, self reliant), women define themselves in the context of relationships and judge themselves by standards of duty and care. Relying on men's voices alone has therefore produced a 'distorted' account of human development, which Gilligan seeks to redress by listening to women's accounts of their personal journeys.

While women may be encouraged to voice their differences, their experiences and their opinions, they often encounter difficulties being heard. Belenky et al (1997) point to the problems women and girls face in asserting their authority and in expressing themselves in public so that others will listen. They suggest that men have greater success than women in getting and holding the notice of others for their ideas and opinions and that women often feel unheard even when they feel they have something important to say. This suggests that 'voice' needs to encompass not only the physicality of expression but also the more political process of listening and giving attention.

Women's voice literature therefore acknowledges the 'weak presence' of women in literature and theorising and is based on the premise that conceptions of knowledge and truth that are accepted and articulated today have been shaped by the male dominated majority culture. A masculine bias therefore lies at the heart of most academic disciplines, methodologies and theories. By giving voice to difference, such work expresses the values of the female world and helps to reshape disciplines to include women. From this perspective, as Jansen and Davis (1998) point out, the goal of feminist research is to correct the 'distortions' associated with the female experience and to

challenge hegemonic understandings. Such work accordingly sees 'lack of voice' as a *state of absence and neglect* that can be redressed by 'bringing more voices in the conversation' (Ferguson, 1994). This does not, however, address the *process of silencing* that occurs. These processes, discussed below, operate at a deeper, more fundamental level and help explain why some voices continue to go unheard.

Surface Visibilities and the 'Token' Status

Some overlaps occur in surface conceptualisations of voice and visibility. Both, for example, relate to states of inequality whereby certain groups are not fully accepted or recognised. However, while it may seem logical to associate such exclusion with 'invisibility', to capture the idea of being hidden or pushed from view, the literature has tended to focus on visibility as the defining state. This association has been made on the grounds that to be visible and to 'stand out in the crowd' is to be seen as different and hence to be isolated and marginalised from the dominant group. Work in this area (e.g. Kanter, 1977; Ely, 1994; Heikes, 1992; Simpson, 1997; 2000) views visibility as a numerical (and often burdensome) state whereby individuals are made to embody their difference and to behave in ways that conform to stereotypical roles. Examining the dynamics of asymmetric power relations and the implications of 'token' status for experiences within the organization, Kanter (1977), for example, illustrates how women suffer the burden of representing their category. They are often forced into a few stereotypical roles (seductress, mother, pet, iron maiden) while at the same time experiencing marginalisation and exclusion from the dominant (male) group. Heightened visibility means women can be subject to increased performance pressures while a desire

for invisibility can manifest itself in a fear of success, low risk behaviour and/or avoidance of conflict. Other work (e.g. Simpson, 1997, 2000) suggest in a similar vein that gender imbalance and associated visibility heightens career barriers, limits career progress and helps to create a hostile working environment for the minority (female) group.

On this basis, to be invisible is to have power. This comes from two main sources: power through membership of the dominant group which then determines the group culture and power associated with a 'spectator status' as the numerically dominant group critically assess the behaviour and performance of the minority. Visibility, by contrast, is to be seen as different, to be marginal to the dominant group culture and to be subject to the controlling 'gaze' of the majority. However, while visibility and 'token' status have been found to be detrimental and burdensome for women, research suggests that men in token positions may be able to draw on the privileges of their sex. Men working in female dominated occupations, for example, have been found to benefit from their token status through the assumption of enhanced leadership and other skills and by being associated with a more careerist attitude to work (Heikes, 1992; Floge & Merril, 1986; Williams, 1993). Male nurses often ascend the hierarchy more quickly than female counterparts (Bradley, 1993). They tend to monopolise positions of power and are often rewarded for their difference from women in terms of higher pay and other benefits (Williams, 1993). This difference is often underpinned by a tendency, on the part of men, to distance themselves from the female colleagues and from female associations of the job (Simpson, 2004; Lupton, 2000). Therefore, while outcomes of token status may vary by gender, in

both cases visibility is associated with *difference and with a state of exclusion,* whether through choice (men) or through coercion (women), from the dominant group.

