LUND UNIVERSITY
Faculty of Social Sciences

Working for change

Experiences of Danish and Swedish diversity consultants

Author: Ronja Mannov Olesen

Supervisor: Giulia Garofalo
Master of Science in Social Studies of Gender
Major: Gender Studies
Graduate School, Faculty of Social Sciences

Master's Thesis
30 ECTS
Course: SIMV07
Term: Spring 2015

Abstract

The six participants, two in Sweden and four in Denmark, interviewed for this thesis are all organizational outsiders: they consult organizations on how to create diverse workplaces. The empirical, qualitative material is analyzed within an interdisciplinary framework consisting of feminist, queer, anti-racist, affect and critical diversity theories. The focus of the thesis concerns resistance from organizational actors, how to engage and maintain an interest in diversity work in organizations as an outsider, and the motivations of the participants. Finally, the thesis analyzes the role of, and differences in, anti-discrimination workplace legislation in Sweden and Denmark. While some participants find the legislation irrelevant or counterproductive to their work, others find it legitimizing and helpful. The paradigms of the participants vary greatly, and are reflected in their approaches, motivations and attitudes toward legislation. Some rely predominantly on the business case, while others merge it with social justice arguments. My analysis suggests that the paradigms of the participants vary due to differences in personal and educational background, and that participants based in Sweden experience increased legitimacy and freedom to choose discursive strategies than those in Denmark, who experience a somewhat skeptical attitude toward diversity initiatives. I conclude that detailed, preventive measures in workplace legislation and policies are key to an increased legitimization of diversity work.

1. Introduction

<u>My arrival[1] at this topic</u>

My interest in the experiences of diversity practitioners arose from two different, but related, aspects of my life: activism and academia. I have developed an interest in change and inclusion processes through volunteering as a workshop facilitator with the Danish educational project The Normstormers. Working with norm criticism as a tool for change, and encountering school children in complex situations, made me wonder: how does 'good' change look? And how does it *feel* - both for those who want to create change, and those who 'have to' change? Simultaneously, I became a co-organizer of MIX Copenhagen LesbianGayBiTrans Film Festival. In that non-hierarchical volunteer-run organization, I wondered: who can be included in a working collective? How can uncomfortable talks about unequal distribution of power be initiated? In both projects, I was also wondering: when are ideologies packaged and sold in the capitalist market instead of sparking 'real' change? What is 'real' change, anyway? Of course, as an academic, my ongoing commitment to queer, trans, feminist, anti-racist, anti-capitalist and post-colonial theory and research has enabled me to formulate these questions, and to find a way to address them in this thesis. Throughout my time as a master's student, I have been particularly influenced by recent empirical and theoretical work on homonormativity (Duggan, 2003), homonationalism (Puar, 2007; Nebeling Petersen, 2012), postfeminism (McRobbie, 2009), norm critical education (Bromseth & Darj, 2010) and the writings of Sara Ahmed. Her work, in particular, is useful for the project of this thesis, as I will show in my literature review.

Issues of responsibility, accountability, unequal distribution of rights and privileges continue to be relevant in Gender Studies, and in my daily life, and this is why I wish to explore them. From my position as a privileged white, ethnically Danish, middle-class, young, able-bodied, queer cis-woman, I am committed to investigating power relations as they play out in, with and around me. The aim of this project is not to argue for why diverse workplaces are a good idea, or to provide guidelines for how diversity work should be done. Neither do I want to ask *if* diversity projects work, but rather, *how* they work (Mease, 2009, p. 181). I am also not aiming to theorize on race, gender, ethnicity, class, sexuality, age, ability, religion, etc in the workplace, or discuss whether or not these differences are important in the Swedish and Danish contexts - the knowledge I have accessed through my

---

[1] Inspired by Ahmed (2012): "Every research project has a story, which is the story of an arrival" (p. 2).

activist and academic work confirms that these differences matter. Rather, this thesis aims to take on a more "performative" and "agentic" perspective, going "beyond conceptual debates" in order to examine "the processes and practices that give an initiative content and shape" (Zanoni et al., 2010, p. 19-20). In short, I aim to account for the discursive strategies used by the diversity consultants interviewed for the project. I am interested in how they navigate between different subject positions and align themselves with 'paradigms' of contemporary diversity thinking.

My aim is to examine the arguments, tactics, positions and motivations of the participants, in order to answer the following research questions:

In contemporary Danish and Swedish contexts, which discursive strategies are chosen by a selection of diversity practitioners in their work? Which paradigms do the practitioners align themselves with?
Subquestions: *How does legislation influence the participants' ability to do their work? Which resistance do they encounter in their work? What are their motivations?*

Ultimately, my aim is to understand what the current climate is for diversity work in these local, Scandinavian contexts. I hope, then, to contribute to the fields of critical diversity studies, feminist organizational studies, as well as queer, feminist and anti-racist research more broadly.

In this thesis I wish to address three separate but interlinked issues in four analytical chapters: Chapter 3 will address the experiences of resistance: which counter-arguments are the practitioners met with? Why do organizations choose not to prioritize diversity? I find practitioners an interesting 'filter' through which to ask these questions since they *encounter* resistance as they work to change organizational culture, and will have to make sense of this resistance and find a strategy to counter it. Chapters 4 and 5 will examine the position of the external consultant from different angles. I will examine the affective work they do as well as which discursive strategies they use. Chapter 6 will address the motivations of the participants: why do you do what you do? This final and apparently simple, yet complex, question problematizes the reflections the participants offered on their choice of profession. I will conclude the thesis with a discussion on diversity paradigms, the role of legislation according to participants, and the balancing act which diversity work, ultimately, is.

Before embarking on the actual analysis, I will begin by sketching out the theoretical fields, which this thesis is based on, and contributes to. I will continue by briefly clarifying my usage of certain concepts and then present my methodological framework and introduce the participants interviewed for the project. A brief chapter on discrimination legislation follows.

<u>Theoretical framework</u>

This thesis is interdisciplinary in the sense that it engages with academic texts from a number of different, but interlinked fields: critical diversity studies, feminist organization studies, affect theory and queer theory are my main sources of inspiration and influence. My starting point in feminist gender studies specifically, and broadly the humanities and social sciences, will shape my entire approach, analysis and outcome in a way which will contribute to the existing research on diversity management, but which will not have management studies as a primary affiliation. Neither will gender be the focal point of this thesis. As Ahmed (2012) notes, "feminism" is not "necessarily *about* gender," rather, feminist projects will be informed by feminist theorists, since they "[...] offer critical insight into the mechanisms of power as such, and in particular, how power can be *redone* at the moment it is imagined as *undone*" (p. 13).

