As a central theme in social science research in the field of work and organisation, the study of gender has achieved contemporary significance beyond the confines of early discussions of women at work. Launched by Blackwell Publishing in 1994, *Gender, Work and Organization* was the first journal to provide an arena dedicated to debate and analysis of gender relations, the organisation of gender and the gendering of organisations. Now published by Wiley Blackwell, the journal has full ISI listing and is edited jointly by Deborah Kerfoot and David Knights. The *Gender, Work and Organization* conference provides an international forum for debate and analysis of a variety of issues in relation to management, work and organisation, and to gender studies. The 2007 conference at Keele University welcomed over 300 international scholars from 37 nations. From papers presented at the conference, special editions of *Gender, Work and Organization* were prepared on topics including: Service Work and Gender, Work/Life Balance, Leadership, State Employment and the Gender Pay Gap. It is anticipated that further special editions of the journal will be published from papers presented at the 2007 event. Visit: [http://www.wiley.com/bw/journal.asp?ref=0968-6673](http://www.wiley.com/bw/journal.asp?ref=0968-6673)

The conference will be held at Keele University, Staffordshire, in Central England, the UK's largest integrated campus university. The University occupies a 617 acre campus site with Grade II registration by English Heritage and has good road and rail access. Many architectural and landscape features dating from the 18th century are of historic significance. The conference venue is stately Keele Hall, the former country residence of the Sneyd family, in the University grounds. Visit: [http://www.keele-conference.com/Keele%20Hall%20Delegate%20Sheet.pdf](http://www.keele-conference.com/Keele%20Hall%20Delegate%20Sheet.pdf)

International travellers are served by Manchester and Birmingham airports. On campus accommodation caters for up to 100,000 visitors per year in day and residential conferences.

**Travel and transport:** [http://www.keele.ac.uk/university/travel.htm](http://www.keele.ac.uk/university/travel.htm)

**Conference venue:** [http://www.keele-conference.com/conferences_keele_hall.htm](http://www.keele-conference.com/conferences_keele_hall.htm)

**University campus information:** [http://www.keele.ac.uk/university/visit.htm](http://www.keele.ac.uk/university/visit.htm)


---

**Plenary Speakers**

* **Professor Pat Yancey Martin,** Emerita Professor of Sociology, Department of Sociology, Florida State University, USA
  [http://www.sociology.fsu.edu/people/martin/](http://www.sociology.fsu.edu/people/martin/)

* **Professor David Morgan**
  Professor Emeritus, Manchester University, UK and NTNU, Norway
  [http://www.socialsciences.manchester.ac.uk/morgancentre/people/morgan/](http://www.socialsciences.manchester.ac.uk/morgancentre/people/morgan/)
GWO 2010 hosts the following streams:

**Frayed Careers: rhythms of working lives**
Stream Convenors: Ida Sabelis, VU University Amsterdam, The Netherlands
Elisabeth Schilling, ISEG Hannover, Germany

**Unmanageable Inequalities: Gender and Power in the ‘Creative Industries’**
Stream Convenors: Deborah Jones, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand
Judith Pringle, Auckland University of Technology, New Zealand
Sarah Proctor-Thomson, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand

**Gender, Dirty Work and Identity: Towards a Research Agenda**
Stream Convenors: Heather Hopfl, University of Essex, UK
Patricia Lewis, University of Kent, UK
Ruth Simpson, Brunel University, UK
Natasha Slutskaya, Brunel University, UK

**Emotion and Aesthetics: organizational space, embodiment and materiality**
Stream Convenors: Leanne Cutcher, Economics and Business, University of Sydney, Australia
Philip Hancock, Warwick Business School, University of Warwick, UK
Melissa Tyler, Business School, Loughborough University, UK

**Entrepreneurship, Innovation and Growth: Gender perspectives**
Stream Convenors: Gry Agnete Alsos, Nordland Research Institute, Norway
Ulla Hytti, Turku School of Economics, Finland
Elisabet Ljunggren, Nordland Research Institute, Norway
Malin Tillmar, Linköping University, Sweden

**Ethics and the Politics of Gender in Organizations**
Stream Convenors: Janet Borgerson, University of Exeter, UK
Alison Pullen, University of Technology Sydney, Australia
Carl Rhodes, University of Technology Sydney, Australia

**Organizations, organizing & gender inequality: Masculinities & femininities in practice**
Stream Convenors: Joan Acker, University of Oregon USA
Sharon Bird, Iowa State University, USA
Patricia Yancey Martin, Florida State University, USA
Amy Wharton, Washington State University, USA

**Gender & the production of elites in organizations**
Stream Convenors: Jorid Hovden, University of Trondheim, Norway
Elin Kvande, University of Trondheim, Norway
Bente Rasmussen, University of Trondheim, Norway

**General Stream**
Stream Convenors: Deborah Kerfoot, Keele University Management School, UK
Toni Schofield, Behavioural & Social Sciences, Uni. of Sydney, Australia

**Global Financial Crisis: Reflections on Gender, Diversity and Ethics**
Stream Convenors: David Knights, Bristol Business School, UK
David Renemark, Research Institute, Gothenburg University, Sweden
Maria Tullberg, Gothenburg School of Business, Economics & Law, Sweden

**Health Care: Professions & Provision - Reframing Gender**
Stream Convenors: Mike Dent, Faculty of Health, Staffordshire University, UK.
Robert McMurray, York Management School, University of York, UK
Nanna Mik-Meyer, Copenhagen Business School, Denmark
Managerial Universities
Stream Convenors: Regine Bendl, Vienna University of Economics and Business, Austria
Brigitte Liebig, University of Applied Sciences, Northwestern Switzerland
Ursulla Müller, Department of Sociology, Bielefeld University, Germany

Gender, migration and entrepreneurship
Stream Convenors: Sibylle Heilbrunn, Dept Business Admin., Ruppin Academic Center, Israel
Tüzin Baycan Levent, Istanbul Technical University, Turkey

The work of mothering and the mothering of work
Stream Convenors: Harriet Bradley, Sociology Dept. University of Bristol
Berit Brandth, NTU Trondheim, Norway
Maud Perrier, Sociology Dept. University of Bristol

Theorizing resistance: practicing gender, change and resistance
Stream Convenors: Marieke van den Brink, Nijmegen School of Management, Netherlands
Elisabeth Kelan, King's College, London, UK
Julia Nentwich, University of St. Gallen, Switzerland

Professional Identities, Gender and Transitions to Later Life
Stream Convenors: Celia Davies, The Open University, UK
Ellen Kuhlmann, Johann Wolfgang Goethe-University, Germany

Women and Work in the Service Sector in Asia and Oceania
Stream Convenors: Kaye Broadbent, Griffith University, Australia
Fang Lee Cooke, Manchester Business School, University of Manchester, UK
Glenda Strachan, Griffith University, Australia

Politics as/at work: (Sexual) politics, practice and gendered power
Stream Convenors: Nickie Charles, Sociology Department, University of Warwick, UK
Suzanne Franzway, University of South Australia
Linda Krefting, Texas Tech University, USA
Carol Wolkowitz, Sociology Department, University of Warwick, UK

Globalisation Today: Gender, Work and Employment in Latin America
Stream Convenors: Valeria Pulignano, Katholieke Universiteit, Belgium
Jenny K Rodriguez, University of Strathclyde, Scotland
Paul Stewart, University of Strathclyde, Scotland
In the realm of diversity (management) research, research on ageism in particular has produced a number of studies focused on specific barriers in women’s careers during the different phases of our working lives. On the one hand, we find studies about young women facing primarily problems of work-life-balance (Leccardi, 2004; Hilbrecht et.al 2008). On the other hand we find studies addressing specific problems of ‘the older worker’ (i.e. from an ever younger age – compare Duncan & Loretto 2004, Hofmeister et.al 2006, Walker et.al. 2007). Generally, careers are considered to be a linear life project, in which we are supposed to climb the ladder of success. Addressing ageism bridges several perspectives on careers in terms of rhythmicity in working lives. We argue that combining age and gender contributes to new perspectives on working life (also Yerkes, 2009): the rational, step-by-step approach towards the fulfilment of one’s development in work basically entails masculine norms affecting both men and women and keeping them from reflecting over the rhythms of life and work.

Women around the age of thirty are sometimes seen as jugglers trying to meet contradictory expectations: striving to be/come committed and dedicated professionals, caring mothers and daughters, supportive spouses, cooperative neighbours, and so on (Acker, 2006). By this time women often experience career ‘failures’, or so called ‘dips’, which they tend to attribute to their own personality or assumed incapacity to meet the general standards of working full time and doing care work. Studies about women older-than-forty show women confronted with conflicting expectations of a slightly different kind. They are expected to be fully qualified professionals, by this time having achieved the highest level in their career as well as in their family lives. Simultaneously, they are not expected to be in their best mental and physical form anymore: in working life women after forty/fifty are not supposed to have a great learning ability, be open for new ideas, or be productive at all. Decline is on – despite the current political demand that people should be productive after sixty-five and postpone retirement.

Young women as well as their older sisters (of whatever age) face similar experiences in the sense of contradictory, inconsistent expectations that make up often invisible career barriers and hinder acceptance of their competences and qualifications. Despite the changes in the last decades towards more women pursuing careers, the combination of gender and age is largely understudied. Life itself follows a non-linear pattern; social constructions of age and gender constitute this. Since the traditional male career proceeds in a linear, accumulative way it is still perceived as normal or preferable way of work life design. On this account the female, or patchwork careers are perceived as frayed, not normal, and with different consequences for organizational decisions (e.g. promotion,
tenure, appointments etc.), reflexive shifts, individual well-being or personal decisions of women concerned (e.g. reduction of work time and/or engagement and renouncement of career ambitions).

A lot has been written about the discrimination of women in different age stages because of their ‘abnormal’ or ‘typical’ work-life arrangements. This research perspective however ignores the aspect of rhythmicity in working life as the different stages are usually studied apart from each other. We propose to explore the stages of working life (lives) as interlinked and biographic: marking, as it were, a ladder of recurrent hurdles on a meandering path. After all, rhythmicity refers to the reiteration of similarities over time, usually detectable via patterns of behaviour, stories, experiences and observations.

