The Emotionality of Organization Violations:
Gender Relations in Practice

Jeff Hearn and Wendy Parkin

Introduction

Organizations have historically often been perceived as rational, unemotional, agendered entities. Over the last twenty years or more there has been a notable expansion of research and indeed policy intervention that has demonstrated the significance of gender relations in organizations and everyday organizational life. At the same time, or perhaps with some time lag, there has been an increasing interest in emotions and violence in and around organizations, in both organizational policy and practice, and empirical research and theory development. In some ways, the focus on gender has fed into the growing interest in emotions and violence. But on the other hand, many of the concerns with emotions and violence in and around organizations have often developed surprisingly separately both from each other, and, in many instances, at some distance from understandings of gender and indeed sexuality. Accordingly, we address the *emotionality of violation*: the persistence of organization violations, and their relation to gender, sexuality and emotions.

This is certainly a significant lacuna – what could be more emotional than violence, whether doing, receiving, witnessing or responding to it? Indeed what could be more gendered? There is a frequent structural co-occurrence of violence or violation, gender relations and emotions in and around organizations. We have previously chronicled this in many situations, for example, in residential institutions (Parkin, 1993; Parkin and Green, 1997; Hearn and Parkin, 2001); in organizations responding to men's violence to known women (Hearn, 1998); and in our own experience of organization violation (Hearn, 2003).

Accordingly, in this chapter we address the emotionality of violation: the persistence of organization violations, as we prefer to conceptualize the field, and their relation to gender, sexuality and emotions. We emphasise throughout the significance of gender and the gendered nature of dominant patterns of violation both in and around organizations. This will recognise the interrelations between the persistent assumptions of women as the main 'carriers' of emotionality, gender and sexuality in organizations, the gendered nature of the expression of emotions, and the occurrence of violence and violations.

After considering meanings of violence and violation, and their gendering, we outline a framework for analysing organization violations, gender relations and emotions – ranging from macro structural violations and oppressions; to meso level, direct physical violence, harassment and bullying; and micro level, mundane, taken-for-granted violations. Organization violations span these levels; they are not restricted to specific acts or incidents of violence. Macro violations may not involve direct physical violence; micro violations may be defined as simply "management practices". The chapter goes on to examine different forms of emotional or emotionalized relations to organization violations, before brief concluding comments on the place of emotions in moving towards violation-free organizations.

What are violence and violations in and around organizations?

Violence has not been a central concern of mainstream organization theory. It is also an especially complex and contested term. This is clear from historical analysis of the changing recognition of what counts as (forms of) violence. The term 'violence' 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 some characteristics in common with others similarly labelled. In this sense, it is a concept with shifting moral referents. Contestations over definitions (particularly what is included and excluded) are intense, 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 vary greatly. First violence is often equated with physical violence, or certain kinds of violence that are seen as 'serious' (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. A second alternative, particularly relevant in organizational contexts, is to expand 'violence' to 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 or similar nature). It can also be seen as 'repeated and persistent attempts by one person to torment, wear down, frustrate or get a reaction from another', (Bast-Petterson, 1995: 50). Violence also includes bullying (exposure repeatedly and over time to negative actions from one or more persons such that the victim has difficulties defending themselves), as well as physical violence. Bullying also includes 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.

A third way is to adopt a broad, socially contextualized understanding of violence as violation. Accordingly, we define violence – or organization violation - as those organizational 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. For example, Iris Marion Young (1990) has explicated a plural categorization of oppression: exploitation, marginalization, powerlessness, cultural imperialism and violence. Further to this, Nancy Fraser (1997: 44-49) has outlined a concept of gender equity that encompasses

a plurality of normative principles: antipoverty, antiexploitation, income equality, leisure-time equality, equality of respect, antimarginalization, and antiandrocentrism.

Violation ranges 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; murder. 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 violation are social phenomena. Violation can, though not always, include some kind of force or potential force: force by the violator; forced violation of the violated. Organization violation is a broader, more useful concept than violence and includes structured oppression and discriminations; harassment, bullying and violences; and mundane, everyday violations within organizational worlds. The emotional impact of organization violation is implicit in the expanding literature on violence, harassment, bullying and stress at work and the negative effects on physical and mental health and well-being.

Organization violations

Organization violations refer to the simultaneous structural presence, operation and social enactment of organization(s) and violation. Organization violations range from structural, historical violations and oppressions; to direct physical violence, harassment and bullying; and then to mundane, taken-for-granted violations. Focusing on violences *as violation* brings together debates on different forms of violence that have usually been kept separate. Social divisions of oppression, such as age, ethnicity, disability, gender, sexuality and class, have all been the focus of processes of politicization. Calling ongoing damage caused by social exclusion, abusive use of language and the power of mainstream cultural values, as well as structural considerations, 'violation' articulates the emotional and other distress and damage associated or caused. The ordinary and extraordinary practices perpetuating oppressions - bullying, isolation, exclusion, harassment, physical violence, emotional assault, along with cultural, ideological and symbolic violences - need to be named as violations. Violations do not occur along a neat progression of increasing severity. They occur through and across different levels: macro extra-organizational structures, meso organizational domains, and micro intra-organizational processes and practices.