So far we have explored 'surface' conceptualisations of visibility and voice and we have drawn some comparisons between the two. Literature in each area focuses on a state of inequality. However, while 'voice' incorporates neglect and a failure to include female perspectives and experiences, 'visibility' is largely concerned with difference and the consequences for the minority group. One therefore demands that we listen to women and hear their accounts and experiences while the other explores material consequences of numerical disadvantage. Both literatures comes from a liberal feminist perspective which focuses on creating a level playing field for women through equal opportunity initiatives and which sees organizational structures as gender neutral. According to this view, equality initiatives would allow women's voices to be heard and their experiences and needs to be incorporated into the organization. Equally, problems of visibility would dissipate once women were no longer organizational minorities. However, this ignores the pre-structuring of organizations and the gender bias of ideas and practices. As Alvesson and Due Billing (1992) point out, it may not be fruitful to focus on equal opportunities because the institutional arrangements are themselves fundamentally flawed. Similarly, social arrangements and practices of organizations are not gender neutral so it is necessary to look at the gendered connotations of deeper cultural layers (Ferguson, 1984; Mills, 1988). Therefore, while women's voice literature, work on 'token' status and liberal feminist perspectives in general seek to show that women are different from men and have different experiences, they do not question the privileging

and invisibility of the norm against which women are often measured nor the influence of discursive practices which can eliminate issues from speech and sound. This suggests a need to focus on deeper phenomenon than 'surface states' of exclusion, difference or neglect. We now explore some of the processes that lie behind these 'states' and turn to deep conceptualisations of visibility and voice. These conceptualisations are largely associated with post-structuralist interpretations of gender processes.

Deep Conceptualisations of Voice: Silencing through Discourse

Post-structuralists point to the importance of organizational discourse (e.g. signs, labels, expressions, rhetoric) which form our thinking, attitudes and behaviour and which, by creating meanings, constitute the norms of acceptable conduct. It is through discourse that we are persuaded to think and act in a certain way. Consequently, meanings about organizations can be framed by rhetorical strategies such as those relating to efficiency, competitiveness and rationality. These in turn help structure and define organizational and management practices (Maddock, 1999; Fondas, 1997; Leonard, 2002). Kerfoot and Knights (1998), for example, argue that rhetoric and associated discourses of entrepreneurialism and risk taking support a competitive masculinity in management that sustains and reproduces a variety of (controlling, instrumental, goal oriented) behavioural displays. Discursive regimes therefore ascribe meaning to taken for granted concepts such as organization and management (Fondas, 1997) and these meanings can maintain a 'tight control' (Kerfoot & Knights, 1998) over organizational life. In fact, as Foucault (1983) argues, discourses not only invade ways of seeing, thinking and behaving, but also constitute the frameworks and parameters of a person's identity – as the individual

experiences the multiple discourses that consolidate his or her social field (Kerfoot & Knights, 1993).

It follows that to be powerful and privileged, dominant discourses must be able to suppress and silence other, contradictory or competing meanings. Therefore, as Gabriel et al (2000) point out, meanings and assumptions created by a discursive regime are inevitably based on omissions and evasions. By foregrounding and privileging some interpretations, others are silenced as unsuitable or excessive. Privileged ways of talking and being, through linguistic processes such as rhetoric and naming, can consequently form the site of struggle over hegemonic interpretations (Fondas, 1997; Ferguson, 1994). In this way, as Foucault (1976) suggests, silence constitutes discourse and can be an agent of power in its own right. The 'unsaid' can thus be illustrative of power being articulated. As such, discourses can be seen to be heavily gendered (Whitehead, 2001; Kerfoot & Knights, 1998; Gherardi, 1995), as privileged discursive regimes based on hegemonic understandings of masculinity suppress and silence ideologies of femininity. The effect is to marginalise certain areas of concern which, as Mills (2002) suggests, often centre around 'female' areas of emotions, discriminatory practices and self esteem.

For post-structuralists, women accordingly encounter difficulties because organizations are gendered in ways that circumscribe or marginalise feminine discourse in favour of the masculine. Women's voices and issues are silenced because in order to maintain its power as a discursive regime, masculinity must suppress, in the struggle for hegemonic status, other competing meanings and interpretations. Acker (1990), for example,

suggests that there is a silence around sexuality, procreation and emotions because these intrude upon and disrupt the ideal functioning of the organization. Equally, as Martin (1990) points out, there is often a silence around conflict in organizations as dominant ideologies deny the existence of points of view that could be disruptive of existing power relations. This can be seen in the way prevailing normative rules marginalise and suppress sexual harassment as an issue worthy of consideration and debate (Wilson & Thompson, 2001; Collinson & Collinson, 1996). Women's interests therefore often appear as contradictions, disjunctions, disruptions or as silences. By presenting some behaviours as 'natural', or in the case of sexual harassment as 'just a bit of fun' (Collinson & Collinson, 1996), certain conflicts and grievances are prevented from forming or from being heard.