This study is based on interviews with consultants who live and work within Denmark and Sweden: two Western, Northern welfare states that are among the richest in the World. These welfare states do not function in isolation from global, neoliberal capitalist formations. Neoliberal state ideals vary, but at the core is the aim of a free, capitalist market, which should regulate itself independent from state intervention (Jansson, 2012, p, 129). Duggan (2003) describes "privatization" and "personal responsibility" as key terms within a neoliberal logic (p. 12), which claims to separate the economic sphere from the political and cultural ones. However, this is an illusion, as she argues: "In the real world, class and racial hierarchies, gender and sexual institutions, religious and ethnic boundaries are the channels through which money, political power, cultural resources, and social organization flow" (p. xiv). Duggan warns that neoliberal, contemporary cultural politics takes the shape of a "[...] newly emergent "equality" politics that supports "diversity" and "tolerance," but defines these in the narrowest terms, and entirely within the framework of globalist neoliberalism" (21). Ward (2008) presents related points about the co-optation of diversity in her work on LGBT activist organizations. "In diversity culture," she argues, "multiple identities (and the histories and struggles they invoke) are talked about, represented, celebrated, but they are also

managed, commodified and reduced to easy-to-understand stereotypes" (Ward, 2008, p. 29). Inspired by Duggan and Ward, whose works are located within a U.S. context, my interest in diversity practitioners stems from a concern with the way human differences are incorporated into the neoliberal, global economy, and the way individuals and organizations in the Scandinavian welfare states respond to this.

This thesis is also inspired by selected works of Ahmed (2010; 2012; 2014). In her writings Ahmed engages with the origins, orientations, and associations of everyday objects, affects and concepts, such as love and shame (2014), diversity (2012) and happiness (2010). She investigates their affective capacities, the investments they are attributed with and the value they accumulate. For example, she examines how people become (emotionally) invested in particular projects, such as the nation (2014, p. 12). Importantly, Ahmed's approach to cultural analysis is located within feminist, queer and critical race studies, allowing her to investigate processes of inclusion and exclusion as well as how social norms are reproduced. As she notes on the importance of talking about categories such as race: "To proceed as if the categories do not matter because they should not matter would be to fail to show how the categories continue to ground social existence" (2012, p. 182). Like Ward and Duggan, Ahmed also engages with the way 'diversity' is being incorporated into national and global projects. Based on her research on diversity practitioners in the UK, Ahmed (2012) notes that a "new equality regime" is instituting "equality as a positive duty" (p. 8). Referencing Acker's concept of "inequality regimes" (2006, p. 443), Ahmed stresses that "[...] an equality regime *can be* an inequality regime given new form, a set of processes that maintain what is supposedly being redressed" (2012, p. 8).

Literature on diversity management does, largely, come from the U.S. and the UK, since this is where the discipline has been fostered (Kirton & Greene, 2009, p. 159). Diversity management literature from these countries is divided into several strands, and I will engage with the one called critical diversity studies in which the purportedly positive effects of diversity management are questioned, such as the claim that the bottom line benefits, and that the conditions of minorities are improved (Risberg & Søderberg, 2008, p. 428). The premise of critical diversity studies is that "Diversity management does not live up to its critical potential, mainly because a powerful business rhetoric that emphasizes individual contributions fails to address issues of social inequality and inclusion" (Benschop, 2010, p. 4). Several anthologies have been published in which diversity management practices are examined from a number of critical angles (for example Prasad et al., 1997; Konrad, Prasad & Pringle, 2006). Prasad and Mills (1997) argue that management academics tend to

take on the role of 'distant cheerleaders' - applauding diversity management without really engaging with the content and effects of it (p. 5). Swan & Fox (2010) remark that there has been a "turn to diversity," a term which "refers to the way that diversity as a concept and set of practices has replaced or supplemented the concepts and practices of equal opportunities and affirmative action (p. 570). This appears to be particularly well-documented in a UK context (see for example Ahmed, 2012). Prasad & Mills argue that management of diversity has quickly become immensely popular within a North American context, developing into a diversity industry with, for example, an abundance of consultants (1997, p. 4). Likewise, as Risberg & Søderberg argue, "Danish business consultants and academics are increasingly talking and writing about the need to pay more attention to a diverse workforce and reflect on how diversity can be managed in an organizational context" (2008, p. 431). I will return to the Scandinavian context below. Prasad & Mills applaud diversity's increasingly positive connotations, but they warn that "managing diversity at the workplace presents as many dilemmas as triumphs, and is constantly fraught with innumerable tensions, conflicts, and contradictions" (1997, p. 5). Ahmed (2012) likewise stresses the need for "[...] research describing the complicated and messy situations in which diversity workers often find themselves" (p. 10), research which, she argues, is largely missing.

In general, there is a noticeable lack of research which focuses on the experiences and activities of diversity professionals (Ahmed, 2012, p. 15; Kirton & Greene, 2009, p. 160). Furthermore, studies that do engage with these experiences are overwhelmingly centered on *internal* diversity professionals: specialists, champions, and agents of diversity who work within an organization and exclusively tend to issues of diversity and inclusion in that organization (see for example Ahmed, 2012; Kirton et al., 2007; Kirton & Greene, 2009; Benschop, 2010; Risberg & Søderberg, 2008). A remarkable exception in that respect is Mease's study (2009; 2012), which is based on interviews with 19 American external consultants. This lack of research on external diversity consultants is a motivating factor for me, since I can contribute to this specific gap in the literature.