Macro extra-organizational structures include the impact of structural violations and the place of violation in the existence, context and formation of organizations. Violations are very closely linked, but not totally determined, by structural power differences, including patriarchal social relations; systems of capitalist and imperialist exploitation; and national exclusions, structural racism and xenophobia. These may violate without direct resort to physical violence and link with the 'mundane', as when widespread racism is present in one-to-one racist language and patriarchal power relations demonstrated in sexist 'joking'. The very

structuring of such social relations can itself often be violating to some and a form of violence/violation, even though there is clearly an incredible variety of social and cultural formations and practices that are called organizations. The very production and reproduction of organization(s) can be a form and location of violence. What is particularly interesting is the extent to which the basic activity of organizing, of forming and maintaining organizations, is or involves violence. Organizations depend for their continuation upon obedience to not just authority, but authority that is at least to some degree unaccountable and unjustifiable. Organizational formation typically takes place in the context of the structural relations of domination, control and violation. The conditions of formation of an organization may have lasting effects on organizational processes, not only in formal structures, but in continuing resentment, guilt, anxiety and other emotions.

Violence can be seen as occupying a central place in the bureaucratization of organizations. Burrell (1999: 402) goes so far as to suggest: "Modernism is about the death camps in a fairly uncontentious way even though its apologists seek to distance the likes of Auschwitz from the achievements of the modernist society." Bauman (1989) has addressed the Holocaust and use of instrumental rationality to transform people into dehumanized objects; the creation of social distance between perpetrators and victims; and allowing of victims to participate in the decisions that adversely affect them. Marsden and Townley (1999: 418) write: 'The Holocaust illuminates the rationality of all modern modes of organizing.'

Organizations occupy specific social domains, where particular structured social relations around violation operate in terms of gender, class, ethnic and other social relations. Typically these structured organizationally-defined power relations contextualize or constitute a meso level of organization violations. Organizational social relations effectively construct different categories of people who are (collectively) significant in the reproduction of organization violations. Indeed if organizations are the focus of the creation and recreation of oppression and exclusion, then different categories of people are more or less subjected to forms of violation, through harassment, bullying, managerial controls, labour processes, cultural and ethnic exclusions, and so on. This brings directly to the question of violations by organizationally-defined categories. These include, most obviously, particular managements, particular organizational groups of men, and particular organizationally-defined ethnic or cultural groups. A more specific set of meso level questions concern organizational orientations to violation, specifically the place of violence and violation in the aims and tasks of the organization. One way of conceptualizing organization violations is to recognise that organizations can have an explicit or an implicit relation or orientation to violation. In some organizations this involves the reproduction of institutional violence and violations.

Violations also occur within routine micro intra-organizational processes, in managerial and work cultures, the ordinary enactment of authority, in the very existence and ordinary functioning of organizations, whereby certain people are demeaned and violated. 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 (Gabriel, 1998). While the place of

violence and violation within organizational domains and orientations, with their broad patterns of organizational structure, function and operation, is very significant in providing the main contours of organizational life, it does not necessarily determine the local complexities of violations within organizations. To do this involves attending to micro intra-organizational processes and practices of organization violations within organizations. Interestingly, the macro level and micro levels are not usually specifically labelled as violations. For example, macro violations may not involve regular direct physical violence, but rather structured, repeated violations and oppressions; micro violations may be defined as "management practices". Violation may also occur in resisting authority, hierarchy or even the organization itself.

Gendering organization violations

Violence and violation figure in organizations in many ways. The most usual forms of violence that are now recognised in organizations are: harassment (sexual harassment, racial harassment, other forms of personal harassment), bullying, and direct physical violence, especially physical assaults Definitions and connotations of sexual harassment and bullying differ significantly, with the former emphasising touch, sexual advances, jokes, use of pornography and sexist language, and implying men's power over women. Bullying behaviours are usually more orientated to the organizational work itself, with unwanted behaviour focusing on the work task and emphasising stress and loss of productivity. Discussions on (physical) violence are usually more focused on physical attacks and behaviours that are assumed to be not usually associated with most workplaces, apart from 'violent settings' such as prisons.

Sexual harassment, bullying and physical violence are to be understood in the context of the gendering and sexuing of organizations. If this is only acknowledged for sexual harassment, the most explicitly gendered and least criminalized, then the gendering of bullying and violence is played down or even ignored. It is often not seen as severe as physical violence, and this can prevent harassment being perceived as violence. There are clear overlaps between harassment, sexual harassment, bullying and physical violence. Not all bullying is sexual harassment though arguably most or even all sexual harassment is a form of bullying and violence to the individual. All are linked with the gendering of organizations and part of men's violences. Similarities between the categories, such as physical and psychological harm, intimidation, persistence, unwantedness, need to be recognised.

There is danger in ranking harassment, bullying and physical violence and presuming a linear progression with physical violence at the 'top' and more likely to be perceived within a criminal framework. Seeing each as a separate category compartmentalizes them and detracts from addressing their interconnections with gender, sexuality and organizational power. Also their overly behavioural focus may neglect the experiences of violation and play down both more structural relations of oppressions and mundane experiences of violation (for example, joking around sex or race falsely described as 'mild') in organizations that would usually not be labelled harassment, bullying or even sometimes physical violence. In addition their struggles are usually seen as distinct from interpersonal workplace conflicts, industrial relations disputes, work process, exploitation, class and gender conflict. The presentation of violence as separate from gender, class and other social division questions is itself

part of their significance and their reproduction. The broad violations of patriarchy, capitalism and nationalism are rarely considered in literature on bullying and physical violence, as if they occur in a world without gender, class and racialization. All these phenomena are violations of the person.