Power relations are therefore based on silences - and discourses can be seen as part of a process that creates and maintains that silence. As Martin (1990) suggests, it is in these 'spaces' that the presence of ideology can be most positively felt and where ideological assumptions particularly sensitive to the suppressed interests of marginalised groups can be uncovered. By adopting the deeper conceptualisation of 'voice', which moves away from seeing voice just as a state of absence or neglect, we can explore the processes that serve to maintain silence and the significance of the 'silent space'.

Deep Conceptualisations of (In)visibility: The Transparency of the Norm

As we have seen, discourse influences and shapes behaviour by helping to produce and constitute identities and interests. By setting limits and creating a system of 'exclusion,

interdiction and prohibition' (Gordon, 2002), discourse defines the norms of acceptable behaviour and reasoning. In other words, as Foucault (1976) suggests, discourse constitutes an on-going production of normalcy. Power is therefore invisible by being located within the norm and consent can be seen as being manufactured through the 'intricate controlling mechanisms' that produce the normative state.

Following from Foucault, work on the link between normativity and in(visibility) suggests that men in particular have maintained their position of power partly because they represent the normative standard case. As we have seen, masculinity retains its power because it is opaque to analysis (Collinson & Hearn, 1994). We cannot question or interrogate what is hidden from view. Therefore, while women have been 'hidden from history' (Mills, 2002) and, until recently, from theorising around organizational practices and processes, men have also been invisible. However, the invisibility that men experience signifies not an absence or a 'weak presence' as in the case of women, but a 'strong presence' in that invisibility emanates from the transparency that accompanies the norm. As Kaufman (1994) suggest, men's experiences have been universalised and their subjectivity has been construed as constituting objective knowledge. This has rendered invisible the strong presence and salience of gender and gendered practices in organizations. Consequently, as Collinson and Hearn (1994) point out:

> *"The categories of men and masculinity are frequently central to analysis yet they are taken for granted, hidden and unexamined. Men are both talked about and ignored, rendered simultaneously explicit and implicit. They are frequently at the*

centre of discourse but they are rarely the focus of interrogation" (Collinson &

Hearn, 1994: 4-5)

To occupy the norm is therefore to be invisible and to evade scrutiny and interrogation. As we saw in our earlier discussion of 'surface' conceptualisations of visibility, to be different from the majority is to be visible and categorically defined. Women are therefore defined by their gender and by femininity. By occupying the normative position, men however are not so defined and hence are 'unmarked'. By representing humanity – the unmarked universal state – they evade damaging and confining essentialisation and categorisation. Therefore, while women have embodied gender (in the same way that ethnic minorities have embodied race), white men in particular have enjoyed the privilege of invisibility within an unmarked body – the "bearers of a body-transcendent universal personhood" (Butler, 1999. p.14). The privileging of the white male in organizations can therefore be understood in terms of the transparency associated with a disembodied normativity. As Hassard et el (2000) argue, the organized body is first and foremost the ideal of the male body - disciplined, disengaged from reproduction, emotionally under control, contained, disassociated from itself. Against this standard body, other bodies (female, black) are judged and identified as problematic for organizations. They are consequently 'marked' and made to embody their respective difference from the (white male) norm.

By inhabiting an unmarked body, men are therefore invisible and have power associated with a disembodied normativity (Haraway, 1991). The dominant accordingly have an interest in remaining unmarked and invisible. However, the norm can be contested and a

site for struggle as different groups challenge the dominant position. Accordingly, groups which desire more recognition may articulate their claims and, in order to promote the visibility of social difference, may position themselves against the norm and compete for attention. The rise of feminism and black power in the 1960s, for example, can be seen as an attempt by minority groups to proudly claim their difference and to problematise and scrutinise both whiteness and masculinity as the source of political oppression. In other words, in the same way that masculinity studies (e.g. Hearn, 1994; Connell, 1987; 1995; 2000) has sought to problematise men and masculinity in organizations, so called 'identity politics' is about the 'marking' of the white male, the hitherto bearers of a disembodied and unmarked normativity. As Robinson suggests, while white men have resisted the process of 'marking', they have been partly 'de-centred' (removed from their occupancy of the norm) and this has helped to increase the visibility of both gender and race.