In our stream we focus on rhythmicity of careers, in particular on what happens during the liminal stages, or on the boundaries marking transition periods, or transformations. Women in their thirties and ‘older’ women are two ways of pinpointing transitions periods in working lives attached to rhythms of life. We are sure that the timescape of female careers is more complex; a vast realm to be discovered and problematized. We are interested in the organizational (managerial) as well as the individual perspective/s; we welcome contributions of a theoretical as well as empirical nature and work–in–progress. Furthermore, we are very interested in inter–cultural, inter–generational and inter–organizational comparisons.

The papers presented in the stream could pick up one or several following questions:

- What happens during liminal / transitional career stages and why? How are events in female biographies (e.g. marriage, child birth, care need of a family member) related to different career episodes? Is it a social attribution, which forces a woman to take over a new “role” after biographic events or in a certain age? Is it the perception of roles and ruptures, abilities and possibilities, which results in different behaviour and different perception of the self? What has changed, if anything, in the past decades and who benefits of change?

- How do women perceive the non-linearity of their careers? Which emotions are connected to recurring ruptures? Do we perceive changes as a privilege, a burden or ‘fate’? How do we explain and evaluate transitions and their consequences? Which specific (gendered) strategies of career management are being used in expectation of a transition period, during this period and after it?

Abstracts of approximately 500 words (ONE page, Word document, single spaced, excluding references) are invited by 1st November 2009 with decisions on acceptance to be made by stream leaders within one month. All abstracts will be peer reviewed. New and young scholars with 'work in progress' papers are welcomed. In the case of co-authored papers, ONE person should be identified as the corresponding author. Note that due to restrictions of space, multiple submissions by the same author will not be timetabled. Abstracts should be emailed to both convenors at ihj.sabelis@fsw.vu.nl and schilling@iseg.org. Abstracts should include FULL contact details, including your name, institutional affiliation, mailing address, and e-mail address. State the title of the stream to which you are submitting your abstract.
Gender, Work and Organization
6th international interdisciplinary conference
21st – 23rd June, 2010

Call for abstracts

Unmanageable Inequalities: Gender and Power in the ‘Creative Industries’

Stream Convenors
Deborah Jones, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand
Judith Pringle, Auckland University of Technology, New Zealand
Sarah Proctor-Thomson, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand

The ‘creative industries’ have emerged as a new object of study in the organisational literature since the late 1990s. Work in these industries is characterised by informal and episodic project-based organisation, and individualised and precarious ‘careers’. If it is true - as many claim - that work in the creative industries prefigures a wider future of work, new or persistent gender inequality in this sector have implications for future broader patterns of inequality. While is there is now an emerging critical literature on creative work, gender is largely neglected. We argue that the example of the creative industries presents particular challenges to the field of gender, work and organization. Scholars of gender and work typically discuss interventions against inequality in terms of programmatic changes - Equal Employment Opportunities programmes, ‘managing’ diversity policies and anti-discrimination law. But these bureaucracy-based interventions don’t seem to apply in the new terrain of the creative sector. Here inequalities seem unmanageable. In this stream we invite papers which explore and interrogate patterns of power and inequality in the creative industries.

The evidence that we have so far is that gendered patterns of work persist and are re-worked in the ‘new’ creative industries, interpolated with age, class, ethnicity. New conceptions of ‘skill’ and ‘attitude’ traverse entrepreneurial as well as creative capabilities, whether embodied in individual creative/entrepreneurs, or played out between occupations within creative sector organizations. At the same time there is a popular impression that any ‘creative’ person can have access to the new creative economy: the seeming informality and social inclusion of the creative industries implies openness and accessibility. Set against this background, even in the absence of overt ‘management’ hierarchies, the creative industries manage to reproduce and proliferate power inequalities through relationship-based processes.

Papers are invited which explore and interrogate patterns of power and inequality in the creative industries. We encourage writers to specify their own local context in which various versions of gender, power and ‘creative industries’ play out. We also encourage an interdisciplinary approach, acknowledging that the literatures of work in the creative industries, like the sector itself, have developed in and across a range of disciplines, including cultural studies, sociology and geography, as well as organisational studies. The following list is indicative, although not exhaustive, of likely topics in the stream:

Mapping inequalities: What kinds of inequality regimes can be discerned in or across various types of creative work? What kinds of information or knowledges do we call on to understand inequality in the creative industries?
Gendering creative work: How are various types of creative occupations implicitly or explicitly gendered? What kinds of occupational masculinities and femininities are dominant? How are cultures gendered in the creative workplace? How does the gendering of entrepreneurship make a difference in women’s careers in creative industries? What are the effects of the salience of ‘new technologies’? How does the gendering of access to technology affect women in creative industries?

Gendered ‘careers’ in creative industries: Do the new career models (e.g. ‘portfolio’ or ‘protean’”) characteristic of employment in the creative industries work for women? Do they entrench the precariousness that contributes to women’s inequality across the work force? What processes are open to women to construct a career in the creative industries?

Critical perspectives on careers: What theoretical frameworks can be brought to bear in re-thinking the construct of ‘career’ in creative industries? Feminist epistemologies, postcolonial theories, critiques of neo-liberalism and other critical frameworks may provide tools for developing the critique of ‘career’ constructs.

Intersectional inequalities in the creative industries: What are the new or traditional relationships between gender and other inequalities in the creative industries? For instance, in film and new media there is a strong emphasis on youth; and there may be distinctive gender patterns in ethnically-based creative forms.

Creativity and entrepreneurship in the creative industries: How is the mix of creative and entrepreneurial skills gendered, whether embodied in individual creative/entrepreneurs, or played out between occupations within creative sector organizations? How can the literature of gender and entrepreneurship contribute to this analysis? How can feminist critiques of ‘creativity’ in the arts contribute to this analysis?

‘Managing’ to transform inequalities: Can inequalities be regulated, managed, controlled in creative industries? Can work in the creative industries be managed so as to make it a pathway to increased social justice? Can the promotion and management of sectoral networks or ‘clusters’ by industry groups or government work to transform inequalities? How are inequalities ‘managed’ in institutional employers of ‘creatives’, such as large broadcasting organisations? How are women in creative industries sectors organising to support each other?

Abstracts of approximately 500 words (ONE page, Word document, single spaced, excluding references) are invited by 1st November 2009 with decisions on acceptance to be made by stream leaders within one month. All abstracts will be peer reviewed. New and young scholars with ‘work in progress' papers are welcomed. In the case of co-authored papers, ONE person should be identified as the corresponding author. Note that due to restrictions of space, multiple submissions by the same author will not be timetabled. Abstracts should be emailed to sarah.proctor-thomson@vuw.ac.nz Abstracts should include FULL contact details, including your name, institutional affiliation, mailing address, and e-mail address. State the title of the stream to which you are submitting your abstract.
Gender, Dirty Work and Identity: Towards a Research Agenda

Stream Convenors
Heather Hopfl, University of Essex, UK
Patricia Lewis, University of Kent, UK
Ruth Simpson, Brunel University, UK
Natasha Slutskaya, Brunel University, UK

This stream sets out a research agenda for the study of gender and dirty work, where dirty work refers to tasks, occupations and roles that are likely to be perceived as disgusting or degrading. The stream acknowledges the neglect of dirty work in organization studies as well as a tendency among existing, mainly US based, research to overlook the significance of categories of difference in experiences of and meanings associated with such work. This agenda is of pressing concern given, within the context of the UK as elsewhere, the increase in the demand for ‘dirty’ work - including paid caring (Anderson, 2000), private and institutional domestic work (Glenn, 1992), low level service work (Noon and Blyton, 2007) and night time working driven by the 24 hour economy (Hobbs, 2003) – as well as areas of work performed by migrant labour. The gendered nature of dirty work is manifest in the way it often draws on traditional notions of masculinity and femininity. Service and care, for example, have strong associations with the embodied dispositions of women while other forms of dirty work (e.g. heavy manual labour, work involving risk or danger) are traditionally the domain of men. These divisions are complicated – both reinforced and undermined – by class and race. Dirty work may be undertaken by ‘lower’ classes, both men and women, and remain invisible to those higher up the hierarchy. Race and nationality can add a further category of disadvantage and another layer to the hierarchical arrangement of such work while at the same time these groupings may challenge the gendered status quo as migrant men, for example, take up work (such as institutional cleaning and food preparation) previously designated as female. Against this background, there is a need to further conceptualise dirty work and to recognise its gendered (and classed, raced) nature. Drawing on early work by Hughes (1951), Ashforth and Kreiner (1999) suggest a typology based on physical, moral and social taint. This highlights the fact that dirtiness is not necessarily inherent to the work itself (i.e. physical taint) but may be perceived as such according to subjective standards of cleanliness and purity based for example on ethical values (i.e. moral taint) or attitudes towards servility (i.e. social taint). This provides a useful starting point for the categorisation and identification of such work. However, what constitutes dirty work in any particular role or occupation may differ (Dick, 2005), raising questions concerning the extent to which social perceptions of dirt and of associated skills and attributes are both culturally and temporally bounded, as well as how dirty work manifests itself across occupations. Some tasks and roles within occupations not normally seen as dirty may be avoided as disagreeable. Certain jobs may be seen as less desirable by some groups yet more acceptable to others. Some skills and attributes may be devalued depending on who practises and embodies them. Some forms of work may be seen as more or less distasteful at different points in time. This suggests the need to test the boundaries of the definitional constructs of dirty work as physical, moral or social taint to develop a more nuanced conceptualisation that can take into account greater complexity in its meanings. How are norms of acceptability played out in different contexts and time periods? How do the meanings attached to such work vary across occupations? How do the boundaries change with
different economic and social conditions? How are gender and other categories of difference implicated in all of these?