Although much of the literature I will engage with in this thesis hails from a North American, Australian or UK context, the project itself is located within a local, Scandinavian context. In general, there is a need for research which accounts for diversity as locally specific (Prasad, Pringle & Konrad, 2006, p. 12; Kirton et al., 2007, p. 1993; Due Billing & Sundin, 2006, p. 101), as well as a need for research about diversity initiatives in places *outside* of the Anglophone countries. Likewise, it is important to examine how feminist knowledge is locally translated into policies, plans, rules and laws, as well as how discourses travel - that is,

to look at " [...] how transfers and shifts take place in a globalised world" (Samuelsson, Krekula & Åberg, 2012, p. 242). The 'when and where' of diversity work also matters because it varies how and why discrimination persists: Prasad, Pringle & Konrad argue that Scandinavia, for example, has achieved major advances for women, while continuing to struggle with inclusion of ethnic minorities (2006, p. 3). I would add that not only does it matter which issues actually persist, but also whether or not they are *regarded* as persisting. For example, recent Danish state intitiatives reflect the turn towards diversity and equal opportunities as concerning all kinds of discrimination, and not just equality between men and women (Randorff Hegnhøj, Olsen & Poulsen, 2007, p. 4). Liinason states that narratives of Sweden as a "feminist utopia" are widely distributed: Sweden - along with Denmark, Norway and Finland - has a unique status internationally as successful at institutionalizing gender equality and "harmony" between the sexes (2012, p. 219-220). Samuelsson, Krekula & Åberg (2012) argue a similar point and highlight the common usage of the word "neighbor" to describe the Scandinavian and/or Nordic countries: "The word 'neighbor' signals that there is a closeness between the Nordic countries, that we have embarked on a joint journey towards gender equality, and that together we have been successful" (p. 239). This perceived closeness is also one of the motivating factors which has spurred me to engage with not only one, but two countries in the region. There is also a need to be cautious about this celebratory, postfeminist discourse which has become prevalent along with the diversity agenda during the last few decades. As Ward (2008) argues, postfeminism supposedly promises a "[...] new era in which gender inequality had become passé, and therefore virtually nonexistent" (p. 9). Postfeminist sentiments are particularly prevalent in Scandinavia, making gender inequality seem like a 'thing of the past,' while positioning *other* countries and cultures as backwards (Liinason, p. 230). This thesis aims to contribute to the nuancing and troubling of this view. The introduction of the concept of 'diversity' in Scandinavia has come to have very limited connotations. The discourse of diversity is arguably restricted to concern gender and ethnicity/race, with the consequence that other dimensions and characteristics are neglected "under the diversity heading" (Due Billing & Sundin, 2006, p. 102). This neglect is for example present in Risberg & Søderberg's article on diversity management in Denmark, in which they consistently restrict their usage of the term diversity to concern ethnicity and gender. They do stress that most research on diversity management in Denmark has been "[...] confined to dealing with inclusion and integration of ethnic minorities – a group who constitute a societal and economical problem due to their higher unemployment rate and the huge public expenses to their transfer payments" (2008, p. 436). This quote, to me, not only

highlights the need for further research on how the term 'diversity' is used in organizations in Denmark, but also the need for research from a critical, feminist, anti-racist angle, since the way the authors describe ethnic minorities is highly problematic and reproduces racist stereotypes. I will return to the connotations of 'diversity' throughout the thesis, since it was occasionally discussed by my participants.

My interest in this project, then, circulates around the concept of 'diversity' and its many connotations. Because of its status as a "management term," Ahmed argues, "diversity becomes something to be managed and valued as a human resource" (p. 53), a product or an attribute which is regarded as valuable. As Ahmed also notes, 'diversity' can both be used descriptively - as an adjective - and normatively: "as an expression of the priorities, values or commitments of an organization" (2012, p. 52). 'Diversity' as a term, then, does not innocently connote 'human difference' as Ward also maintains: "[...] there is an important distinction to be made between *diversity* as a material fact of difference, and *diversity politics* as an ideological project oriented toward normalizing and containing difference" (2008, 48). 'Diversity,' then, has become embedded in a neoliberal logic where it can connote *difference as* 'value,' 'asset,' and 'profit.' Benschop argues that a shift has occurred: "Whereas the smaller notion of diversity as gender, race and class focuses on inequalities between social groups, the broad notion of diversity shifts the emphasis to individual difference [...] Over time business motives seem to have replaced equality motives as the drivers to pay attention to diversity" (2010, p. 3). 'Diversity' has generally replaced 'equality' in a - primarily, but not exclusively - British context (Kirton & Greene, 2009, p. 161), since its connotations are more "collaborative" than "confrontational" (Ahmed, 2012, p. 64).

Based on the multiplicity of connotations diversity arguably has, in this thesis, I will be using 'diversity' as an umbrella term: I will use it to connote human difference, and when I explicitly want to use it to signify diversity as political work, as a term, and as a practice, I will either place it in citation marks ('diversity') or make sure it is presented as 'diversity work,' 'diversity initiatives,' etc. Importantly, many of my participants do *not* refer to their work as diversity work - some of them even categorically avoid the term. However, for practical reasons, I will still call their work 'diversity work,' since they are - broadly speaking - involved with change work which aims to promote workplace inclusivity toward human difference.

<u>Legislation</u>

Both Denmark and Sweden have anti-discrimination laws concerning workplaces. In this section I will briefly present them, since they influence the way the participants in this study approach their work. In the concluding discussion in the end of this thesis I will elaborate on the participants' own views on legislation and the importance it does and should have when working with diversity.

When I emailed my participants and asked them where they would find information about Danish workplace legislation, they all directed me to different sources: Britt told me to ask the Danish Institute for Human Rights, Niels told me to ask the Ministry of Equality, and Annie told me to consult ILGA's website. None of the sources proved completely fulfilling, but the fact that all participants directed me to different sources is interesting to me: there does not seem to *one* obvious source - governmental or otherwise - where diversity practitioners find their information. I also asked LGBT Denmark, since I know they have a working group concerning employment rights. The chairperson of LGBT Denmark, Søren Laursen, replied with a link to the "Law on the ban on differential treatment at the work market, etc" (Law no. 1349, 2008). In the law, "differential treatment" is defined as: "any direct or indirect differential treatment on the basis of race, skin color, religion or faith, political views, sexual orientation, age, handicap or national, social or ethnic heritage" (Chapter 1, §1). The law covers both actual and hypothetical differential treatment - for example when a person "is treated less well than another is, has been, or would be treated in a similar situation" (Chapter 1, §1, pt. 2) because of the factors listed above, or when "a supposedly neutral praxis, decision or criteria" (Chapter 1, §1, pt. 3) would leave a person in a less favorable position based on the factors above. "Giving instructions to treat a person differentially" (Chapter 1, §1, pt. 5) as well as "harassment" are also mentioned as banned in the law - the latter entails "differential treatment [...] with the aim or effect of violating a person's dignity and creating a hostile, threatening, degrading, humiliating or uncomfortable climate for the person" (Chapter 1, §1, pt. 4). In Chapter 2 of the law, specific examples of differential treatment are listed which employers cannot do: treat employees differently regarding "hiring, firing, transfer, promotion or regarding pay- or working terms" (Chapter 2, §2). Furthermore, employers cannot "request, gather or receive and make use of information" (Chapter 2, §4) about applicants' conditions concerning all of the factors listed above - except for handicap and age, which seem to have special status in the law as factors which is can *sometimes* be okay to treat differently. Furthermore, if religion, faith or political views are of