A Framework of Surface and Deep Conceptualisations of Voice and Visibility

We summarise the four conceptualisations of voice and visibility in Figure 1.

Take in Figure 1 here

The above figure summarises the analytical orientations within each conceptual level. With reference to 'voice', we distinguish between (lack of) voice as a state of absence or neglect (surface) and the processes of silencing through the privileging of discursive regimes (deep). Conceptualisations around visibility indicate that, when applied to

women, visibility can be seen as a numerically burdensome and disadvantageous state (surface) associated with the pressures of difference and exclusion. On this basis, invisibility is to be advantaged and part of a dominant group. In a similar vein, the power of invisibility can be explored in the context of processes and struggles around the norm (deep) and the privileges that attend the normative position.

Connections and Paradox

Some connections exist *across* both surface and deep conceptualisations (i.e. looking at horizontal comparisons on the framework). At a surface level, both visibility and voice relate to *states* of inequality associated with absence and neglect (voice) and with exclusion and difference (visibility) with little regard for underlying processes. The focus is largely on women and women's experiences and there are close associations with liberal feminism. However, while women's voice literature has a specific focus on giving voice to difference and to acknowledging women's experiences, literature on visibility is more concerned with the material practices and implications for women as members of a numerically minority group. By the same token, at the deeper conceptual level, there are overlaps between the power of silence within discourse (the unsaid) and the power of invisibility associated with the norm (the unseen). Here, the focus is largely on masculine discourse and on (white) masculinity.

At the same time, there are close associations *between* the two levels of abstraction (i.e. looking at vertical comparisons on the framework). For example, with visibility, in order to understand the material practices associated with numerical imbalance, we need to understand the power of (in)visibility and the significance of its location to the norm – as

well as the conflict and resistance that occurs around the normative state. Equally, looking at voice, to appreciate why women's voices have been neglected or gone unheard we need to understand the power of silence and the role of silence in dominant discursive regimes. Therefore, while separate consideration of surface and deep conceptualisations has some value in contributing to our body of knowledge on gender and organizations, it is in combining the two that more powerful inferences can be made.

The framework can also highlight tensions and paradox. For example, from the above discussion, we can see that it is possible to have a vested interest in being both invisible and visible. As we have seen, invisibility has an alliance with power for some groups through their occupancy of the normative position. Members are consequently 'unmarked' and so fail to attract surveillance and discipline. At the same time, visibility can be associated with power and influence for those who are struggling for recognition and who previously have been hidden from view. Both invisibility and visibility therefore can have positive links with power. This paradox can be explained by the differential location of (in)visibility to the norm. On this basis, the power of invisibility lies in its incorporation with the norm. Outside the norm, however, to be invisible is to lack power so that heightened visibility is required to gain recognition and to challenge the normative state. By positioning (in)visibility in relation to the norm, this 'deep' conceptualisation incorporates an analysis of power with processes that keep certain dominant groups hidden and beyond scrutiny.

Conclusion

This paper has reviewed gender and organization literature through the twin concepts of voice and visibility. In so doing, we have helped to provide a level of coherence to the diverse ways in which the concepts have been used and have thereby strengthened their potential as analytical principles. By drawing attention to 'surface' and 'deep' conceptualisations, located broadly within liberal feminist and post-structuralist perspectives respectively, and by highlighting the complexities of the relationships within and between them, we have contributed to new understandings of the gendering of organizations and the theoretical development of the field. Through our framework, we have uncovered the complex ways in which the concepts have been used, their relationship to each other and have drawn attention to potential contradictions and paradox. It is through exploring these interdependencies and tensions that we can further our understanding of gender processes in organizations. However, more work is required to acknowledge and disentangle possible relationships, which go beyond the boundaries of this paper, both inside and outside these conceptual levels. The multifaceted and frequently paradoxical nature of processes relating to gender and (in)visibility, for example, make it a particularly fruitful focus of future enquiry. Therefore, as well as making an important contribution to our understanding of the significance of 'voice' and 'visibility' in theorising around gender and organizations, this paper has provided useful foundations for future empirical and theoretical work.