The negative qualities associated with dirt and dirty work are often projected onto dirty workers making identity management problematic. Research suggests such workers can engage in normalising practices, recasting their dirty work in positive terms through occupational ideologies or by shifting attention to the non-stigmatised features of the job. Much of this work however has adopted an ‘identity blind’ approach, overlooking the significance of gender and other categories of difference. There are exceptions (e.g. Lee-Treweek, 1997; Stacey, 2005; Bolton, 2005) which have highlighted how female nurses mobilise femininity in the dirty work of gynaecology; how female care workers use resistance and create dignity at work. Nevertheless, more research is required to acknowledge how gender as well as race, class and migrancy are likely to be implicated in workers’ experiences and in the management of subjectivity. Duffy (2007) for example has drawn attention to the racially based gender typing of domestic work; Anderson (2000) has argued that migrant men in institutional cleaning are effectively ‘de-gendered’ by race and citizenship. This suggests that while we may have a core focus on gender, a deeper understanding of that specific inequality can only be gained through a lens that takes into account other aspects of difference (Shields, 2003). How do men and women manage the tainted nature of their work and how are these negotiations influenced by class, race and nationality? What specific challenges do particular identity groups face? What meanings do each draw on to manage the dirty work component of their jobs and how do they position themselves in relation to other groups? How are occupational and other ideologies activated in these processes? Papers may thus address the following issues:

- The ways in which gender and other categories of difference are implicated in meanings and occupational ideologies attached to dirty work
- How these meanings may vary by gender as well as across occupations and time periods
- The experiences of dirty workers in different occupations, the challenges faced and how these can be related to gender, class, nationality
- The links between dirty work and embodiment
- The emotional dimensions of dirty work e.g. dynamics of creating dignity and management of disgust
- Perceptions of taint and stigma and how these are negotiated by men and women in everyday work contexts
- The ways in which gender and other forms of difference are implicated in workers’ management of subjectivity as dirty workers
- How dirty workers position themselves in relation to others and the ways in which such positioning draws on gender and other categories of difference
- How a ‘gender lens’ can assist in drawing out the complexities of dirty work and the different methodologies that can be adopted

This stream responds to the need for a greater understanding of the meaning of dirty work and of processes underlying the intersection of dirty work and identity. More specifically, it acknowledges the need for a ‘gender lens’ in exploring this significant but often neglected area of work – a lens that can also incorporate other aspects of difference. It accordingly seeks to consolidate the existing and rather fragmented work in this area and to frame questions that will help mobilise a conceptualisation and understanding of dirty work that can provide a springboard for new research agendas. It invites papers that will form the basis of empirical and theoretical understandings of this form of labour, hitherto often invisible within contemporary accounts of work and organization.

Abstracts of approximately 500 words (ONE page, Word document, single spaced, excluding references) are invited by 1st November 2009 with decisions on acceptance to be made by stream leaders within one month. All abstracts will be peer reviewed. New and young scholars with 'work in progress' papers are welcomed. In the case of co-authored papers, ONE person should be identified as the corresponding author. Note that due to restrictions of space, multiple submissions by the same author will not be timetabled. Abstracts should be emailed to r.simpson@brunel.ac.uk Abstracts should include FULL contact details, including your name, institutional affiliation, mailing address, and e-mail address. State the title of the stream to which you are submitting your abstract.
Emotion and Aesthetics: organizational space, embodiment and materiality

Stream Convenors
Leanne Cutcher, Economics and Business, University of Sydney, Australia
Philip Hancock, Warwick Business School, University of Warwick, UK
Melissa Tyler, Business School, Loughborough University, UK

Although much has been written on the topic of emotion (particularly on emotional labour) and the management of the aesthetic dimension of work, the interface between the emotional and the aesthetic continues to remain relatively neglected in empirical and theoretical analyses of gender and organization. With this in mind, the intention of this stream is to consider some of the conceptual, empirical and theoretical aspects of this interface and, in doing so, to contribute to the development of a more in-depth and focused understanding of gender, aesthetics and emotion in a number of key areas, including organizational space, embodiment and materiality. Broadly speaking, therefore, the aim of the stream is to provide a forum within which to disseminate and discuss research on the conceptual, empirical and theoretical aspects of the interface between the emotional, the aesthetic and the gendered dimensions of work and organisation.

Possible contributions to the stream might include (but are of course not be limited to) papers on:
- Conceptual aspects of the emotional and the aesthetic in organisations.
- Theoretical perspectives on emotions and aesthetics.
- Emotion in an aesthetic economy.
- Service work, aesthetic and emotional labour.
- Aesthetics, emotion and embodiment.
- The ethics of aesthetic and emotional management.
- Methodological aspects of emotion and aesthetics in organisational research.
- Symbolic and semiotic dimensions of emotion and aesthetics.
- Spatial and material aspects of gender, emotion and aesthetics.

Abstracts of approximately 500 words (ONE page, Word document, single spaced, excluding references) are invited by 1st November 2009 with decisions on acceptance to be made by stream leaders within one month. All abstracts will be peer reviewed. New and young scholars with ‘work in progress’ papers are welcomed. In the case of co-authored papers, ONE person should be identified as the corresponding author. Note that due to restrictions of space, multiple submissions by the same author will not be timetabled. Abstracts should be emailed to Leanne Cutcher l.cutcher@econ.usyd.edu.au Philip Hancock Philip.hancock@wbs.ac.uk and Melissa Tyler m.j.tyler@lboro.ac.uk Abstracts should include FULL contact details, including your name, institutional affiliation, mailing address, and e-mail address. State the title of the stream to which you are submitting your abstract.
Entrepreneurship, Innovation and Growth: Gender perspectives

Gender aspects of organization and work-life have been studied for some decades (Hanson & Pratt, 1995; Powell, 1999), and research on gender and entrepreneurship has increased the latest 15 years (Ahl, 2002). Still, gendered studies of innovation or growth of firms are hardly found.

Both entrepreneurship and innovation are seen as tools to create economic growth and wealth. The understanding of innovation has evolved from being viewed as radical to be viewed as incremental, even though the Schumpeterian understanding; “a new product, a new service, a new production process, usage or organizational structure introduced in the market or in the production process to create additional economic value” is often employed in policies. This definition/understanding is seldom gendered, although the policies and means to promote innovation and entrepreneurship result in significant gender skewness (Pettersson, 2007).

In most countries innovation policies have stemmed from and are linked to technology and science policies (Lindholm Dahlstrand & Stevenson, 2007), and therefore have contributed to strong technology connotations for the concepts of innovation and innovative firm or organization. Technology as a sphere is strongly gendered, for example, if measured by educational and occupational choices. The technological innovation and new innovative firms are almost exclusively dominated by male entrepreneurs and managers and most women-controlled businesses operate in retail, personal services, and personal care (Arenius & Kovalainen, 2006), which are not considered to represent a great potential for innovation or for growth. Still, the role of gender and gendered practices within the context of innovation and innovative firms has received only limited attention (e.g. Eriksson et al, 2008).

Recently, there has been an explicit aim to broaden the concept of innovation to cover also organisational, design and other non-technical innovations. In this vein, innovation is not understood through an end-product. Instead, innovation is something that happens in organizations, at workplaces. So far, much of the research has been focused on antecedents and prerequisites to innovation, and the role of middle managers in creating an environment that encourages innovation and entrepreneurship (Hornsby et al. 2002; Kuratko et al. 2005). Based on recent literature the connection between management structures and individuals is more of a two-way street. Innovation emerges as top down and bottom up forces confront and negotiate and the negotiation takes place in the ‘conversational space’ (Heinonen & Toivonen 2007; 2008). In spite of the importance both economically, gender equality and otherwise, the issue of gender and gendering of these issues are not often addressed.
A particular area of interest with limited focus will be the innovation, i.e. renewal of the public sector which in the Nordic countries is dominated by women employees, especially in the health care and social services. Previous studies from the public sector suggest that not all concepts originated from the private sector are easily transferable to the public sectors. For example, corporate entrepreneurship which is suggested to mean ‘the process whereby an individual or a group of individuals, in association with an existing organization, create a new organization or instigate renewal or innovation within that organization” (Sharma – Chrisma 1999, p. 18) can gain meanings of cost-cutting and increased burden on employees when interpreted by the employees at the workplace (Heinonen, 1999). Investigations exploring what are legitimate innovations and innovative behaviors within public sector organizations; if and how they are linked to well-being and quality of working life, and how these processes are gendered, will be of great interest.

The stream on “Gender perspectives on entrepreneurship and innovation” invites both conceptual and empirical papers from different perspectives which address these issues.

The following list is an indicative but not exhaustive list of potential topics:

- innovation processes and practices and the role of gender and gender equality
- studies of business development and growth support (e.g. consulting) from a gendered perspective
- access to resources needed for innovation and growth from a gendered perspective (access to finance, skilled workforce, partners)
- participation in innovation processes within and between firms from a gendered perspective
- gendered understandings of knowledge and how knowledge is used in innovation processes
- innovations and innovative behaviors in e.g. personal services and public sector organizations and the role of gender
- the relation between the lack of women in top management positions, innovation, growth and the gender segregated labor market
- gendered aspects of public policies and support schemes directed towards innovation and growth

Abstracts of approximately 500 words (ONE page, Word document, single spaced, excluding references) are invited by 1st November 2009 with decisions on acceptance to be made by stream leaders within one month. All abstracts will be peer reviewed. New and young scholars with ‘work in progress' papers are welcomed. In the case of co-authored papers, ONE person should be identified as the corresponding author. Note that due to restrictions of space, multiple submissions by the same author will not be timetabled. Abstracts should be emailed to Elisabet.ljunggren@nforsk.no Abstracts should include FULL contact details, including your name, institutional affiliation, mailing address, and e-mail address. State the title of the stream to which you are submitting your abstract.
Ethics and the Politics of Gender in Organizations

Stream Convenors
Janet Borgerson, University of Exeter, UK
Alison Pullen, University of Technology Sydney, Australia
Carl Rhodes, University of Technology Sydney, Australia

Ethics, perceived as an investigative opportunity, evokes and marks relations, engagements, and potential articulations in many realms, including organization. Moreover, the ethics and organizabilities of gendered juxtapositions, intersections, and exclusions may suggest possible approaches to, and understandings of, organization contexts. This stream encourages multiple approaches, wide-ranging investigations and paradoxical notions, opening ethical discourses that shed light on mobilizations and manifestations of gender in organizations and, further, inform business and managerial practice.

In Western society, gender offers, but also sediments, a central means through which we apprehend the meaning of humanity and human possibilities for action and interaction. Indeed, justificatory grounds – that is, the why, where, when, and who –surrounding such interactions, form crucial ethical concerns. For example, if ethical deliberations concern human interactions and relations necessary for ‘the good life’, and if gendered differences are central to human understandings of selves and others, then notions of organizing/organized ethics and gender appear intimately, perhaps fruitfully, connected. Organizations, as central institutions for human contact and interactive influence in contemporary society, offer key sites for investigating ways in which connections between gender and ethics take hold and gain force. Indeed, as organizations effect change for people, destabilising both life moments and historical norms, the conceptualization of gender and ethics provide a dynamic opportunity for both investigation and political intervention.