The relationship between violation and the gendering and sexualing of organizations can be understood in several ways. First, dominant forms of violence as violation in organizations are by men to women, children or other men. Closely linked is the dominant male presence and the dominance of male presence throughout organizations and their hierarchies, such as business, governments, the police, the judiciary, the church, armed forces. Patriarchal organization violations follow from structured power relations between men and women in organizations. Gendered hierarchical and managerial power, and inequality of gender, sexual and other related social divisions (Gwartney-Gibbs and Lach, 1994) are central issues. As men still dominate management, their opportunities to exercise power in negative, violating ways are greater than those of women, as is their ability to silence complaints. Some women are accessing higher positions, bringing opportunities to exercise negative power, as suggested in some bullying surveys. Micro-violations often entail particular groups of men routinely producing violations, for example, through perpetuation of men's dominant organizational cultures. The form of violent/violating, usually but not necessarily masculine, organizational cultures that reproduce violent, bullying, harassing and conflictual behaviours and experiences is crucial (Collinson and Hearn, 1996). Masculinization of workplaces sets the norms by which women who seek to join must behave and of what is acceptable in the expression of emotions.

Second, there are many organizations and professions seen as predominantly female which still have male management either directly or at a distance as in residential care organizations. This is apparent in the field of midwifery in the UK where it is overwhelmingly women who care for women at the same time as the midwifery profession is controlled by the male medical discourse. Moreover, just because an organization is not obviously male-dominated it does not mean that men's power is not being exercised. There are clear gendered hierarchies of occupations, professions and indeed whole or parts of organizations, such as doctors over nurses, lawyers over social workers, and so on. These are relevant to both the contextualization and practice of harassment, bullying and physical violence, facilitating some forms of behaviour and constraining others.

Third, there is the clear perpetration of sexual harassment, bullying and physical violence by men, individually, in groups or more collectively. The TUC (Trades Union Congress) (1999) report *Violent Times: Preventing Violence at Work* found that young women were twice as likely to be attacked at work than their male counterparts. Almost a quarter of women in the 25-34 age group had been threatened with violence at work, and 11 percent had been attacked, compared with 6 percent of men of the same age.

Fourth, there is male domination in men's reactions to violation, formally in policies or more informally in terms of collusion, avoidance or other responses. Organizational responses to violence are significant in this respect. Research on sexual harassment suggests that inadequate managerial responses can reinforce rather

than resolve claims of sexual harassment (Collinson and Collinson, 1996). The nature of these responses may be related to the gender profile of management.

Fifth, there are powerful assumptions about what constitutes management with the emphasis on 'strong' 'macho' environments still being seen as desirable (Collinson, 1988; Einarsen and Raknes, 1997). Whatever the gender, such a culture of management is imposed on personnel regardless of their gender but with women having to comply in order to progress and men having to comply to avoid being seen as 'soft' or 'feminine'. The reluctance of men to complain about bullying can also be perceived as the unwillingness of men to present other than a so-called 'macho' coping image. Some men accept the 'all's fair in business' thinking so much that they suppress their emotional reactions and refuse to label negative experiences as bullying or violation (Wright and Smye, 1997). Being perceived as emotional and not being able to emotionally handle negative experiences may be experienced as a sign of weakness, even if men are as emotional as women (Hearn, 1993).

Organization violations and emotional relations

Organizations have always been sites of interconnecting gender relations, sexuality, violations and emotions, but their recognition has been uneven. In researching the power of sexuality in organizations, we have demonstrated the power and paradox of 'organisation sexuality': the interconnection between gender, power and sexuality and its pervading influence in supposedly agendered, asexual rational worlds (Hearn and Parkin 1995). Emotions are ever-present in organizations, though often not formally acknowledged. Studies of workplace resistance and subjectivity have highlighted the significance of the 'non-rational' and the 'emotional' in organizational behaviour, and questioned the overly rationalist assumptions about human behaviour that have dominated organizational literature (Kondo, 1990; Jermier et al., 1994).

Organization violations involve the damaging event(s), and emotional responses to damage, and are embodied, material and discursive. The organizational relationship between the violator and the violated is a crucial issue in understanding how violence and violation relate to organizational dynamics. Such relationships might include violence between workers and managers; between organizational peers; between clients and professionals. There are several standpoints from which to define violence as violation: the violator doing violation; the violated receiving violation; the witness witnessing violations; those of other social actors involved in dealing with violence, such as lawmakers or enforcers; and those of less directly involved analysts. There is thus a range of ways of relating to organization violations, including doing, receiving, witnessing, and working with such violations. In some situations the position, observation and sometimes relatively passive participation of audiences is especially important. 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.