References

Acker, J. Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: A theory of gendered organizations, *Gender and Society*, 1990, 4, 2, 139-158

Alvesson, M. & Due Billing, Y. (1992) Gender and organization: Towards a differentiated understanding, *Organization Studies*, 1992, 13,12, 073-102

Belenky, M., Clinchy, B., Goldberger, N. & Tarule, J. *Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice and mind*, Basic Books, 1997

Bowen, F. & Blackmon, K. Spirals of silence: The dynamic effects of diversity on organizational voice, *Journal of Management Studies*, 2003, 40, 6, 1393-1417

Bradley, H. Across the great divide. In C. Williams (Ed) *Doing women's work: Men in non-traditional occupations*, London: Sage, 1993

Butler, J. *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*, London: Routledge, 1999

Calas, M. & Smircich, L. Voicing seduction to silence leadership, *Organization Studies,* 1991, 12,4, 567-601

Coe. T. *The Key to the Men's Club*, Corby: Institute of Management, 1992

Collinson, D. & Hearn, J. Naming men as men: Implications for work, organization and management, *Gender Work and Organization*, 1994, 1,1, 2-22

Collinson, M. & Collinson, D. It's only Dick: the sexual harassment of women managers in insurance sales, *Work, Employment and Society*, 1996,10,1,29-56

Connell, R. *Gender and Power*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 1987

Connell, R. *Masculinities*, University of California Press, 1995

Connell, R. *The Men and the Boys*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 2000

Davidson, M. & Cooper, C. *Shattering the Glass Ceiling*, London: Paul Chapman, 1992

Edmonson, A. Speaking up in the operating room: How team leaders promote learning in interdisciplinary action teams, *Journal of Management Studies*, 2003, 40,6, 1419 - 1452

Ely, R. The social construction of relationships among professional women at work. In M. Davidson & R. Burke (Eds) *Women in Management: Current Research Issues,* London: Paul Chapman, 1994

Ferguson, K. On bringing more theory, more voices and more politics to the study of organizations, *Organization,* 1994, 1, 1, 81-99

Ferguson, K. *The feminist case against bureaucracy*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1984

Ferrario, M. Sex differences in leadership style - myth or reality, *Women in Management Review*, 1991, 6, 3, 16-21

Floge, L. & Merrill, D. Tokenism reconsidered: Male nurses and female physicians in a hospital setting, *Social Forces*, 1986, 64,4, 925-947

Fondas, N. Feminization unveiled: Management qualities in contemporary writings, *Academy of Management Review*, 1997, 22, 1, 257-282

Foucault, M. *Histoire de la sexualite: La volonte de savoir*. Paris, France: Editions Gallimard, 1976

Foucault, M. The subject and power. In M. Dreyfus & P. Rabinow (Eds) *Michel Foucault beyond structuralism and hermeneutic*s. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983

Gabriel, Y., Fineman, S. & Sims, D. *Organizing and Organizations*, London: Sage, 2000

Gherardi, S. *Gender, Symbolism and Organizational Culture*, London: Sage, 1995

Gilligan, C. *In a different voice: psychological theory and women's development,* Harvard University Press, Cambridge MA, 1982

Gordon, N. On visibility and power: An Arendtian corrective of Foucault, *Human Studies*, 2002, 25, 125-145

Haraway, D. Simians, cyborgs and women: The reinvention of nature, New York and London: Routledge, 1991

Hassard, J., Holliday, R. & Willmott, H. *Body and Organization*, London: Sage, 2000

Hearn, J. Changing men and changing management: Social change, social research and social action. In M. Davidson and R. Burke (Eds) *Women in Management: Current Research Issues, London*: Paul Chapman, 1994

Heikes, J. When men are in the minority: the case of men in nursing. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 1992, 32,3, 389-401

Hirschman. A. *Exit, voice and loyalty: Responses to decline in firms, organizations and the state*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1970

Ibarra, H. Personal Networks of Women and Minorities in Management: A Conceptual Framework, *Academy of Management Review*, 1993, 18, 1, 56-87.