While research conventions in organization studies and business ethics have meant that studies of gender, ethics and organizations are both rare and limited, feminist traditions have looked to the treatment of women at work as a foundational concern that is bound inextricably with ethics and justice. Such traditions seek to uncover and redress discrimination against women at work – in relation to equal opportunities, equity of pay, and power relations, perhaps in the form of applied ethics. In this politicised treatment of ethics and organizations, achievement of a fair equality between men and women provides a focus, a means of comparison, and a goal. This is a politics founded on a demand for justice and that counters the inhumanity of inequality and intolerance. With this approach the ethics of gendered practice are often manifest through an advocacy for ethico-political choices and acts which, however incomplete and utopian, offer different ways of living, acting and thinking in relation to gendered resistance. Such approaches have, however, been subjected to critique in that rather than developing a feminist or gendered theory of ethics, they focus largely on applying existing gender-neutral ethical theories to concerns for gender inequality and oppression.

This stream will explore, develop, make explicit aspects of organizations’ contributions to invoking, manifesting, and challenging intersections of ethics and gender beyond that which has hitherto been
considered in the research literature. We seek contributions that investigate the gendered relations between subjectivity, relationality, reciprocity, alterity and ethics. We hope to attract multidisciplinary contributions that provide new means through which gender and ethics can be understood, theoretically and empirically, in relation to organizations.

Contributions might provide a critical investigation of:

- The gender-neutrality of business ethics
- Ethics of gender/Gendering ethics
- Feminine ethics as/versus an ‘ethics of care’ in organizations
- Ethics and otherness
- Ethics and feminine organizations
- Masculinity, rationality and business ethics
- The ethics of gendered workplace resistance
- Differences in the ethical acculturation of men and women in organizations
- ‘Feminine values’ as an organizational advantage
- Feminism and ethics in organizations
- Ethics and gendered subordination
- Political resistance to business ethics
- Undoing gendered business ethics
- Corporeal ethics
- Ethics and gender discrimination
- Ethics and sexuality in the workplace
- Sexual harassment and ethics
- Ethical work and relationship to gender
- Ethico-politics and gendered philosophy
- Unethical work practices such as bullying
- Diversity and ethical practice
- Ethics of relationality
- Feminist methodologies and ethics

Abstracts of approximately 500 words (ONE page, Word document, single spaced, excluding references) are invited by 1st November 2009 with decisions on acceptance to be made by stream leaders within one month. All abstracts will be peer reviewed. New and young scholars with ‘work in progress’ papers are welcomed. In the case of co-authored papers, ONE person should be identified as the corresponding author. Note that due to restrictions of space, multiple submissions by the same author will not be timetabled. Abstracts should be emailed to all convenors at J.L.Borgerson@exeter.ac.uk alison.pullen@uts.edu.au and carl.rhodes@uts.edu.au Abstracts should include FULL contact details, including your name, institutional affiliation, mailing address, and e-mail address. State the title of the stream to which you are submitting your abstract.
This stream is organized around the theme of ‘organizations, organizing and gender inequality’. We invite paper submissions that focus on dynamics that foster and/or reduce gender inequality in and by organizations. We particularly encourage work on the practicing of femininities and masculinities, the impacts of race, ethnicity, and class differences on gender practices, and on how gender practices pervade and/or intersect with (other) organizing dynamics. Large organizations, as Joan Acker (2006) explains, are inequality regimes that use gender, race, and ethnicity to selectively hire, reward, and advance people and in doing so, create societal inequality generally. Like Acker, Barbara Czarniawska (2008) urges organization scholars to focus on organizing dynamics rather than on organizations as “fixed” or stable. We recognize that this challenge is not easy. Organizational scholars who study gender, and gender scholars who study organizing, have worked for decades to help students, colleagues, policy-makers and practitioners understand that “gender” cannot be reduced to individual biology or personality traits. Yet many people continue to equate femininity with ‘traits of women’ and masculinity with ‘traits of men’ and thus reduce their behavior to “natural phenomena” that are somehow inevitable. Despite the admirable efforts of many scholars—especially those whose research examines ‘masculinities’ and more recently ‘transgenders,’ it remains true that few people in the world today are accustomed to thinking about gender as a dynamic, organizing process (force) that powerfully shapes the structures, cultures and practices of everyday life.

**Structure & practice.** While we recognize the framing of gender as a dynamic, we also recognize the real and powerful ways in which gender exists as structures. When most people think about the concept of structure, they imagine something that is fixed, durable and lasting. We know however that while structures are relatively durable and often constrain how we think and what we do, they are also constructed over time by the practices we all engage in. As Connell (2009) states: “Gender relations are always being made and remade in everyday life. If we don’t bring it into being, gender does not exist” (p. 73). She reminds us that “the gender we bring into being,” or gender practice, is both discursive and material, both narrative talk and material, bodily actions. Coming to grips with this paradox and finding ways to advance understanding of it is a critical goal for gender scholars. We challenge scholars to show how gender as structure (i.e., enduring and relatively “fixed”) relates to gender as practice (i.e., as rapid, dynamic, and one-way in time; Martin 2003) and vice versa.

**Women- vs. men-only organizations.** The gender composition of organizations is partly a structural condition but it has implications too for how gender is practiced. Are women-only organizations better than men-only organizations on gender equality? In what respects and how and why? After a presentation on masculinities at work/in organizations, audience members often ask if women-only
organizations are “better.” Feminist management is often mis-represented as feminine management although both women and men are capable of practicing feminist management which, as an ideal, promotes democracy, empowerment of subordinates, and other positive goals. It resists using hierarchical power to dominate, exploit, or control. Yet women may fail to act in feminist ways even in avowedly feminist organizations (e.g., Freeman’s “tyranny of structurelessness”). Does feminist management exist? What kind(s) of management or other organizational practices foster gender fairness and fairness relative to other status distinctions—sexual orientation/identity, race/ethnicity, social class, religion, age, able-bodiedness, etc.?

Promoting gender equity. A great deal of gender and organization (and gendered organization) research has focused on how organizations should and can change to advance gender equity. Yet, effective solutions to the problem of inequity are recalcitrant. We welcome papers that identify and/or assess strategies, theories, or other means of improving workplaces by avoiding the production of disadvantage for women and for those, both women and men, in other less privileged statuses. What strategies? What policies? What methods? Which actors? Which combinations of factors are more and less effective?

Advancing understanding of gender as an organizing dynamic:
- We want to see papers that are specifically about femininities—as dynamic practices that exist in relation to masculinities and within a context of the current gender order and workplace.
- We invite papers about the practices of femininities AND masculinities—as they relate to each other
- We invite papers that examine the practicing of gender in ways that “unsettle” conventional assumptions/beliefs about what gender is, and about the relative value of what we think of as femininities and masculinities.
- We want to see papers that examine how relational femininities and masculinities (as dynamic organizing practices) create and maintain, or alternatively challenge and undermine hierarchical structures of power and status.
- We encourage papers that examine global femininities and masculinities in relation to work and organizations: What do these look like (e.g., like Connell’s ‘transnational business masculinities’ or Jesper Blomberg’s ‘finance masculinities’)? How do different femininities relate to each other and to masculinities?
- How do we study and effectively transfer knowledge about masculinities and femininities at work/in organizations in their dynamic forms? That is, what innovative methods will facilitate this endeavor?
- We invite theoretical/conceptual papers on organizing and gender dynamics, including the practicing of masculinities and femininities
- We welcome papers: on the reciprocal relationship between gendered structures and gendering practices; that explore gender relations and dynamics in women-only organizations, men-only organizations, women-predominant or men-predominant organizations, and/or fully mixed organizations; on strategies, policies, or other actions and conditions that enhance gender equity in organizations or have potential for doing so

Abstracts of approximately 500 words (ONE page, Word document, single spaced, excluding references) are invited by 1st November 2009 with decisions on acceptance to be made by stream leaders within one month. All abstracts will be peer reviewed. New and young scholars with 'work in progress' papers are welcomed. In the case of co-authored papers, ONE person should be identified as the corresponding author. Note that due to restrictions of space, multiple submissions by the same author will not be timetabled. Abstracts should be emailed to Sharon Bird at sbird@iastate.edu and Pat Martin at pmartin@fsu.edu Abstracts should include FULL contact details, including your name, institutional affiliation, mailing address, and e-mail address. State the title of the stream to which you are submitting your abstract.
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Gender and the production of elites in organizations:
change, stability, contexts

Stream Convenors
Jorid Hovden, University of Trondheim, Norway
Elin Kvande, University of Trondheim, Norway
Bente Rasmussen, University of Trondheim, Norway

International elite studies have shown that elites are recruited from higher social classes and have similar educations. They have access to influential networks and are frequently closely connected to each other. Studies of men and women in the elites reveal dramatic gender differences in the distribution of housework and care. New elite members are very often directly selected by the people already holding power positions, except in politics or voluntary organizations where they are, ostensibly, democratically elected. In this stream we invite papers that contribute to exploring the gendering of elites - across different countries, cultures, sectors and types of organizations.

For example Norway, supposedly a land of gender equality, is full of contradictions. While women have a central position in political leadership, they are practically absent from top positions in business and in public and in voluntary organizations. This contrast in gender representation between politics and working life and other organizations has been called the Norwegian paradox. Paradoxically, male dominance in elite positions in the Scandinavian countries is higher than in other countries, where the gender gap in general is much larger.

In the global context, recent studies show new patterns of mobility. While women top managers use more time than men to reach a management position, once they become managers, their ascent to higher positions is much faster than men’s, mainly by way of movements between organizations. There is also a new trend in career paths from politics to other societal sectors.

Changing organizational structures are potentially changing power structures and thereby also career opportunities. Decentralization may lead to more open recruitment to leadership because management is selected on the basis of expertise, collegial cooperation and professional values. Financialization of the economy on the other hand, may centralize power at the top. Does the heroic image of top managers as strategic actors mastering the uncertainty of the globalized market where they have to take risks and gamble with ‘big money’ (Solheim 2002) gender top management male? In Iceland the financial collapse resulted in a demand for women leaders. Public organizations are increasingly influenced by ‘market’ concerns as they shift from an administrative to an entrepreneurial orientation. This is also the case with many voluntary organizations, and sport organizations have been a motor in this development. This means increasing demands from outside to adapt to market based models of organization, which put democratic principles and procedures under strong pressure. What do these changes mean for the gender dynamics and the power dynamics in the organizations? Will a strengthening of the position of market mechanisms in public and volunteer organizations and the increased focus on the financial market in private businesses, construct management and leadership as masculine?
We invite theoretical and empirical contributions that explore the processes, practices and policies generate both change and stability in the gendering of power and elite production in organizations. Papers may address, but are not restricted to the following questions:

- Are new patterns of social mobility changing the gendering of elite production? What is the influence of class, gender and ethnicity in elite recruitment in different sectors? Have diversity or equality policies changed the dominance of white male elites? Does the increasing number of women in Business Schools change the male dominance?