Doing violation. The enactment of violence may involve both positive (pleasure in winning, sadism, conquest) and negative (anger, self-disgust, guilt, depression) emotions, as well as the cutting off from emotions. This is perhaps clearest in war, but similar dynamics can apply at other times and in other

organizations. Organizational crisis, work stress, strong internal competition, and time pressures may all be associated with bullying, scapegoating and other violations (Einarsen et al., 1994; Vartia, 1996). Teamworking can generate conflict between co-workers where intense pressure to meet deadlines leads to aggression towards those who have difficulty complying with required production levels, especially when work pressures impinge on group cohesion.

These kinds of organizational processes and practices interlink closely with other violations involving local organizational exclusions of 'outsiders'. Workplace cultures are important in constraining or facilitating the emergence of violence. Possible 'motivating factors' (Salin, 2003) towards violation include the nature of the reward system and expected benefits, the presence of very high or very low performing colleagues or subordinates, as well as changes in the workgroup that lead to dominant subgroups engaging in resistance to those changes. Violence and violation may also be an outcome of perceived injustice (for either subordinate or dominant groups) within or from organizations (Folger and Baron, 1996). In the most extreme form, sacked employees (particularly in the US) have responded by shooting their superiors and/or colleagues. Violence may also be targeted against oneself, for example, drug abuse. Where usually gendered workplace cultures are characterized by heavy drinking and/or intense competition between employees within or between organizations, violence is more likely to occur (Bennett and Lehman, 1996). Heavy drinking can occur as a means of workers dealing with feelings of intense conflict, guilt or shame (Johnson, 1986: 196) – in extreme cases in the military, death camps, organizations using torture, and other organizations specializing in violence.

In organizations where violence is legitimated, an important question is how this is articulated and framed within the goals and objectives of the organization. Such organizations as the military and the police are simultaneously engaged in the doing of violence, the maintenance of the potential for violence, and the justification of violence. The dominant way of enacting these is through the reproduction of hierarchy, often a strict hierarchy. Even in such organizations, there are great variations in the extent to which overt physical violence is part of organizational routine. For example, a martial arts organization may be routinely involved with controlled violence and violation within the rules of that activity, while the dominant goals may be the making of profit.

An outstanding example of the analysis of the dynamics of institutional violence in organizations of this kind has been produced by Robert Johnson (1986). In a wide-ranging review of the literature on war, the military, massacres, concentration camps, torture, police, prisons, as well as some industrial workplaces, he sets out some of the major organizational and social psychological processes by which violence is reproduced. Responsibilities can be dispersed and impersonal rather than clear and personal. An important part of these organizational processes is the reproduction of transcendent and mundane authorizations (Kelman, 1973). The first are vague justifications of the expendability of people; the second are more specific justifications of how stipulated ends will be achieved. Both constitute organizational ideologies. In addition, those to receive violence can be constructed as less than human, as numbers, as not people at all – as when bomber pilots use various

psychological devices to convince themselves that their work does not involve harming others. For example, bomber pilots and crew may adopt trivializing, casual, ironic and supposedly humorous psychological and linguistic methods, such as "There goes the cookie", in continuing their bombing without too much direct thought for the impact of their bombs (Johnson, 1986; Smith, 1993). Despite these and many other insightful points, and some attention to issues of class and race, Johnson does not address questions of gender and sexuality.

Huggins and Haritos-Fatouros (1998) interviewed former police and military torturers in Brazil during the period 1964-1985, and linked their analysis to gender and masculinities. They identified both "lone wolves", who tended to work according to their own rules, and sometimes entered into direct fights with and punishments of criminals or alleged criminals on a "fair" basis, or because they "deserved" it. Such individualistic behaviour, even if it involved taking more personal responsibility for violent actions, can bring the officer into conflict with the managerial authorities. In contrast, other interviewees were characterized as "institutional functionaries", in which loyalty to the organization was paramount. For some such individuals, murder and killing were presented as morally superior to witnessing torture, which brought direct physical pain to the victim, but sometimes also psychological pain to the police. In this latter situations, emotions are not absent but severely subordinated to the organization. But on the other hand, resorting to murder "to put someone out of their misery" was seen, by some senior officers, as counter to the interests of the organization, and in that sense an unwanted individual emotional response.

A problematic issue that particularly concerns military, paramilitary, and similar organizations is the difficulty of maintaining the potential for physical violence to others outside the organization while minimizing, or at least reducing, that violence to each other and the self within the organization. This classic dilemma for armies is partly the subject of Dixon's (1976) analysis of 'the psychology of military incompetence', in which he argues that the primary anxiety is redirected by and controlled through organizational devices, such as rules and procedures. However, the most important element of organizational process in such organizations is that they produce and reproduce violation, pain, and damage. Accordingly, people with such experiences may remain in the organization, be expelled from it or even be killed.

In addition, violation episodes develop over time. The qualitative dynamics of such organizational situations may develop over long time periods and take complex forms. Gwartney-Gibbs and Lach (1994) writing on gender and workplace disputes address the origins, processes and outcomes of such disputes; in each phase they emphasize the importance of the patterning of gender roles, sex segregation in jobs, and institutionalized work structures. Leymann (1992) has looked at the developmental processes of bullying episodes in workplaces, and how they often move through various stages - from conflicts and unethical communication, targeting of individuals by psychological violence, violating responses by personnel staff, to expulsion. Sometimes the process may recommence with other targets.