Jansen, G. & Davis, D. Honouring voice and visibility: sensitive topic research and feminist interpretive enquiry, *Affilia Journal of Women and Social Work*, 1998, 13, 3, 289 – 301

Kanter, R. *Men and women of the corporation*, New York: Basic Books, 1977

Kaufman, M. Men, feminism and men's contradictory experiences of power. In H. Brod & M. Kaufman (Eds) *Theorizing Masculinities*, London: Sage, 1994

Kerfoot, D. & Knights, D. Management masculinity and manipulation: From paternalism to corporate strategy in financial services in Britain, *Journal of Management Studies*, 1993, 30,4, 659-77

Kerfoot, D. & Knights, D. Managing Masculinity in Contemporary Organizational Life: A Managerial project, Organization, 1998, 5, 1, 7-26

Leonard, P. Organizing gender? Looking at metaphors as frames of meaning in gender/organization texts, *Gender Work and Organization*, 2002, 9, 1, 60-80

Lupton, B. Maintaining masculinity: Men who do women's work. *British Journal of Management*, 2002, 11, S33-48

Maddock, S. *Challenging women: Gender culture and organization*, London: Sage, 1999

Martin, P. & Collinson, D. Over the pond and across the water: Developing the field of gendered organizations. *Gender Work and Organization*, 2002, 9, 3, 244-265

Martin, J. Deconstructing organizational taboos: The suppression of gender conflict in organizations. *Organizational Science*, 1990, 1, 4, 339 -359

Milliken, F., Morrison, E. & Hewlin, P. An exploratory study of employee silence: Issues that employees don't communicate upward. *Journal of Management Studies*, 2003, 40, 6, 1453-1476

Mills, A. Organization, gender and culture. *Organization Studies*, 1988, 3, 351-69

Mills, A. Studying the gendering of organizational culture over time: Issues, concerns and strategies. *Gender Work and Organization*, 2002, 9, 3, 280-307

Morgan, D. *Discovering Men*, London: Routledge, 1992

Murray, S. "We all love Charles". Men in childcare and the social construction of gender. *Gender and Society*, 1996, 10, 4, 368-385

Nicholson, N. & West, M. *Managerial job change: Women and men in transition,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988

Pinder, C. & Harlos, H. Employee silence: Quiescence and acquiescence as responses to perceived injustice. *Research in Personnel and Human Resource Management*, 2001, 20, 331-369

Robinson, S. *Marked men: White masculinity in crisis*, Columbia University Press, 2000

Rosener, J. Ways women lead. *Harvard Business Review*, 1990, Nov – Dec, 119-125

Simpson, R. Gender mix and organizational fit: How gender imbalance at different levels of the organization impacts on women managers. *Women In Management Review,* 2000,15,1,5-20

Simpson, R. Have times changed? Career barriers and the token woman manager. *British Journal of Management*, 1997, 8,121-129

Simpson, R. Masculinities at work: The experiences of men in non-traditional occupations. *Work Employment and Society* (forthcoming)

Sturges, J. What it means to succeed: personal conceptions of career success held by male and female managers at different ages. *British Journal of Management*, 1999, 10, 239-252

Tannen, D. *You just don't understand*. London: Virago, 1991

Turnley, W. & Feldman, D. The impact of psychological contract violations on exit, voice, loyalty and neglect. *Human Relations*, 1999, 52, 7, 895-922

Whitehead, S. Woman as manager: A seductive ontology. *Gender Work and Organization*, 2001, 8, 1, 84-107

Williams, C. *Doing women's work*, London: Sage, 1993

Wilson, F. Research note: organizational theory: Blind and deaf to gender. *Organization Studies*, 1996, 17, 5, 825-842

Wilson, F. & Thompson, P. (2001) Sexual harassment as an exercise of power. *Gender Work and Organization*, 2001, 8, 1, 61-83

Figure 1: *Surface and Deep Conceptualisations of Voice and Visibility*

	Voice	**Visibility**
Surface conceptualisation	Inequality seen as a state of absence and neglect (weak presence). Emphasis on giving voice to difference and to women's experiences e.g. women's voice literature, women in management literature. Liberal feminist perspective	Inequality seen as a state of exclusion and difference Visibility seen as a numerically disadvantageous state Focus on material practices and implications for women as 'tokens' Invisibility associated wit the power of the majority Liberal feminist perspective
Deep conceptualisation	Processes of silencing through discourse. Focus on the power of silence and silence as an agent of power Focus on masculinity as hegemonic discourse Post-structuralist interpretation	Processes of maintaining power through invisibility of the norm (strong presence) Contestations over the normative state and demands for visibility. Focus on white masculinity as disembodied normativity Post structuralist interpretation