- How does changing organization structures influence the power structure of organizations? Does the increasing importance of knowledge in the economy open management positions for well-educated women? Will the managers from lower level need to move outside their particular field of expertise and become what is called ‘professional managers’ to qualify for top-level management? Will the ethical, financial and environmental crises open top management positions for different types of leaders and for women?

- How do organizational elites define and construct leadership? How are women as top leaders represented in neo-liberal leadership discourses? Which understandings of gender characterize elite leadership practices?

- How does the work/family balance influence the gendering of elites in organizations? Is being in elite positions seemingly ‘incompatible’ with having children? Can we observe variations in these effects between different countries? What effect has the gendering of women as mothers or potential mothers have on how organizations ‘think’ about male and female leaders?

- How does the increasing internationalization of ideas on management influence the inclusion and exclusion of women in management? Can we observe an import and ‘normalization’ of transnational business masculinity in different organizational contexts?

- How do processes of professionalization and commercialization influence women’s opportunities for elite positions in voluntary organizations? How do such processes affect the gendering of recruitment patterns and selection of top leaders in sports organizations?

Abstracts of approximately 500 words (ONE page, Word document, single spaced, excluding references) are invited by 1st November 2009 with decisions on acceptance to be made by stream leaders within one month. All abstracts will be peer reviewed. New and young scholars with 'work in progress' papers are welcomed. In the case of co-authored papers, ONE person should be identified as the corresponding author. Note that due to restrictions of space, multiple submissions by the same author will not be timetabled. Abstracts should be emailed to bente.rasmussen@svt.ntnu.no
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As a central theme in social science research in the field of work and organisation, the study of gender has achieved contemporary significance beyond the confines of early discussions of women at work. Launched in 1994, *Gender, Work and Organization* was the first journal to provide an arena dedicated to debate and analysis of gender relations, the organisation of gender and the gendering of organisations. The *Gender, Work and Organization* conference provides an international forum for debate and analysis of a variety of issues in relation to gender studies. The 5th international interdisciplinary conference at Keele University attracted over 300 international scholars from over 30 nations.

The Conference is organised primarily as a series of streams. Authors whose work does not readily fit one of the stream themes but who wish to present their paper at GWO2010 are invited to submit an abstract to the General Stream.

Abstracts of approximately 500 words (ONE page, Word document, single spaced, excluding references) are invited by 1st November 2009 with decisions on acceptance to be made by stream leaders within one month. All abstracts will be peer reviewed. New and young scholars with 'work in progress' papers are welcomed. In the case of co-authored papers, ONE person should be identified as the corresponding author. Note that due to restrictions of space, multiple submissions by the same author will not be timetabled. Abstracts should be emailed to d.kerfoot@mngt.keele.ac.uk Abstracts should include FULL contact details, including your name, institutional affiliation, mailing address, and e-mail address. State the title of the stream to which you are submitting your abstract.
Historically there has been a limited literature in organizational analysis and the financial sector (Morgan and Knights, 1997; Knights and Tinker, 1997; Hodgson, 2000; Morgan and Sturdy, 2000) although of recent time a growing literature in the sociology of finance (Knorr Cetina and Bruegger, 2002; Knorr Cetina and Preda, 2005; Mackenzie and Millo, 2003; MacKenzie, 2006; Lepinay, 2007). While studies of gender have an extensive literature, very little focuses on the financial sector (c.f. Kerfoot and Knights, 1993; Renemark, 2003; 2004; 2007; Czarniawska, 2004; Mörck and Tullberg, 2005; Knights and Thanem, 2006; Blomberg, 2009). The financial crisis in 2008 hit almost everybody by surprise and not least the bankers that had sanctioned a system of expansion regardless of adequate risk assessment and a culture that rewarded short-term growth through targeted sales and generous bonuses. It is difficult to avoid attributing blame to one or other of the participants in this series of events and especially to senior executive managers and traders. For they have sanctioned reckless expansion, overexposed borrowing, trading in untested securitized loan instruments, a culture of short term targets supported by stratospheric bonuses, and a determination to reward themselves excessively even when their companies are facing siege conditions and having to plead for government assistance. Many of the commentaries that have sought to understand the financial crisis are steeped in precisely the same cognitive paradigm of linear rational thinking that could be said to have created the problems in the first place. They seek explanations that are either psychological in the sense of finding individual scapegoats or technical in locating the causes of the crisis in a systemic failure of regulation or governance/management control. Perhaps the severity of the crisis and its implications for us all leaves some space, therefore, for a radical challenge to that paradigm. One such challenge can be found in the literature and analyses within studies of gender and masculinity.

The stream will be less interested in scapegoating managers for their selfishness as this can be better left to the media where sensational stories of greed or quasi-criminality are their stock in trade. Nor would we expect papers to focus on the identification of different or elaborated technical solutions to governance and regulatory failure. Clearly, given the seriousness of the crisis in having led to possibly a global recession if not depression, eradicating criminal or even quasi-criminal behaviour and improving governance and regulatory controls that might restrain managers from collective self-suicide are important. These are clearly necessary responses to the crisis but they may not be sufficient. What is needed in addition is a sociological form of analysis that seeks to understand the crisis as also having resulted from the cultural pre-eminence of neo-liberal ‘free market’ economics and of masculine discourses that reflect and reproduce an instrumental material and symbolic pursuit of self-importance.

Through presentations and discussions, the theme seeks to understand the gendered aspects of the crisis in organizations, institutions and government. It is concerned to analyse the crisis and its
aftermath globally in terms of dominant masculine discourses within management in the financial sector. The focus of interest are the gendered processes, power relations and subjectivities or identities that are socially sustained and reproduced within financial organizations, regulators and governmental institutions. We welcome studies that address any aspect of gender in a local or global context with reference to the financial sector broadly defined and with respect to issues that precede or supercede the crisis. That is to say, the financial sector does not just include banks and their investment arms and market traders but also insurance, building societies, financial intermediaries, and a whole range of business services such as accountancy and management consultancy. We welcome contributions from within any of the following themes:

- Gender discourse and management
- Gender and Organizational Ethics
- Masculinity at work
- Diversity in the financial sector
- Globalization and postcolonial diversity theory

The following questions may be suggestive of topics but are not intended to be in any way exhaustive:

- Can gender analysis be an important way of understanding the financial meltdown of 2008?
- How is the global recession to be understood from a gendered perspective?
- Will we see a wave of de-globalization during the economic recession? If so, how will it affect gender relations?
- Could the tensions between finance and society be ameliorated were the industry less dominated by masculine discourses?

Abstracts of approximately 500 words (ONE page, Word document, single spaced, excluding references) are invited by 1st November 2009 with decisions on acceptance to be made by stream leaders within one month. All abstracts will be peer reviewed. New and young scholars with 'work in progress' papers are welcomed. In the case of co-authored papers, ONE person should be identified as the corresponding author. Note that due to restrictions of space, multiple submissions by the same author will not be timetabled. Abstracts should be emailed to all convenors at david.knights@virgin.net david.renemark@handels.gu.se Maria.Tullberg@handels.gu.se
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This track offers a forum for reassessing how health services are organised, and what the study of those services can add to our wider understanding of work, gender and organisation. We start from a position of optimism.

There is much to celebrate in the history of health care research and its contribution to our understanding of gender work and organisation. Work in and around health care has formed the basis of enduring conceptual insights, from Goffman’s total institutions, to Strauss et al.’s negotiated orders, Foucault’s discourse, Atkinson’s medical talk and Mol’s body multiple. With respect to the literature on occupations, health focused research has had a major role in defining what it is to be a profession, and then problematising those definitions in terms of their gendered assumptions and projections. The mid 1990s witnessed a flurry of work pointing to the links between the nature of professions and patriarchy; to the manner in which both the organisation of provision and the definition of a profession was subject to masculine gendering; to how occupations dominated by women were repeatedly placed in positions of subordination in relation to the male stronghold of medicine; how the positions of men and women, and masculine and feminine, are maintained/resisted through gender projects at work, and; how the status of both certain occupations and indeed unpaid caring are repeatedly undervalued due to their status as women’s work. Research then and since sought to analyse health provision as a site for first revealing the gendering of work, but increasingly also reappraising the nature and value of that work in both the care of others and the construction of identities in relation to and through others. Research with health workers has also sought to raise our awareness of the manner in which health care settings are sites of identity work, as well as emotional labour and dirty work.

Yet despite these contributions it appears that there is much still to be done. There are a broad range of issues and challenges still worthy of concern with respect to the provision of health services that may benefit from being viewed through the lens of gender. Most obviously: why, despite years of commentary, is women’s numerical domination of many health occupations and systems not generally mirrored by their representation in higher leadership positions? Does it reflect the persistence of certain types of organisational male-steaming and the continued existence of glass mazes and ceilings? Alternatively, what might be the consequence of women coming to numerically dominate certain branches of medicine (e.g. general medical practice)? Does it imply a change in the practice and organisation of such branches of health care/care? Will primary care services be delivered as they always have done but simply by women rather men? Is there something in the nature of primary care medicine that allows room for the feminine?
Then there is the question of nursing. Is there still a professional predicament in nursing? How do we redefine professionalism to take into account emotional, caring and holistic forms of work? What is the status of nurses who are responsible for independent diagnosing and prescribing: holistic nursing pioneers, or wannabe doctors and deserters? Related to this we might also want to consider whether there is a role for men and masculine in caring? What does it mean and what are the identity consequences of being a male carer or nurse? Then there is the reform of health care systems: constantly imposed organisational change, an obsession with targets and intervention through national directives. Is it anything more than a show of masculine virility: a demonstration of each new minister’s desire to change organisations in their own image? What are the dangers of masculine approaches to objective rational planning through contracts and targets? What were the consequences of replacing Weberian rational-bureaucratic masculinity with the cut and thrust of competitive delivery?

Finally, we would argue that a consideration of gender in the analysis of health and caring is still a marginal concern. Rarely do you see funding calls or national policy initiatives with a consideration of gender at the core. Is this because we have moved beyond gender? We could go on, but the point is that there are some real and interesting challenges in the delivery of health services and care. In this deliberately wide call we invite you to consider those challenges: to tell us how the organisation of health services and care may better be understood through a gendered reading, and how studies in this area may inform debates on gender work and organising more broadly.