"importance" to the employing organization, differential treatment can be allowed (Chapter 3, §6). In fact, if special permission is granted by the minister, it is permitted for an organization to treat employees differently for *any* of the factors named in the beginning of the law (Chapter 3, §6, pt. 2). If someone has been treated differently, they have to "prove factual circumstances," and then it is up to the employing organization to counter this accusation by proving the opposite (Chapter 4, §7a). In the interview, Annie stressed that she thinks that discrimination "[...] can be hard to prove. And it can be hard to take a case up and start gathering that evidence for an employer that you would still wanna work for. Maybe. Because that can make things really uncomfortable." All cases concerning differential treatment are decided by the Council for Equal Treatment, and the Danish Institute for Human Rights is in charge of monitoring equality issues - that is, exclusively concerning gender. Gender is, in fact, not mentioned in this law at all. The "Law for equal treatment of men and women regarding work, etc" (Law no. 645, 2011) deals specifically with this issue, but restricts gender to concern men and women.

The law, then, does name a wide variety of actions as illegal "differential treatment," however, it also leaves a lot of room for interpretation: who is to decide what is "humiliating?" And when can you "prove" that humiliation happens because of one's minority status? Furthermore, who decides when a job applicant has been rejected because their religion or political views were *too* "important" for the hiring organization? According to Søren Laursen from LGBT Denmark, his organization are quite content with the law, except for one thing: "we want gender identity stated as a specific reason for protection. Trans people are very much at risk at the employment market, but they are not specifically mentioned."[2] Further along in the thesis, I will elaborate on the way gender identity and non-binary gender are perceived as issues of concern for those of my participants who actually do bring it up in their work.

Annie, an American who lives in Denmark and works in a small NGO for LGBT workplace inclusion, added another interesting observation about Danish hiring culture. In the interview, I mentioned that it is not legal to ask about a person's sexual orientation, which Annie was aware of:

Annie: "But you kind of... Danes do."

Ronja: "They do?"

---

[2] "Vi vil have kønsidentitet anføres som specifik beskyttelsesgrund. Transpersoner er stærkt udsatte på arbejdsmarkedet, men de står ikke specifikt nævnt." - from an email correspondance with the author on May 12, 2015.

Annie: "I was very surprised at my first - well, only - job interview here in Denmark: 'hi, my name is bla bla, I have two kids, my wife is..,' and I am like 'oh my, that is a lot of information about you. And I'm single, and a lesbian,' and you know [laughs]" Annie elaborated that she thinks this is connected to the heteronormative blind spot of not realizing that straight people "come out all the time." Employers, then, do not always abide by the law, because Danish working culture 'overrules' it by demanding a high level of openness. As highlighted by Prasad, Pringle & Konrad (2006), anti-discrimination laws are "[...] often disregarded or even violated in actual organizational situations" (p. 9).

There is only one preventive, and vaguely formulated, measure in the law, and only for one group of people: the employer has to "make arrangements that are appropriate concerning the specific needs of giving a person with handicap access to employment" However, making these arrangements is only demanded if it will not cause the employer "a disproportionately large burden" (Chapter 2, §2a). In my view, the major difference between the Danish and the Swedish laws is that the Swedish one explicitly demands preventive measures, as I will elaborate on below. This point is also stressed by Risberg & Søderberg, who state that the Danish "[...] law has mainly functioned reactively. It has made it possible for employees to complain of discrimination, but it has not urged companies to introduce affirmative action" (2008, p. 430).

I easily found the Swedish "Discrimination law" (Law no. 567, 2008) by Googling it. The law concerns all areas of life, and has as a purpose to "counteract discrimination and in other ways further equal rights and possibilities regardless of gender, gender transgressive identity or expression, ethnic belonging, religion or other faith, disabilities, sexual orientation or age" (Chapter 1, §1). The definitions of direct and indirect discrimination are almost identical to the Danish definitions of differential treatment, and the Swedish law also contains a ban on harassment (Chapter 1, §4). The law contains certain sections specifically for work life. The Swedish law is different in some significant areas from the Danish one: It deals with "discrimination" instead of "differential treatment" - the terms are synonyms, but the latter sounds like a euphemism, and the Swedish law seems concerned with a human rights approach, with its emphasis on not only discrimination, but also "equal rights." The Swedish law explicitly mentions gender, gender identity and gender expression as causes for discrimination, which neither of the Danish laws referred to above do. The Swedish law is *longer* - it simply attends to more details concerning what discrimination is, and how it can be prevented, and has several paragraphs on, for example, recruitment and equal pay (Chapter 3, §7-§12). Another example is that it is explicitly stated that employers

cannot retaliate against an employee who is accusing them of discrimination according to the law (Chapter 2, §18). This is significant, following Annie's statement that it can be difficult and uncomfortable to accuse your employer for discrimination in Denmark. The preventive element is by far the most remarkable difference between the discrimination laws of Denmark and Sweden. In Chapter 3 of the Swedish law, entitled "Active measures," it says that "employers and employees must cooperate on active measures to achieve equal rights and opportunities in the working life" (§1). In addition, organizations with more than 25 employees have to create an "equality plan" every third year where preventive measures are described, and a plan for how they will be carried out is in place (Chapter 3, §13). Sweden has a national, independent Discrimination Ombudsman who is both in charge of inspecting organizations and making sure the law is abided to, and making decisions in cases about discrimination (Chapter 4, §1). Importantly, the majority of the preventive measures - such as conducting "goal-oriented work to actively promote equal rights and opportunities" - are restricted to exclusively concern gender, ethnicity and religion/faith (Chapter3, §3). Liv, who works for a Swedish member-organization, explained why she finds this restriction problematic, since the rest of the causes for discrimination will not be attended to until "something has happened [...] all causes [for discrimination] which there are no preventive demands for don't get the same kind of legitimacy. You can't discover discrimination based on these causes because we don't need to work with them."[3] Liv has an interesting addition: "The employers know they have a responsibility to prevent discrimination, but to work preventively with these causes doesn't automatically lead to an inclusive workplace."[4] In the end of this thesis I will engage with exactly this difficult issue: how to create inclusive workplaces, with or without legislation as a catalyst or motivating factor.