Receiving violation. Being violated involves many negative emotions (hurt, shame, humiliation), and very occasionally positive emotions, as in the pleasure within sado-masochism. It may also lead onto cutting off from emotions, especially where

violation is very sudden, traumatic, severe and long-term (Hodgkinson and Stewart, 1991; Scott, 2001). Violation that is not recognised as such can still be discomforting and emotional, though perhaps for reasons that are unclear at the time. Such responses may include emotions that are not legitimated.

A number of work sectors appear to present particular risks of physical violence from customers or members of the public. These include those handling money and/or valuable goods, authority, lone workers, providers of care, advice, education and service and those working with potentially violent people and in 'dangerous work' (Cardy, 1992; Woods and Whitehead, 1993). Local organizational constructions of time and space can have specific implications for the production of violence. Similar effects may result from the increasing pressure on employees to work longer hours as part of the '24 hour a day economy'. Late night opening of retail outlets can render employees, especially women workers, vulnerable to intentionally harmful behaviour, for example, robberies, sexual attack. Lone workers, for example, taxi drivers, may be particularly vulnerable to violence and attack. Other factors that can increase risks of violation include restructuring crises and other organizational changes. Of relevance here are organizational changes such as: customer care initiatives, work intensification, expansion of contract work and internal markets, quality initiatives and business process re-engineering, technological innovation, restructuring and downsizing, surveillance and new forms of managerial control.

Violations clearly occur where organizations overtly pursue violence and violent ends. In addition, whereas some organizations appear to rest on the pursuit of violent goals and have an explicitly legitimated orientation to violence, illegitimated (or ambiguous) use of violation occurs in some organizations. Violation may not be part of official goals but may be officially sanctioned or may be an ambiguous phenomenon, as in the use of corporal punishment and other violation in schools. Violation may become part of the unofficial goals or taken-for-granted practices of the organizations. In such situations, violence and violation may express and reproduce hierarchies. In some organizations, such as prisons, violence between peers (inmates) may be used as a form of control by managers, staff, or others in authority.

Johnson's (1986) commentary on institutional violence in some industrial workplaces argues that similar processes can operate in dehumanizing workers as in military, prison and police organizations where violence is, in some senses, more openly legitimated. In situations of great work and production pressure, managers and supervisors may push workers to work in ways that are dangerous, exhausting or in other respects health or even life-threatening. Indeed management power and control can often be reconceptualized as violation or tending to increase violation. While managerial control and motivations systems might not be intended to generate directly harmful or violating effects, they may contribute to organizational cultures that in turn increase tension and/or vulnerabilities, which may facilitate intentionally harmful behaviours in the workplace. He argues to some extent for a naturalistic model of human behaviour in that for such violence to be done repeatedly and routinely, it has to be underwritten by authorization. The means to this 'dehumanization' include bureaucratic organizing, procedures and rules; isolation of the organization from mainstream moral values and regular external review; and insulation of workers or agents of the institution (p. 188 ff.). Organizational isolation can be physical (behind

walls etc.) or social. In both cases it is also psychological for those concerned. Such organizations also socialize and train their personnel '… to insulate them from awareness or appreciation of the moral dimensions of their behavior.' (p. 184).

More generally, Wright and Smye (1996) have identified three kinds of corporate abuse: extremely competitive, win/lose corporate cultures in which people strive against their colleagues rather than with them; blaming cultures in which people are frightened to step out of line; and sacrifice and overwork cultures which involve people putting their jobs and their work above their personal and social lives and well-being to the extent that they become ill (Johnson, 1986). These processes and practices may be exarcerbated where there are distinct 'front' and 'back' regions, as, for example, in commercial kitchens.

Witnessing violence. The organizational forms of routine social processes or social activities as overtly or physically violent may be relatively rare, outside sport, pornography, criminal, sado-masochistic, and genocidal organizations. On the other hand, in some organizations a major element of their organizational activity involves the watching of violence, as, for example, in boxing. Witnessing violence can bring several emotional responses. In some cases, the condoning of violation may involve active positive recognition and approval or more negative lack of explicit recognition. This latter response can lead onto ignoring of violation, and thus ignoring of the accompanying emotions. Such condoning and ignoring of emotions may in turn be forms of violation, whether experienced directly so or not. They can also be individual or collective. Resisting violation can be individual or collective, as in peace organizations, for example. It can more active (by persistence) or more passive (by distance) (Collinson, 2000).

An important and intensely practical issue is how organizational members maintain organizational relations when physical or other violence does occur in or around organizations. This is especially important when violence is relevant to the task of the organization. This is one of the challenges examined by Baron (1987) in *Asylum to Anarchy.* Following a violent incident in a therapeutic community, in which a patient is badly injured and two staff are punched in the face, the staff move on to discuss the violence as an instance of differing perspectives on the ideology of the organization. This includes differences in how staff respond to violence and reinterpret other staffs' positions. A key area is the interrelation of administrative and therapeutic concerns. To collapse them into one system of authority and control opens up the way for totalitarianism (whether administrative or therapeutic modes); a partial solution is the creation of separate modes by time, place, or personnel.