Examples of the issues you might like to consider include (but are not limited to):

- The super/subordinate position of the professions
- The gendering of performance measurement/management
- Dirty work and gender
- Emotional work as women’s work?
- The relevance of patriarchy
- ‘Competency’ versus ‘jurisdiction’: alternative genderings of occupational work
- The glass maze & women in leadership
- Unpaid care work – a change in positions?
- The gendering of NHS re-organisation
- Women in primary medical practice
- The gender politics of US health care reform
- Re-appraising the historical role of women in cure and care.
- Gender research: funding and positioning in health care
- Rebalancing medical schools
- Reconsidering the ‘ethics of care’

Abstracts of approximately 500 words (ONE page, Word document, single spaced, excluding references) are invited by 1st November 2009 with decisions on acceptance to be made by stream leaders within one month. All abstracts will be peer reviewed. New and young scholars with ‘work in progress’ papers are welcomed. In the case of co-authored papers, ONE person should be identified as the corresponding author. Note that due to restrictions of space, multiple submissions by the same author will not be timetabled. Abstracts should be emailed to rm517@york.ac.uk. Abstracts should include FULL contact details, including your name, institutional affiliation, mailing address, and e-mail address. State the title of the stream to which you are submitting your abstract.
Managerial Universities: Institutional change, organisational exclusion and the micropolitics of gender relations

Stream Convenors
Regine Bendl, Vienna University of Economics and Business, Austria
Brigitte Liebig, University of Applied Sciences, Northwestern Switzerland
Ursulla Müller, Department of Sociology, Bielefeld University, Germany

While the (often discontinuous) process of change towards gender equality in universities has been studied (see for example Fogelberg, Hearn, Huus and Mankkinen 1999, Danowitz Sagaria, 2007), there is a need for more theorizing with respect to changing gender relations and equality at managerial universities. Besides the restructuring of management, promotion and careers, the managerial university triggers new forms of perception, thinking and action with regard to knowledge creation, success criteria and, of course, to gender relations and equality. Insightful research has focussed on the effects of managerialism and new public management on female academic staff (Currie, Thiele, and Harris, 2002; Good and Bagilhole, 1999; Pritchard and Deem, 1999; Thomas and Davis, 2002) highlighting the need to apply a gender perspective to the enactment of new public management (NPM) in public service organizations. As existing research has demonstrated, the move towards gender equality in higher education has arguably, in part at least, been due to women’s efforts in challenging entrenched cultural values at universities where, most often, men have been in positions of power to contest or enact change. By contrast, earlier studies suggest that the implementation of NPM in the British Civil Service adversely affected gender equality (Cunningham, Lord and Delaney, 1999).

This stream starts from the question: what happens to these change processes when universities ‘take up’ managerialism? Does managerialism counteract women-dominated change processes, as some authors propose? Do NPM processes offer new chances for the advancement of gender equity in universities? What factors might enable or restrict change for teaching and research in an increasingly entrepreneurial university context?

In order to gain more knowledge and understanding of the meaning of managerialism and NPM for gender equality policies and practices at universities, analyses could begin by exploring how women have been involved in unmasking their organizational exclusion from access to resources, influence, career opportunities and academic authority, and how they deal with managerial processes and structures at their universities. In this stream, we aim to bring together international scholars from many disciplines in order to understand how managerial universities affect gender relations, gender equality and feminist activism. Submissions to this stream may address, but not be limited by, the following questions:

- how does new managerialism interact with gender equality measures and feminist collective action?
- what happens to feminist activism at managerial universities? If it becomes transformed into newly institutionalized structures and cultures, what types of transformations emerge?
- how does new managerialism influence gender equality policies and practices?
- how do transformations to managerial universities primarily managed by top-down strategies affect micro-political actions towards gender-equality?
- to what extent, and how is existing feminist knowledge and organizational learning on equality and diversity in managerial universities acknowledged and evaluated?
- how does managerialism affect organisational and environmental developments towards equality and diversity in teaching and research?
- what patterns of change, in terms of gender equality, become visible across contexts when universities take the path towards managerialism?

Abstracts of approximately 500 words (ONE page, Word document, single spaced, excluding references) are invited by 1st November 2009 with decisions on acceptance to be made by stream leaders within one month. All abstracts will be peer reviewed. New and young scholars with 'work in progress' papers are welcomed. In the case of co-authored papers, ONE person should be identified as the corresponding author. Note that due to restrictions of space, multiple submissions by the same author will not be timetabled. Abstracts should be emailed to convenors at brigitte.liebig@fhnw.ch ursula.mueller@uni-bielefeld.de  regine.bendl@wu.ac.at Abstracts should include FULL contact details, including your name, institutional affiliation, mailing address, and e-mail address. State the title of the stream to which you are submitting your abstract.
In an era of globalization migration is on the rise. International migrants constitute 3.5% of the population worldwide, about half of them are women. People migrate out of desire for a better life, to escape from poverty, because of political persecution and due to social and/or family pressures. Reflecting complex migration dynamics, gender often determines the decision making process and the impacts of migration on the migrants themselves, as well as on the sending and receiving areas. For many women the migration experience modifies their gender role, upgrading or downgrading their status.

Research on migration has recently shifted towards a more gendered approach, acknowledging the fact that more sophisticated theoretical and analytical tools are needed in order to understand the dynamics underlying particularities of women migrants. During the last decades, a shift in work orientation towards self-employment can be observed in migrant populations in general and among female migrants in particular. Thus, women migrant women not only play essential roles in the labor markets of the receiving countries but also in the initiation and development of formal and informal businesses. Some researchers even state that women migrants often were the first to explore alternative economies and become self employed. More than that, there is some evidence as to such that women migrant entrepreneurs are the fastest growing group of business owners (Pearce, 2005; GEM Report 2004 UK; Baycan Levent et.al. 2006).

The framework for interpretation and evaluation of migrant women's entrepreneurial activities includes class, gender, ethnicity, migration backgrounds and minority status. The contents of these concepts can not be assumed but rather need to be discussed critically. The theoretical debates between culture and structure, individual and group, institutional framework and biographical experience, institutions and agencies and gender show that female migrant entrepreneurship is a multi-layer phenomenon. Migrant women engaging in entrepreneurial activities do so for a variety of reasons above and beyond cultural and socialization backgrounds. Structures and institution may hinder or foster these women, and the ability to deal with structures and institutions depends also on their personal biographies. The intersection of class, gender, ethnicity, migration backgrounds and minority status and its meanings vary for different groups in different places.

In this stream we seek papers that can be located at various points of the described intersections. We hope thereby to contribute to the discourse on migrant and minority entrepreneurship which often neglects the role of women and gender in entrepreneurship and to the discourse on female entrepreneurship that often neglects to account for different backgrounds of women (Essers, 2008).

Areas of interest which draw on diverse theoretical perspectives include but are not limited to:

- Female entrepreneurs in enclave economies;
• Identities of female migrant entrepreneurs;
• Case studies on female entrepreneurs in various migrant groups;
• Institutional framework conditions and barriers for female migrant entrepreneurship;
• Cross-national comparisons of female migrant entrepreneurship;
• Female migrant entrepreneurs changing gender relations

Abstracts of approximately 500 words (ONE page, Word document, single spaced, excluding references) are invited by 1st November 2009 with decisions on acceptance to be made by stream leaders within one month. All abstracts will be peer reviewed. New and young scholars with 'work in progress' papers are welcomed. In the case of co-authored papers, ONE person should be identified as the corresponding author. Note that due to restrictions of space, multiple submissions by the same author will not be timetabled. Abstracts should be emailed to Sibylle Heilbrunn sibylleh@ruppin.ac.il and Tüzin Baycan Levent tuzin.baycanlevent@itu.edu.tr Abstracts should include FULL contact details, including your name, institutional affiliation, mailing address, and e-mail address. State the title of the stream to which you are submitting your abstract.
The work of mothering and the mothering of work: reproduction and production reconsidered

Stream Convenors
Harriet Bradley, Sociology Dept. University of Bristol
Berit Brandth, NTU Trondheim, Norway
Maud Perrier, Sociology Dept. University of Bristol

The relationship between reproduction and production has long been a concern of feminist analysis and gender research, the latest manifestation of this being the large volume of literature on ‘work-life balance’ or ‘the reconciliation of work and family life as it is termed in Europe. However, the precise nature of the reproduction/production relationship changes as the socio-economic and demographic context evolves and technological developments transform the nature of both work and domestic life. In the context of globalized production systems and increased migration and mobility the conceptualisation requires revisiting. Miriam Glucksmann’s concept of the ‘total social organisation of labour’ is one useful way to explore this relationship.

This strand will focus on the mutual impact of reproduction and production on each other, both in terms of ideologies and practices. How has the work of being a mother altered due both to developments in medicine and the ‘psy’ disciplines (Rose) and also to the growth of dual-earner families as the norm? What has been the impact of ‘scientific motherhood’ on mothers practices (Apple 2006)? Has being a mother become professionalized? Who carries out the tasks of mothering? Can men mother? How has the role and function of mothering changed? Conversely, within the context of feminisation, has paternalism replaced maternalism? How have practices of mothering and caring entered workplace relations? What new kinds of jobs and professions have been constructed to cope with the demands of contemporary care? How, if at all, is care within employment being reconceptualised and re-evaluated? What are the impacts on childcare workers? How do such developments affect relations between women of different class and ethnic backgrounds? Contributions to the stream on any of these aspects or related issues are invited.

Abstracts of approximately 500 words (ONE page, Word document, single spaced, excluding references) are invited by 1st November 2009 with decisions on acceptance to be made by stream leaders within one month. All abstracts will be peer reviewed. New and young scholars with ‘work in progress’ papers are welcomed. In the case of co-authored papers, ONE person should be identified as the corresponding author. Note that due to restrictions of space, multiple submissions by the same author will not be timetabled. Abstracts should be emailed to convenors Harriet.Bradley@bristol.ac.uk Berit.Brandth@svt.ntnu.no Maud.Perrier@bristol.ac.uk and should include FULL contact details, including your name, institutional affiliation, mailing address, and e-mail address. State the title of the stream to which you are submitting your abstract.
Theorizing resistance: practicing gender, change and resistance

Stream Convenors
Marieke van den Brink, Nijmegen School of Management, Netherlands
Elisabeth Kelan, King's College, London, UK
Julia Nentwich, University of St. Gallen, Switzerland

The aim of this stream is to advance contemporary thinking about gender and organizational theory by bringing together international scholars with an interest in change and resistance towards gender equality initiatives in organizational settings.