---

[3] "før der er sket noget [...] alle grunde som der ikke er forebyggelseskrav om, får ikke samme legitimitet. Man kan ikke opdage diskriminering ud fra disse grunde, fordi vi ikke behøver at arbejde med dem."
[4] "Arbejdsgiverne ved jo godt at de har et ansvar for at forebygge diskriminering, men at arbejde forebyggende med de her grunde betyder jo ikke at man får en inkluderende arbejdsplads"

2. Methodology

Finding and selecting research participants

In this chapter I will first elaborate on how I found and approached my research participants. I will then proceed to elaborate on the choices I made concerning epistemology, methodology and methods.

My search for participants ended up greatly influencing how I approached my topic, since I realized that diversity consultants were probably not as I had first imagined them to be. Initially, I was particularly interested in people from gender or minority studies. I wanted to avoid having business studies graduates because I did not want participants who had a 'traditional' consultant background: someone who had studied business management or human resources in university, and then gone straight into the business world. My hypothesis was that graduates from other disciplines, and less obvious 'diversity management' backgrounds, might have a more critical view of the sector. However, as I was Googling my way to potential participants, it became clear to me that many consultants or practitioners came from quite diverse educational and occupational backgrounds, and that I could probably not make any judgement on their mindset or 'level of critical awareness' based on their resumés or the programs they had graduated from. In addition, it was particularly difficult to find Danish participants with academic experience from the fields of gender and minority studies, since there are very few programs available in Danish universities where such a focus is possible. My sampling approach might be referred to as purposive criterion sampling, since I was strategically aiming to find participants that met certain criteria (Bryman, 2012, p. 419) - importantly, as I have showed, my sampling criteria changed as I was initiating the search for participants. However, I also aimed at a high level of variation which entails "[...] sampling to ensure as wide a variation as possible in terms of the dimension of interest" (p. 419). I decided to email practitioners that were at least slightly different from each other in terms of education, experience, expertise and present occupation - in particular regarding the size of their workplace, the specific focus of their work, and their position in the organizational hierarchy. I chose these variables to cultivate a variety of views on a number of issues: personal motivation, the experience of resistance to their work and the level of freedom they had in choosing methods and strategies. I was also aware of contacting people of different genders, ages and ethnicities.

What my participants do have in common is, firstly, hands-on experience: experience in facilitating workshops or in some other way initiating and/or implementing change processes. I wanted participants who are personally involved in change processes and have regular, direct contact with both management and employees from different kinds of organizations. Secondly, I decided only to contact external practitioners, or consultants: people who were hired by an organization to consult, facilitate and/or implement diversity measures for restricted periods of time. Consultants are characterized as organizational outsiders whenever they are "[...] in the position of advising about diversity issues without the authority to implement or make major funding decisions" (Mease, 2012, p. 388). External consultants, I assumed, would have experiences from a number of different organizations to reflect on, in addition to not necessarily feeling particularly loyal toward their clients. I decided to include one organizational insider, Eva, who works in a Swedish city administration: she works for the same general employer as the ones she is consulting, but she is not a daily part of the same actual workplace as them. I included her for two primary reasons: firstly, it would be interesting to compare the guidelines and rules imposed on and by her to those which operate in the private and non-profit sectors, and secondly, I knew that she would have previous work experience from private and civil sectors.

My reason for sampling from both Denmark and Sweden is not that I want to do a straight forward comparative study between them. Rather, I wish to treat the difference in geographical and national affiliation as a factor of equal importance to, for example, level of experience, public or private sector work, etc. By doing so, my aim is two-fold: firstly, I wish to examine whether state-specific measures (such as legislation) actually plays an important role in the experiences of the participants, or if other factors are more defining. Secondly, I wish to question the hierarchization which automatically places national identities as both the most important identity marker and the primary framework for one's work circumstances. In sum, then, I want the difference between Denmark and Sweden - a difference which is widely researched and much discussed in the media - to be a factor in the study only if it turns out that it is indeed an important factor. For practical and financial reasons, I decided to find participants based in the Skåne region and participants primarily based in or within a few hours of Copenhagen. Of my six interviews, two were based in Skåne, three based in Copenhagen and one based in a smaller Danish city. Because I did not aim to conduct a conventional comparative study between the two states, I did not aim to 'match' every Danish participant with a similar Swedish one, or vice versa. Deciding on a proper sample size was difficult, since there are no clear-cut guidelines for proper sample sizes when conducting

qualitative interviews (Bryman, 2012, p. 425). I decided on six interviews because I would not have the time to conduct, transcribe and properly engage with more interviews in the period available to me for this project. In addition, I was not aiming to do a generalizable and fully representational study of external diversity practitioners in Denmark and Sweden.

I found the Danish participants by Googling the (Danish) words 'diversity' (mangfoldighed), 'equality' (ligestilling), 'inclusion' (inklusion), 'minorities' (minoriteter) and 'consultant' (konsulent) in various constellations, which proved to be an efficient method: a handful of useful consultancy firms quickly appeared. In addition, KVINFO's expert database was also useful, since it is searchable, and lists many different women working with equality and diversity. KVINFO is a renowned, Danish resource center on gender, equality and diversity. It was based in 1987, and is a self-governing institution under the Danish Ministry of Culture. The Swedish participants were found based on my own existing knowledge of diversity organizations, which I contacted. I also found rosaguiden.se to be useful, because it lists various companies working within the fields of diversity and equality. Rosaguiden.se is a business register for organizations working with equality and gender, founded and run by the NGO Feministiskt perspektiv. Interestingly, a similar web site does not exist in Denmark - KVINFO's database is not really comparable, because it lists women who are 'experts' within *any* professional field.

I contacted all potential participants by email, using the same short presentation as a template (see Appendix A). All of the potential participants I contacted showed a keen interest in my project and agreed to be part of the study, except one Danish consultant who informed me that she was too busy. The participants may have welcomed the opportunity to reflect on their work with a stranger, while also doing the 'good deed' of helping out a student.

Since my sample is relatively small, and I would like for the reader to have the possibility to draw their own conclusions about the positions of the participants, I will refer to, and quote, each of them individually. This research project, though, is not *about* the individual consultants, but rather the paradigms they represent, and the subject positions they take on. A few weeks after concluding each interview, I emailed all of the participants and asked them to identify themselves according to gender, sexual orientation, age, ethnicity, religion, disabilities and other identifications they found relevant to add. I chose to ask them these rather sensitive questions via email, and not in person during the interviews, since I wanted to give them the opportunity to answer the questions in their own time - or not at all. See Appendix B and C for the email I sent them, and a brief introduction of the participants.