Working with violations. In some organizations the work of the organization is routinely concerned with people who are violent or likely to be violent. For those working with violence routines of organizational defence may operate in peaceful organizations and workplaces (Menzies, 1960). Similarly, there is the impact of the presence of individuals and groups of people who are more (or less) likely to be violent/violating. This may be because of their previous enactment of violence or their membership of a social category that is more likely to be violent.

Responses to violation and indeed threatened and potential violation are found in many other organizations, in the form of policies and procedures on violation and sexual violence, for example, sexual harassment and 'campus rape'. This is becoming increasingly common in welfare agencies, sometimes prompted by physical and threats from clients to workers. It is also becoming an increasingly important issue in commercial organizations, particularly in terms of the safety and security of staff. There are a number of organizational considerations which may highlight these questions, including workers working alone or in small groups, handling of money or other valuable goods, entry of women into organizations and occupations that have been 'men's domains', work in high risk areas of cities, night time work, and organizational activity that is unpopular or perceived as hostile by others.

In organizations created to respond to violence, 'violence' becomes both an element in the achievement of goals, and an element in the routine performance of work. This is most clearly seen in psychiatric institutions, criminal justice agencies, and anti-violence and peace organizations. In some cases, violation, particularly physical violence, may be transformed into a file, a case. Such definitions may be overlain by professional ideologies that are either tolerant, even accepting, of violence, or are unambiguously opposed to violence. The resort to procedures and proceduralism is perhaps not surprising. The processing of violation interrelates with other organizational processes, including the construction of rules around how violence and violation are handled in the organization.

In studying men's violence to known women, that violence outside the organization in question was often 'reduced' to an element of the organizational structure, function, operation, and process (Hearn, 1998). The way this happens and continues to happen involves interrelations between the men's violence to women, men's explanations of that violence, organizational/professional-client relations within worker culture, formal organizational goals and talks, and violation in the organization more generally. In such organizational situations, responses to violation are often part of organization-client relations. This is likely to involve engaging with the emotional pain and damage from violence, past or present. The place of the violated is often undervalued in most organizational contexts. There may even be a sense in which organizational process is often antithetic to the recognition of the full experience of pain from violence. On the other hand, organizing around pain and damage can produce very powerful organizational processes, not least in moving from violation to anger to action. Such organizational dynamics may be especially important in survivors' (of violence) organizations. Organizational responses to violence may develop ambiguous, contradictory social processes between destructive violating experiences and 'de-violenced' structures and modes of being.

These detailed work processes and practices operate at the level of everyday discourses and consciousness, as in the following example on the relation of violation to the reproduction of masculinities and men's power. At several points in research on men's violence to women (Hearn, 1998) 'horror stories' were told to the researchers by men workers. These were either about particular horrific cases of men's violence to women or men's threat on men professionals. The stories seemed to have several meanings; they conveyed a sense of both emotional voyeurism and bravado. They confirmed a certain kind of masculinity ("I can take it"), while at the same time

admitting an emotional response to violence. Past events were objectified and externalized, and simultaneously the worker said something for his benefit, dealing with the feelings that persist. This kind of talk can of course easily slip into a verbally or even physically violent work culture, as when clients are characterized as 'full of shit'. For the men, such as probation workers, solicitors, social workers, there was often a profound ambiguity between a routine 'straight' masculinity (set within a conventional homosexual subtext) and a less obviously heterosexual, more ambiguous sexuality, that is saying "I'm not like that".

Of particular interest was how accounts given by individual men and accounts of staff in agencies that deal with them often mirrored each other. Men in contact with the Probation Service tended to see their violence to women as secondary to other crime and often talked at length of their violence to men; probation officers often did not focus on violence to women as the main issue in their work with the men. In contrast, men in men's programmes usually accepted that violence to women was the central problem and sometimes developed relatively sophisticated explanations thereof; workers in those programmes similarly saw violence as central and developed complex understandings of it related to general questions of power and control, and the individualities of individual men. Working on and responding to violence involves not just dealing direct with violence but also constructing accounts and explanations of violence. Definitions and explanations of violence by agencies and agency staff are themselves often dominated by men. The way that men who have been violent provide definitions of, and excuses and justifications for their violence is often mirrored in the accounts of staff in agencies that deal with men that are also dominated by men. While both individual men and agency men may avoid the topic of violence, both may also reproduce it by treating it as a separate and separable activity: the separation of violence from men's power and control in general can become part of the problem of violation in and around organizations.

Concluding remarks: towards violation-free organizations

In this chapter we have examined how doing, receiving, witnessing and working with violation bring a range of emotional responses, sometimes occurring simultaneously. We conclude with discussion of how greater consideration of emotional life could contribute towards violation-free workplaces and other organizations. First, emotional life remains one of the most subtly problematic areas of organizational life; the assumption of rationality as opposed to emotionality is still pervasive in many organizations. Recognition of emotions, along with gender, sexuality and violations, as part of organizational worlds is slow. Marris (1986) wrote of bureaucracies being resistant to bereavement and 'impregnable by death' as 'the crucial administrative structures no longer depend on upon familial structures, but on the co-ordination of impersonal functions' (p.90). He argues that this leads to grief becoming an illness still seen when bereaved people can be required to provide a sick note if absent beyond the designated amount of compassionate leave (also see Martin, 1991).