Despite decades of equal-opportunities legislation and affirmative action initiatives, progress towards gender equality in organizations remains painfully slow, regardless of organizational or national context. While open forms of resistance and backlash, for instance micro-political actions (Van den Brink 2009), have not at all disappeared, more subtle forms of resistance have developed lately. The (liberal) discourse of seeing (gender) equality as a major achievement of modernity provides a strong normative background for ignoring and delegitimizing factual inequalities in modern societies. In fact, it seems that the arena of gender discrimination itself has changed. This change has been described as 'rhetoric modernisation' (Wetterer, 2003), 'dethematisation' (Müller, Müller-Franke, Pfeil & Wilz, 2007) or 'gender fatigue' (Kelan, 2009), thereby identifying a strong ideological dilemma between strong believes in equality while ignoring the facticity of inequality. On the one hand, gender discrimination is acknowledged as something possible but unacceptable within the workplace, but on the other hand it is framed as something that has been dealt with in the past and that is no longer relevant for day-to-day interactions (Czarniawska & Calás, 1997). There is a clash between the rhetoric around gender diversity and the actual implementation of these initiatives in daily situations, which provides an interesting setting for feminist inquiry in the context of (multinational) organizations.

We would like to explore approaches theorizing resistance as social practices performed in contexts, specific to events, actors and other practices (Prasad and Prasad, 2000). This track invites theoretically and/or empirically informed papers from different disciplines that deepen our understanding of change, resistance, discursive, rhetoric and micro-political practices that impede gender equality on an everyday basis. We welcome papers that:

- develop theoretical approaches to researching power and resistance in organizations
- provide an analysis of any of the multiple forms of resistance or power struggles towards gender equality policies and/or practices
- explore the micro-politics of resistance
- suggest how changes in culture might be facilitated
- engage feminist theoretical perspectives on resistance and change
- explore the role of different forms of masculinities in change processes
- discuss intersectionality and its importance for organizational change
Abstracts of approximately 500 words (ONE page, Word document, single spaced, excluding references) are invited by 1st November 2009 with decisions on acceptance to be made by stream leaders within one month. All abstracts will be peer reviewed. New and young scholars with 'work in progress' papers are welcomed. In the case of co-authored papers, ONE person should be identified as the corresponding author. Note that due to restrictions of space, multiple submissions by the same author will not be timetabled. Abstracts should be emailed to elisabeth.kelan@kcl.ac.uk julia.nentwich@unisg.ch mcl.vandenbrink@fm.ru.nl Abstracts should include FULL contact details, including your name, institutional affiliation, mailing address, and e-mail address. State the title of the stream to which you are submitting your abstract.
Students of gender, work and organisation have cast a novel light on the operation of the labour market, the dynamics of inequality in the workplace and on the gendering of lifeworlds. But they have largely remained silent about how the experience of gender at work may continue to shape organised activity after women and men have formally retired from paid work. This stream offers an opportunity to focus a gender and work lens on the social organisation of later life, to examine some of its institutional and organisational sites, to explore the enactments of gender that take place and the potential for transformations of gender identity.

The main focus will be on those who have held positions in the professions. Professional identities are among the strongest and most fixed of occupational identities. They are hard won at the outset of a career; they attract considerable rewards in material and status terms and professional work routinely eats into time beyond regular working hours. Professional identity often overrides other identities and ‘lingering identities’ (Reitzes and Mutran, 2006) may well be expected in retirement. But ‘lingering identity’ may not capture the range of possibilities for activities related and unrelated to career. Nor does it draw attention to the ways in which post-professional experience may be inflected both by already gendered experiences and by new sites in which gendering may take place.

For professionals approaching retirement, gender will have already made multiple appearances. Professional identity itself in its classic form can be thought of as an expression of a particular masculine identity - that of the unencumbered individual, the detached and rational choice maker (Davies 1996). This in itself may serve to heighten confidence in making deliberate identity maintaining or identity transforming choices at retirement. However, the organisation of professional work and professional careers is gendered. The difficulties that women may have faced, given the organisation of a professional career, in struggling to maintain a balance between work and family, and their absence from senior positions in the professions has been well documented (Kuhlmann and Bourgeault 2008). Implications of this for later life trajectories deserve to be explored. Professional men, for example, may find opportunities in mid career to begin to build a profile beyond the immediate workplace, perhaps in the governance of their profession. Further national and international opportunities become possible later, such that ‘retirement’ will mark a moment when careers continue, when additional respect and status accrue, and professional identity is further enhanced. In contrast, professional women who have taken career breaks and whose family responsibilities continue on their return, may well remain absorbed by consolidating their practice and thus be unlikely to be able to take up opportunities in the same way. Professional women who have had an uninterrupted career may be in a position comparable to men – alternatively, gendered professional networks and accumulated experiences of gender disadvantage in the workplace may leave them looking elsewhere, or carrying out less visibly rewarding work in retirement – mentoring and supporting younger colleagues, for example.
Voluntary, community, national and local forms of engagement provide settings for organised citizen participation which can be taken up by professionals and others on retirement. Do opportunities foregone in middle life as a result of a gendered division of labour limit possibilities for participation in these other spheres in later life? Or does a lifetime of professional service integrate professionals in local communities and open up opportunities for choosing forms of participation less differentiated by gender? Do government sponsored equal opportunities policies for public bodies work to women’s advantage? Processes of making retirement choices are likely to be complex and open-ended, drawn out over varying periods, characterised by trial and error, and adjusted as personal circumstances and external factors change. Decisions are also likely to be shared and negotiated with significant others. In interviews with a sample of both men and women across the range of occupational strata, Barnes and Parry (2004:213) highlighted the importance of joint renegotiation, sometimes transforming and sometimes re-enacting a traditional division of labour in retirement. ‘The reflexive deployment of gender’, these authors argue ‘may rank alongside financial resources and social capital in its importance to the achievement of satisfying retirement transitions’.

Gender is performative; we ‘do gender’ in interaction with others in the specificity of settings (Martin 2003). The experience of gender in new sites of activity thus also deserves to be explored. To what extent is gendered experience of work life re-enacted and to what extent transformed in these various later life settings? Is feminist pessimism about identity transformation confirmed (Atkins 2003)? There are questions here around embodiment, ageing, physicality, sexuality and cognitive capacity which will be worked out both in the daily routines of retired life as well as in these chosen sites of organised participation.

The topic offers a chance for contributions of various kinds. Empirical work using personal narratives to explore the creation of post-retirement identities would be particularly welcome. There is potential, however, to draw in contributors from a diversity of theoretical traditions and methodologies. There is growing recognition in the study of retirement of demographic change, generation effects and the increased labour market participation of women. This, along perhaps with available large-scale survey data (for example the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing), could be utilised to explore aspects of gender in more depth than hitherto. Theoretical work on time, on the nature of the life-course is relevant; the new ‘Timescapes’ study in the UK (Adam 2008) already has a strong link with gender. There is room for debates about structure and agency and for drawing on contemporary discussions of identity transformation. Thus, while the topic is likely to appeal to sociologists of professions, we will seek contributions more widely. And although the main focus is on post retirement professionals, papers concerned with women and men from other occupations will not necessarily be ruled out where they draw attention to structured sites of post paid employment activity and the way in which these are inflected by gendered experience and give rise to new forms of gender enactment.

Abstracts of approximately 500 words (ONE page, Word document, single spaced, excluding references) are invited by 1st November 2009 with decisions on acceptance to be made by stream leaders within one month. All abstracts will be peer reviewed. New and young scholars with ‘work in progress’ papers are welcomed. In the case of co-authored papers, ONE person should be identified as the corresponding author. Note that due to restrictions of space, multiple submissions by the same author will not be timetabled. Abstracts should be emailed to c.m.davies@open.ac.uk and e.c.kuhlmann@bath.ac.uk Abstracts should include FULL contact details, including your name, institutional affiliation, mailing address, and e-mail address. State the title of the stream to which you are submitting your abstract.
The Asia and Oceania regions are socially, politically and economically dynamic. Countries in the regions have undergone rapid transformation from colonies to economic powerhouses. The regions have produced women presidents and prime ministers. They have also attracted an increasing number of transnational migrants who are contributing to the economic and social development of the regions. The rising significance of the Asia and Oceania regions and their economic role in the global context highlights the need for detailed analysis of the jobs, occupations and work experiences of women in these regions. Women are significant contributors to all facets of development in the regions, yet at the same time face the pressures of combining their economic contributions with their domestic and family responsibilities.

There is diversity and disparity between the experiences of women in each of the countries but while there is difference in the degree, similarity exists as uniformly women are worse off than men on a range of employment measures including access to secure employment, wages, conditions, workplaces free from harassment, safe workplaces and access to training and promotion including overcoming the phenomena of the ‘glass ceiling’ and ‘sticky floor’. There are also disparities between women – some countries in the regions have produced women in senior leadership positions in business and politics, yet these same countries also have a high percentage of women comprising the poorest sections of the community and naturally the demands of these different constituent groups differ.

This stream seeks to explore the nature and diversity of women’s work in a variety of service sector industries and occupations in the Asia and Oceania regions. By exploring the specificities of individual national contexts and of specific industries and occupations, the stream will also examine the similarities in women’s experiences and the barriers women face in their working lives. Experiences such as in Korea and Japan where women are disproportionately represented in casual and temporary employment, in India women are overwhelmingly employed in the ‘informal’ sector of the economy. Yet in countries where the state has taken a positive role in promoting women’s employment, gender inequity and barriers remain. The issue of occupational segregation ensures women in China, Japan, Australia and New Zealand are over-represented in education, child care, health care, finance, retail and hospitality.

The experiences of women in the service sector in the Asia and Oceania regions merits more detailed examination. We are seeking papers which address issues which are not readily available or accessible in the English language literature. In addition, because of the limited literature available in this area, we are especially keen to receive contributions examining the Pacific Islands.