Throughout the thesis I will mainly refer to the practitioners I interviewed as 'the participants' or 'my participants.' I will do this in order to avoid calling them 'the consultants' - a term which can be too narrow, since not all of the participants have job titles which include 'consultant' - and because sticking to one term helps to avoid confusion about who I am talking about. I will, similarly, primarily use the term 'organizational actors' when I am referring to the people my participants work with: the employees or managers they encounter in organizations they are hired to work with.

Interviews: accounting for experience and subjectification

The interviews I did were semi-structured, informal conversations with an approximate duration of one hour each, all of which were recorded with the permission of the participants, and later transcribed (see Appendix E). I did not take notes during the interviews, in order to be more present, engaged and encouraging. All interviews, except one, were conducted in person in undisturbed locations chosen by the participant. Three interviews were in the workplace of the participant, one in their home, and one in a café. Niels's interview was conducted by phone, which is not ideal for long interviews, and it arguably made it impossible for both myself and the participant to use and read vocalized responses (such as "hm-hm") and body language (Bryman, 2012, p. 488).

I brought my interview guide with me, in order to assure that I touched upon all of the topics I needed to. The structure and order of the interviews varied greatly, focusing more on past events in some cases, or on particular dilemmas in others. I would usually end the interviews by asking participants to sum up what motivations they had for doing their work. By ending with this type of question, I hoped that the participants would be more ready to reflect on, and share, the more personal side of their work motivations. All participants received the same written information about the project in advance of the interview (see Appendix D), but I also began each interview with an oral introduction, which differed in length and content from interview to interview. With some participants, sharing my own experiences and perspectives seemed appropriate and comfortable, and with others I limited myself to briefly clarifying the purpose of the project and the interview, as I had already stated it in the initial email correspondence.

I do not see my occasional openness as inherently harmful to the interviews, since I do not have any illusions that an interview can be objective, or a straight-forward representation of the subject's thoughts and feelings. Instead, the interview is a meeting between two people, who adjust to each other and the situation. As Smith (2005) argues,

interview situations are discursively situated conversations in which data is collaborately produced, and this should not be viewed as contamination (p. 139). Rather, by finding "common ground" (DeVault & Gross, 2007, p. 179) with my participants, I have shown genuine interest in, commitment to, and knowledge in the issues we discussed. The conditions of the interview and the power relations between researcher and participant are of great importance (p. 179). I wish to note that I experienced the interviews as relatively easy to conduct and participate in, and that I perceived that my participants had a similar experience. Importantly, this might be due to certain similarities in our social positions as highly educated, presumably middle class, and a shared interest and experience in talking about the issue of diversity. However, it was possible to create even more rapport with some participants rather than others due to mutual recognition of similiarities in age, gender, sexual orientation, and/or academic field. The assumed power asymmetry where the researcher has the upper hand was, in my perception, levelled somewhat both by my status as a grateful student, and by my primary interest in their professional (and not private) identities.

My epistemological approach to the interviews, as well as the entire research project, is based on the poststructuralist idea of social realities as continuously constituted by social actors. Scott champions a poststructuralist approach to experience in her influential 1991 text *The Evidence of Experience*. She argues that by viewing experience as " [...] uncontestable evidence and as an originary point of explanation" (p. 777), differences are naturalized and left un-examined, instead of being questioned, explored and analyzed. The risk, according to Scott, is that meanings, and the ideological systems they represent, become dehistorized and essentialized (p. 777): "What counts as experience is neither self-evident nor straight-forward; it is always contested, and always therefore political" (p. 797). In Scott's approach, discursive arguments are seen as mobilized by the participants in the specific situation of the interview. I perceive the interview situations for this project as historically situated events in which the participants were not only reflecting on their past activities, but also constituting the very act of reflection in the meeting with me. A basic idea in feminist research, according to DeVault and Gross (2007), is that "[...] telling requires a listener and that the listening shapes the account as well as the telling [...]" (p. 179). What the participants chose to share with me, and how, was not only shaped by their own subject positions, but also by mine: the way I reacted, the questions I asked, my body language and every smile and nod influenced the account the participants were telling in that particular event that was the interview. Further, the account the participants gave does not have a fixed meaning: I, by listening to it, was negotiating that meaning - both during the interview and after.

Scott is calling for a reading of linguistic events which does not "aim for the resolution of contradiction" (p. 793). In discourse analysis, which I will be using as my main analytical strategy, the discussion on agency is ongoing, in part because discourse analysis is a widely used, interdisciplinary approach with many contradictory meanings (Bacchi, 2005, p. 198-200; Potter & Wetherell, 1990, n.p.). Potter & Wetherell (1990) share Scott's encouragement to embrace contradiction: "There is a clear tension between seeing people as active users, on the one hand, and seeing discourse as generating, enabling and constraining, on the other. Put simply, discourse analysis studies how people use discourse and how discourse uses people" (n.p.). Instead of attempting to resolve the presumed conflict between seeing people as controlled by discourse or controlling discourse, Potter & Wetherell see it as the actual aim of discourse analysis to examine the mechanisms by which both processes take place. In Bacchi's words, it is the aim of feminist, poststructuralist discourse analysis to theorize "[...] a subject who is simultaneously made a speaking subject through discourse and who is subjected to those discourses" (2005, p. 205).

The politics of translation

The politics of language, translation and location are central questions in feminist academic practice, since they shape any research project. As Rich argues in her landmark essay *Notes Toward a Politics of Location*, "[...] a place on a map is also a place in history [...]" where the individual is "[...] created and trying to create" (2007 [1984], p. 369). Her point is that location is political, and that we - as feminists - need to realize where we are coming from. It matters, then, that this thesis has been written by a researcher with Danish as a first language, about Danish and Swedish contexts, based on interviews conducted in Danish, Swedish and English.