Second, in the gendering of emotions, it could be argued that both men and women experience discrimination. For women the assumption that they are the carriers of emotion can be used in a violating way as, for example, when many of the taunts of male opposition MPs in the UK Parliament in 1997 towards the group of

newly elected women Labour MPs were based on the notion that they were emotionally driven through PMT or taking HRT and thus incapable of acting rationally (Lovenduski and Sones, 2005). This resonates with Gutek's (1989) analysis of sex-role spillover whereby rational organizational men are contrasted with women as overwhelmingly sexual beings, so overriding seeing women as capable, committed workers. A related violation is the expectation that women undertake the emotional and caring work in organizations, so leading to myths around women managers. For men violation is around pervasive patriarchal cultures that discourage demonstrations of softness or 'femininity' on the part of men. Arguably, the way to equality and violation-free organizations is not just around equality of opportunity but around what is seen as acceptable in emotional expression.

Third, emotions are relevant in rejecting a simple hierarchy of violations, whereby physical violence is seen as the most 'severe' and mundane violations as less important. In such a view, emotional responses to physical violence are then more easily justified than emotional responses to more mundane violating events. All violations bring emotional responses and the day-to-day experience of racism or sexism can be more emotionally harmful and damaging than a single physically violent event. The harassment and bullying experienced by women in military, police and business settings caused emotional and mental ill-health exacerbated by the negative responses to any complaints (Hearn and Parkin, 2001).

Furthermore, the increasing virtuality of organizations through the WorldWideWeb and ICTs generally offers more ways of doing, receiving, witnessing and working with violation. These include witnessing violent websites which may lead to active violence and abuse; internet trafficking of women and children; and supposedly 'mundane' receiving of offensive spam emails which can invade privacy. All have gendered emotional impacts and are extremely difficult to control.

Violation brings emotions, and one form of violation is the violation of emotions. Emotionality and violation are mediated by denial/recognition and legitimation/illegitimation. Violation can become recognized, and then become emotional or emotionalized. The processes by which violations have been named and voiced are similar in that each proceeds through dynamics of being voiced and being silenced and kept unspoken. Naming and voicing of violation do not automatically lead to policies and practices that assist the creation of less violating working environments. Rather there is often a less clear process with many remaining silent, through fear of losing jobs, little confidence in management, difficult legal procedures or further intimidations. Organization violations violate 'human dignity', a concept that itself needs to be gendered and sexualed, and indeed 'emotioned'. Human dignity depends on giving dignity to emotions. These matters have key implications for organization theory, researching organizations (including emotions involved in researching organization violations), and policy and practice in organizations.

References

Baron (1987) *Asylum to Anarchy*. London: Free Association.

Bast-Petterson, R. (1995) Summary of abstracts and presentations of the participants

J. Hearn and W. Parkin 'The emotionality of organization violations: gender relations in practice', in R. Simpson and P. Lewis (eds.) Gendering Emotions in Organizations, Palgrave, Houndmills and New York, 2007, pp. 161-182.

14

at the workshop. In Bast-Pettersen, R., Bach, E., Lindström, K., Toomingas, A. and Kiviranta, J. (eds) *Research on Violence, Threats and Bullying as Health Risks Among Health Care Personnel*, pp. 17-20. Copenhagen: TemaNord.

Bauman (1989) *Modernity and the Holocaust*. Cambridge/Oxford: Polity/Blackwell.

Bennett J.B. and Lehman, W.E.K. (1996) Alcohol, antagonism, and witnessing violence in the workplace: drinking climates and social alienation-integration. In VandenBos, G.R. and Bulatao, E.Q. (eds) *Violence on the Job: Identifying risks and developing solutions*, pp. 105-152. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Bessant, J. (1998) Women in academia and opaque violence. *Melbourne Studies in Education*, 39,2, 41-67.

Burrell, G. (1999) Normal science, paradigms, metaphors, discourses and genealogies of analysis. In Clegg, S.R. and Hardy, C. (eds) *Studying Organizations: Theory & Method*, pp. 388-404. London: Sage.

Cardy, C. (1992) *Training for Personal Safety at Work*. Aldershot: Gower.

Collinson, D.L. (1988) 'Engineering humour': masculinity, joking and conflict in shopfloor relations. *Organization Studies*, 9,2, 181-199.

Collinson, D.L. (2000) Strategies of resistance: power, knowledge and subjectivity in the workplace. In Grint, K. (ed) *Work and Society: A Reader*, pp 163-198. Cambridge: Polity.

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

Collinson, D.L. and Hearn, J. (eds) (1996) *Men as Managers, Managers as Men. Critical Perspectives on Men, Masculinities and Managements*. London: Sage.

Dixon, N. (1976) *On the Psychology of Military Incompetence*. London: Jonathan Cape.

Einarsen, S. and Raknes, B.I. (1997) Harassment in the workplace and the victimization of men. *Violence and Victims,* 12, 247-263.

Einarsen, S., Raknes, B.I. and Mathieson, S.B. (1994) Bullying and harassment at work and their relationships to work environment quality: an exploratory study. *European Work and Organizational Psychologist*, 4, 4, 381-401.