Papers in the stream will address women in service sector industries and occupations in countries in the Asia and Oceania regions. Issues might include:
• The applicability of western (or Anglophone/European) focused feminist/gender analysis for understanding women and work in the Asia and Oceania regions
• The formal or the informal service sector
• Public or private service sector experiences
• Women in either highly paid or low paid service sector employment
• The impact of the global financial crisis, privatisation, marketisation, immigration, deregulation, ethnicity, religion on women working in service sector occupations
• Career development of women professionals and managers
• Women expatriates working in these regions
• The role of unions and union organising in service sector occupations compared with the service sector and female workforce generally
• Underemployment of women in the service sector

Contrary to the burgeoning body of studies and debates that gender and employment issues have generated in the European and North American regions over the last two decades, similar issues in the Asia and Oceania regions have not attracted the same attention. As such, the nature and characteristics of women’s experiences of work in these regions remains little understood, as well as the challenges they may face as individuals and occupational and social groups within and across national boundaries. The intention of this stream is therefore to address this gap by generating debates and discussions amongst academics and practitioners who are interested in these regions and issues.

Abstracts of approximately 500 words (ONE page, single spaced, excluding references) are invited by 1st November 2009 with decisions on acceptance to be made by stream leaders within one month. Prospective contributions will be independently refereed. New and young scholars with 'work in progress' papers are welcomed. Please note that due to restrictions of space, multiple submissions by the same author will not be timetabled. EMAIL a copy of your abstract to k.broadbent@griffith.edu.au Abstracts should include FULL contact details, including your name, institutional affiliation, mailing address, and e-mail address. State the title of the stream to which you are submitting your abstract.
Politics as/at work: (Sexual) politics, practice and gendered power

Stream Convenors
Nickie Charles, Sociology Department, University of Warwick, UK
Suzanne Franzway, University of South Australia
Linda Krefting, Texas Tech University, USA
Carol Wolkowitz, Sociology Department, University of Warwick, UK

Work and gender, both separately and together, are enmeshed in relations of power - and power is, of course, the stuff of politics. The focus on politics in the context of work and political activity as itself a form of work will allow the stream to explore the many dimensions of politics as it is practised – whether this be at the micro-level of daily workplace interactions or the macro-level debates of formal political institutions. The informal sexual politics of working life, trade union activity and women’s workplace organising, for example, all involve politics. Conversely, the focus also allows us to conceptualise the doing of politics, whether at a formal or informal level, as a form of work, something which has not hitherto been given much scholarly attention. Those of us who are involved in politics, whether with a capital P or not, are also involved in gendered work. This stream will explore the political processes which characterise work and organisations and how they are gendered, as well as providing the opportunity to conceptualise the doing of politics and how, when we do politics, we also do gender and contest gendered power.

A focus on politics as/at work embraces a diverse range of topics, all of which are welcome in this stream. A fundamental aspect is sexual politics, as it is played out in daily interactions at work and as it feeds into the more formal political arenas of trade unions and LGBT caucuses and pressure groups. Informal sexual banter and sexual harassment reflect and reinforce gendered relations of power, but also give rise to forms of resistance that challenge and potentially transform these relations. Such resistance also takes organisational form and gives rise to the development of workplace policies to challenge and marginalise discrimination on the grounds of sexual diversity. Sexual politics also refers to the dynamic of power between women and men and the cultural association of power with masculinity. This not only leads to an association of power and authority with men, an association which has long been recognised, but also ensures that the political domain is gendered masculine and that women who enter it may be obliged to ‘do’ masculinity in order to be able to ‘do’ politics. Thus the work of politics, as the work of senior managers, involves doing gender.

Looking at the politics of work and politics at work also brings the intersections between sexual politics and other systems of power to the fore; papers discussing these interconnections will make an important contribution to this stream. If the performance of power and resistance permeates everyday life, one important example is the politics of desirable dress, appearance and bodily performance. Dress codes are gendered, classed and ‘raced’, and the appearance of employees, is often critical to the jobs they can access and how they are perceived in them. Who has the power to dictate what people should wear at work and how they should look? How are these constraints resisted? And what pleasures are involved in conforming to these strictures? Can these processes of resistance and conformity be conceptualised in terms of power and politics?
Doing politics, particularly at the formal level of legislative assemblies, has not received a great deal of attention from sociologists, although more has been paid to the informal politics of social movements. At both levels, however, gender has not always been at the forefront of analysis. Furthermore, there are new insights to be gained from conceptualising the doing of politics as a form of paid or unpaid work. Politicians, for instance, and some pressure group workers, receive a salary for the work they do, they work in specific institutional settings, such as legislatures, political parties, and organisational headquarters and branches, and these institutions are characterised by gendered cultures in the same way as any other workplace. Conceptualising political activity as a form of work may therefore throw light on the way it is gendered and how, even within political institutions, work is taking place in the context of specific relations of employment and in particular conditions that might not be tolerated in any other place of work. Similarly, for many people activism in social movements might be seen as a form of voluntary work that is gendered and patterned by gendered relations of power and authority in the same way as are formal workplaces.

Although women are now to be found in positions of power, in political parties and political institutions, as well as workplaces more generally, it is still overwhelmingly men who occupy such positions. What is it that reproduces this situation? Why is it that boardrooms and high political office continue to be dominated by men? What is it about power that genders it masculine? How can women challenge the gendering of power and how are they doing so?

The investigation of new and more subtle forms of governance also crosses the usual boundaries between political science and sociology. The topic of resistance at work, both formal and informal, has a long history of scholarship associated with it. But what is happening to resistance today when there are new and more subtle forms of governance at play within institutions? How are these forms of governance gendered? Do they make it more difficult to practice politics at work and are they resulting in a weakening of the collective power of workers, whether women or men? These are questions that could be addressed by papers in this stream.

The stream will embrace a wide range of topics all of which relate to different aspects of politics as/at work. Thinking of politics as work breaches disciplinary boundaries and has the potential to provide a different perspective on both work and politics. It is this new, and gendered, perspective which we are seeking to encourage in the papers which will be included in this stream.

Abstracts of approximately 500 words (ONE page, Word document, single spaced, excluding references) are invited by 1st November 2009 with decisions on acceptance to be made by stream leaders within one month. All abstracts will be peer reviewed. New and young scholars with 'work in progress' papers are welcomed. In the case of co-authored papers, ONE person should be identified as the corresponding author. Note that due to restrictions of space, multiple submissions by the same author will not be timetabled. Abstracts should be emailed to C.Wolkowitz@warwick.ac.uk. Abstracts should include FULL contact details, including your name, institutional affiliation, mailing address, and e-mail address. *State the title of the stream to which you are submitting your abstract.*
Globalisation Today: Gender, Work and Employment in Latin America

Stream Convenors
Valeria Pulignano, Katholieke Universiteit, Belgium
Jenny K Rodriguez, University of Strathclyde, Scotland
Paul Stewart, University of Strathclyde, Scotland

The purpose of this stream is to encompass the study of organisations beyond the European ‘comfort zone’ and explore dynamics of gender, work and employment in Latin America. In this regard we are referring to the need to engage more broadly with labour, labour markets and work organisations on a global dimension. Globalisation has impacted inequalities by adumbrating labour subordination, restraining or compromising many governments, and displacing and occluding a range of cultures, communities and environments (Osland, 2003). Thus current societal and workplace complexities call for a better understanding of the impact of globalisation dynamics upon organisational change. Moreover, recognition of other dimensions of life beyond organisational realities is vital since changes in labour markets, fragmentation of production processes, changes in communication (Greenaway & Nelson, 2000; Acker, 1992) and transnational mechanisms are necessarily part of the equation of organisational change (Anderson & O’Dowd, 1999). Specifically, these are pushing for radical changes to labour standards (see Lee, 1997), and most importantly, challenge the way in which workplace inequalities are understood. Furthermore, while we are necessarily cognisant of transnational organisational and political processes we need to be wary of assuming organisational and labour market convergence across countries and social spaces. Thus, we must begin from the assumption that the spatial organisation, history and sociology bring heterogeneity of practices and experiences. Current challenges in organisations are associated with the impact of aspects such as cultural diversity, including understandings of labour and markets. In that sense, more insight is required to make greater sense of the shape, fluidity and dynamism of gendering practices in collective contexts: viz, labour markets, -work organisation and the impact of non-working life upon the experience of workers (see Martin, 2006:256).

The Latin American region presents major challenges since the relationship between gender, work and employment remains under-researched mainly due to an uneven focus on indicators of material progress (see Yusuf, 2003). In general, the macro level is more widely discussed than the meso and micro levels yet in the Latin American region, division of labour is strongly gendered and linked to gender and generally family organisation. As a result, the incidence of the informal labour market makes it difficult to theorise globalisation unless it is looked at from a systems effect perspective (see Smith, 2005). Conceptually, a major constraint in developing regions is rooted in a lack of understanding as to how gender perspectives can be identified and addressed (United Nations, 2002). A combination of work structures, organisation of employment, subjective attitudes and culture leads to the normalisation of discrimination leading to a lack of opportunities. Stereotypical views of occupations and roles perpetuate patterns of job allocation, making some labour dynamics restrictive and predictable (i.e., data continues to highlight the extent of occupational gender divisions still much more marked than in Europe and North America; a significant majority of managers are men, a significant majority of nurses and secretaries are women). This creates organisational realities where
inequalities, oppression, and invisibility are reproduced through gendered structures and processes that are reinforced through external power structures. In summary, gendered politics transversally permeate work cultures and employment practices.

This stream invites contributions from those researching the gendered dimensions of work and employment in the Latin American context. We especially welcome papers adopting an interdisciplinary perspective. Papers are invited on (but not limited to) the following themes:

1. Gendering of labour market dynamics.
2. Representations and identities at work.
3. Critical accounts of the impact of organisational processes on political and social representations of work and employment.
4. Gendered cultures in organisations.
5. Gender relations and management.
6. Affiliation (workplace and extra workplace political action).
7. Impact of external political agendas on gendered workplace action.

Abstracts of approximately 500 words (ONE page, Word document, single spaced, excluding references) are invited by 1st November 2009 with decisions on acceptance to be made by stream leaders within one month. All abstracts will be peer reviewed. New and young scholars with 'work in progress' papers are welcomed. In the case of co-authored papers, ONE person should be identified as the corresponding author. Note that due to restrictions of space, multiple submissions by the same author will not be timetabled. Abstracts should be emailed to paul.stewart.100@strath.ac.uk jenny.rodriguez@strath.ac.uk valeria.pulignano@soc.kuleuven.be Abstracts should include FULL contact details, including your name, institutional affiliation, mailing address, and e-mail address. State the title of the stream to which you are submitting your abstract.