Three of the interviews were conducted exclusively in Danish, since it was the first language of both myself and the participants. Two were conducted where I spoke Danish, and the participants spoke their first language; Swedish. And finally, even though we both speak Danish, Annie's interview was conducted exclusively in English, since English was her first language. I transcribed both the Danish and the Danish/Swedish interviews into Danish, since I cannot write Swedish as easily as I understand it. As a result, then, a rather long string of translation ensued for the Swedish interviews: spoken Swedish was transcribed into Danish (by me) and quotes used in this thesis were translated into English (by me). I informed the participants of this, and gave them the possibility to approve their quotes. There exists a real risk that I have misunderstood or misinterpreted the statements of all of my participants - an

unavoidable element of communication - but the risk is of course higher in the three interviews which were not conducted exclusively in my own first language. I was happy to be able to conduct the interviews in a way which allowed both my participants and I to express ourselves in the language of our preference, since I believe it enhances the quality of the research - both in terms of accuracy and validity, but also because it is politically important to avoid making one language - such as English - the only acceptable one. For this reason, I will include the transcribed version (in Danish) of quotes by the Swedish and Danish participants in footnotes. In her essay on the translation of Scandinavian, feminist academic texts into English, Widerberg (1998) argues for a political translation approach which aims to disrupt the general homogenization and Americanization of local knowledges (p. 135), which can ultimately impede for example Scandinavian contributions: "Removing the Scandinavian illustrations and references, to make it appear more like a general story valid to us all, also means removing our differences, making *our* specific contributions invisible" (p. 136). In that context, it has been helpful for me to understand the specifically Swedish context by reading Liinason's (2012) explanations of how Swedish terms can be translated into English, and how this translation has changed over time: in the 1970s, for example, there was no distinction between how 'jämställdhet' and 'jämlikhet' were translated into English - they both meant 'equal opportunities'. Today, Liinason explains: "'Jämlikhet' ('equal opportunities') refers to the equal rights of all, irrespective of ethnicity, religion, sexuality, sex, age, ability etc. and is thus a wider concept than 'jämställdhet' ('gender equality'), which specifically refers to equal opportunities between women and men" (p. 222, paraphrasing Holm 2001). Liinason does not mention the Swedish word for 'diversity' in her text - 'mångfald' - but I would argue that it can be viewed as the desired outcome of 'jämlikhet' - 'equal opportunities', as seen in the following logic: if everyone has equal opportunities, diversity will be the result. In Denmark, I would argue, a similar translation can be added: 'jämlikhet' = 'equal opportunities' = 'lighed'. 'Jämställdhet' = 'gender equality' = 'ligestilling'. 'Mångfald' = 'diversity' = 'mangfoldighed'. Liinason's text, then, importantly highlights that particular translation practices follow local understandings of key concepts, understandings which can and do change over time.

Treatment of empirical material

I chose to transcribe most of my participants' statements verbatim, since this project places great emphasis on the exact phrasing and wording of the participants. However, I did regularly paraphrase statements, especially my own interview questions, to speed up the transcription process and avoid unnecessary filling. For the subsequent treatment of the

material, I followed the general guidelines for coding and categorization of qualitative data proposed by Saldaña (2009). He stresses that there is no single, right way to code, since "each qualitative study is context-specific and your data are unique, as are you and your creative abilities to code them" (p. 30).

I began coding by reading through a hard print of the interview transcripts, taking notes and manually highlighting along the way - not every sentence, but the ones that stood out to me, or that I had noticed, during the interview or transcription, were relevant to my research purpose (Saldaña, p. 18). Thus, I was already doing tentative coding during transcription, which is recommended by Saldaña (p. 17). I subsequently read the transcripts multiple times, adding color codes according to the categories and themes I found most relevant. Categories are descriptive and explicit, while themes are more subtle, tacit and abstract (p. 13). As recommended by Saldaña (p. 22), I chose to do manual coding because of my lack of experience with coding in general, and coding software in particular (p. 22).

3. Resistance

Introduction

In this chapter, I wish to explore the participants' experiences of encountering resistance. I begin by addressing why I choose to use the word 'resistance', and what I mean by it. I will continue by looking at how the participants experience what I might call 'macro resistance': the lack of a general acknowledgement, by organizations, of diversity as an important and valuable point on the human resource agenda. Particularly, I will be bringing forth experiences of resistance based on material arguments: organizations lacking resources such as time and/or money. I will proceed to discuss defensive attitudes and delegitimizing arguments from organizational actors, and the participants' reflections on the reasons for these attitudes. Finally, I will address which topics and concepts are perceived by the participants as being particularly difficult to engage with, and which ones are experienced as 'off limits.'

On resistance

The diversity consultants Mease (2009; 2012) interviewed for her research, named *fear* among organizational actors as the primary cause for difficulty in their work. The fears included: "being accused of racism or sexism, saying the wrong thing, losing status, losing

control, hurting others, losing privilege, not knowing what to say, compromising one's authority, change, lost opportunities, or being vulnerable" (2012, p. 395). Many of these so-called fears, I would argue, could be named *resistance* toward organizational change: the fear of losing privilege or compromizing one's authority, for example, are articulations of opposition to change. Calling these examples 'resistance' instead of 'fear' does matter, since the latter concept risks positioning the organizational actors as passive victims, while the former articulates them as active subjects who are navigating their position within the change process. I find 'fear' to be an interesting affective metaphor, but ultimately an inappropriate concept in the context of opposing diversity initiatives. Organizational actors are not in any real danger, rather, they are in danger of losing privilege, and of realizing how they might benefit from, and contribute to, the current unequal distribution of organizational power and resources. It is not surprising, as my participants confirmed, that organizational actors respond to this kind of 'danger' with more than fear; they respond with active resistance. 'Resistance', then, is the rather broad concept I have chosen to describe the obstacles my participants meet at many different stages and levels - political, societal, cultural, institutional, individual - when they engage with creating change: silences, blank faces, (lack of) policies, emotional outbreaks, official statements, actions and attitudes. Resistance can take many forms, as Kirton & Greene (2009) show in their study, since diversity and equality work is "[...] an area of intense contestation, often arousing hostility, conflict and backlash" (p. 161). 'Resistance' has stuck with me throughout the thesis process because it is a word which accurately connotes what I want it to: movement (away from), navigating (around), opposition, negotiation. In addition, it is not - in contrast with fear - an exclusively negative word; it is dynamic. My usage of 'resistance' was itself negotiated and, well, resisted by my participants, as this quote by Britt shows: "All change is met with some sentimentality and growing pains because they [organizational actors] can't figure it out. But I would rather not call it resistance. Not even when I'm talking about initiatives. I would call it tensions. Tensions exist on many fronts, and need to be taken seriously, like a gift, like a point of learning."[5] For Britt, then, using 'tensions' to describe resistance allows her to view them it positively, as constructive and instructive gifts. Like 'resistance', 'tensions' has a distinctively somatic connotation, implying that it happens in and between bodies. In their article on diversity specialists' resistance toward the co-optation of the social justice agenda, Swan & Fox (2010)

---

[5] "Al forandring bliver mødt med noget vemod og vokseværk fordi de ikke kan finde ud af det. Men jeg vil helst ikke kalde det modstand. Heller ikke når jeg taler om tiltag. Jeg vil kalde det spændinger. Spændinger findes på mange fronter, og skal tages alvorligt, som en gave, som et læringspunkt."

explain the complexity of resistance like this: "The resistance and co-optation of diversity workers work in tandem with other groups' resistance and co-optation. There is not necessarily, then, any once and for all either resistance or co-optation when we look at organizational micro-practices and their effects" (p. 576). By using a broad, yet loaded concept like 'resistance', it has been possible for me to encourage the participants to reflect widely on their own experiences and on what they thought resistance meant to them.