Folger, R. and Baron, R.A. (1996) Violence and hostility at work: a model of reactions to perceived injustice. In VandenBos, G.R. and Bulatao, E.Q. (eds), *Violence on the Job: Identifying risks and developing solutions*, pp. 51-81. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Fraser, N. (1997) *Justice Interruptus: Critical Reflections on the "Postsocialist" Condition*. New York and London: Routledge.

Gabriel, Y. (1998) An introduction to the social psychology of insults. *Human Relations*, 51,11, 1329-1354.

Gutek, B.A. (1989) Sexuality in the workplace: key issues in social research and organizational practice. In Hearn, J., Sheppard, D.L., Tancred-Sheriff, P. and Burrell, G. (eds) *The Sexuality of Organization*, pp. 56-70. London: Sage.

Gwartney-Gibbs, P.A. and Lach, D.H. (1994) Gender and workplace dispute resolution: a conceptual and theoretical model. *Law and Society Review,* 23,1, 265-296.

Hearn, J. (1993) Emotive subjects: organizational men, organizational masculinities and the (de)construction of 'emotions'. In Fineman, S. (ed) *Emotion in Organizations*, pp. 148-166. London: Sage.

Hearn, J. (1998) *The Violences of Men: How Men Talk About and How Agencies Respond to Men's Violence to Women*. London: Sage.

Hearn, J. (2003) Organization violations in practice: a case study in a university setting. *Culture and Organization*, 9,4, 253-273.

Hearn, J. and Parkin, W. (1995) *'Sex' at 'Work'. The Power and Paradox of Organisation Sexuality, Revised and Updated* (1st ed. 1987). London and New York: Prentice Hall/Harvester Wheatsheaf; New York: St. Martin's Press.

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

Hodgkinson, P. and Stewart, M. (1991) *Coping with Catastrophe*. London: Routledge.

Huggins, M.K. and Haritos-Fatouros, M. (1998) Bureaucratizing masculinities among Brazilian torturers and murderers. In Bowker, L.H. (ed) *Masculinities and Violence*, pp. 29-54. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Jermier, J.M., Knights, D. and Nord, W.R. (eds) (1994) *Resistance and Power in Organizations*. London: Routledge.

Johnson, R. (1986). Institutions and the promotion of violence. In Campbell, A. and Gibbs, J.J. (eds) *Violent Transactions*, pp. 181-205. Oxford: Blackwell.

Kelman, H. (1973) Violence without moral restraint: reflections on the dehumanisation of victims and victimisers. *Journal of Social Issues*, 29, 25-61.

J. Hearn and W. Parkin 'The emotionality of organization violations: gender relations in practice', in R. Simpson and P. Lewis (eds.) Gendering Emotions in Organizations, Palgrave, Houndmills and New York, 2007, pp. 161-182.

16

Kondo, D. (1990) *Crafting Selves: Power, Gender, and Discourses of Identity in a Japanese Workplace*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Leymann, H. (1992) *Från mobbning till utslagning i arbetslivet* [From Bullying to Expulsion from Work Life]. Stockholm: Publica.

Lovenduski, J. and Sones, B. (2005) *Women in Parliament - the New Suffragettes?* London: Methuen.

Marris, P. (1986) *Loss and Change* (rev. ed.). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Marsden, R. and Townley, B. (1999) The Owl of Minerva: reflections on theory in practice. In Clegg, S.R. and Hardy, C. (eds) *Studying Organizations: Theory & Method*, pp. 405-421. London: Sage.

Martin, J. (1990) Deconstructing organizational taboos: the suppression of gender conflict in organizations'. *Organization Science*, 1,4, 339–359.

Menzies, I.E.P. (1960) A case study in the functioning of social systems as a defense against anxiety: a report of a study of the nursing service of a general hospital. *Human Relations*, 13 (2), 95-121.

Parkin, W. (1993) The public and the private: gender, sexuality and emotion. In Fineman, S. (ed) *Emotion in Organizations*, pp. 167-189. London: Sage.

Parkin, W. and Green, L. (1997) Cultures of abuse within residential child care. *Early Child Development and Care*, 133, 73-86.

Salin, D. (2003) *Workplace Bullying among Business Professionals: Prevalence, Organisational Antecedents and Gender Differences*. Doctoral dissertation. Research Reports, Serie A, no 117. Helsinki: Swedish School of Economics and Business Administration.

Scott, S. (2001) *The Politics and Experience of Ritual Abuse. Beyond Disbelief.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Smith, J. (1993) *Misogynies*. London: Faber & Faber.

TUC (1999) *Violent Times: Preventing Violence at Work*. London: TUC.

Vartia, M. (1996) The sources of bullying - psychological work environment and organizational climate. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 5,2, 203-214.

Woods, M. and Whitehead, J. with Lamplugh, D. (1993) *Working Alone: Surviving and Thriving*. London: IPM/Pitman.
.
Wright, L. and Syme, M. (1997) *Corporate Abuse*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Young, I.M. (1990) *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

J. Hearn and W. Parkin 'The emotionality of organization violations: gender relations in practice', in R. Simpson and P. Lewis (eds.) <u>Gendering Emotions in Organizations</u>, Palgrave, Houndmills and New York, 2007, pp. 161-182.