Not on the agenda: the lack of acknowledgement of diversity

When talking about her previous job as head of diversity in a large, Danish city's central administration, Gudrun referred to the projects she did as "gigantic" and cross-departmental. However, these projects took place on the initiative of the mayor[6] at the time, who had loads of ambitions for the diversity agenda, according to Gudrun. The mayor "[...] was elected in 2006, and it was a completely different economic situation; a lot happened in 08-09 [...] the crisis came, and many were fired. Mergers. Suddenly there are 500 applicants for the same position. Therefore, because of natural causes, the focus and the momentum regarding the inclusion agenda, and exploiting the resources we have, changed completely."[7] Gudrun explained that the will to work with inclusion has "[...] completely disappeared; no-one at city hall can see the point in it these days."[8] Interestingly, Gudrun ascribes the fading interest in the diversity agenda to "natural causes:" the financial crises. This implies firstly, that the financial crisis was somehow not 'human-made' - as if it came out of nowhere. Secondly, as a consequence, it is implied that nothing could have been done to sustain interest in diversity in spite of the crisis.

In Annie's interview, the impact of the financial crisis also came up as a possible reason for why diversity initiatives are not prioritized. She explained that the original idea with the LGBT inclusion organization she co-founded was that it would be a consultancy firm. However, she argued, since it was founded in 2010, right after the financial crisis, this did not work out: "People are not focused on HR [human resources] at the moment, it's just starting to come back. Instead of just staying afloat, people are now trying to see how to improve things, instead of just not going bankrupt. HR has always been a fluffy point on the budget - you can make a solid bottom line argument, but people won't see it translate directly,

---

[6] For the sake of Gudrun's anonymity - not the mayor's - I will not name the mayor, although Gudrun did.
[7] "[...] blev valgt ind i 2006, der var en helt anden konjunktur, der skete enormt meget i 08-09 [...] mange bliver fyret. Sammenlægninger. Pludselig får man til alle stillinger 500 ansøgere. Derfor, af naturlige årsager, så blev fokus og momentum ift inklusionsdagsordenen, og at udnytte de resurser vi har, en fuldstændig anden."
[8] "fuldstændig væk, der er ingen der kan se ideen i det for tiden, på rådhuset"

as in sales." Thus, because human resources - including diversity management - is regarded as a "fluffy" issue, it is not high on the agenda of the companies Annie was hoping to work for in Denmark - but she stresses that this is a general tendency, and that the financial crisis has had a global impact on the low regard for diversity issues. In Annie's quote, the argument for why companies would want to invest in diversity is directly linked to the business case argument, which I will elaborate on in chapter 5. Thus, even though she *does* argue that diversity is good for business, companies will not listen because it does not immediately appear on the bottom line. Mease (2012) similarly stresses that diversity work is, in general, quite precarious: "Diversity consultants not only compete with each other for business and access to organizations; they also compete with other organizational initiatives and financial demands" (p. 390).

Niels also talked about the low regard for diversity initiatives. His organization "[...] always works with companies with limited budgets and where this agenda has limited legitimacy"[9]. However, he denied that diversity management in itself is met with resistance, but rather that resistance happens if organizations have to spend money on it, prioritize it and "do it seriously."[10] This lack of prioritizing is characteristic of "*institutional* resistance," which in contrast to "*individual* resistance" is defined by "the structural potency of the problem," according to Prasad & Mills (1997, p. 15). In the interview, Niels mentioned a survey where managers rated management issues, and where 'diversity' came in last. Bringing up the survey allowed him to prove a point about the general state of diversity management: it is not only his organization that is struggling with commitment; this is a general tendency. For Niels, the lack of time and money are the main reasons why organizations are hesitant about prioritizing diversity, while some of the other participants - Liv in particular - do not find that this is a common cause for resistance. This is significant, because Liv works in a similar organization as Niels does, as I will return to throughout the thesis.

On the defence: the 'non-issue' argument

In addition to the general reasons for resistance which I mentioned above, which in combination can result in diversity being low on the priority list for both the public and private sector, other factors can cause resistance. These factors do not exclusively come from 'high up': management, politicians, and global financial movements. Instead, they come from anyone in the organizational hierarchy. As Benschop (2010) highlights, critical approaches to

---

[9] "arbejder altid med virksomheder med begrænsede budgetter, og hvor denne dagsorden har begrænset legitimitet".
[10] "gøre det alvorligt"

diversity management need to conceptualize resistance broadly, and avoid thinking about it, for example, as employees formally opposing "managerial control:" "Proponents and adversaries of diversity management are divided over organizational ranks and hierarchies, and thus a more complex view on resistance is called for to understand the power dynamics in this field" (p. 7).

Niels and Annie both named 'Janteloven' - the Law of Jante - as a major factor which affects their ability to do diversity work specifically in Denmark. The Law of Jante is a commonly used concept which comes from the Danish-Norwegian writer Aksel Sandemose's novel *A Fugitive Crosses His Tracks* (1936 [1933]), in which the writer uses the Law to describe the oppressive atmosphere in the small, fictive Danish town Jante. The Law of Jante's most important message is: do not think you are special. The expression continues to be used all over Scandinavia, but especially in Denmark, to humorously describe the social codes which prevent the individual from standing out, being different and excelling, keeping people in line and on the same level (Den Store Danske, 2015). Niels explained it in the following way: "[...] basically, it's like this: we have built a verbal context which is 'if you don't do like we do, you're in trouble'"

Ronja: "It's a challenge, this 'we do it like this here', at the workplaces?"

Niels: "Not only at the workplaces - in Denmark there's a very strong culture for homogeneity, an entire set of common expressions and ethics about 'we are who we are, and we wanna continue to be so' [...] So, when you arrive, and you eat something different, you look differently and have a different religion, then you have to work directly against clashes."[11]

Niels, then, ascribes a great deal of importance to the Law of Jante, because it makes it particularly difficult for newcomers to a company - in his example, implicitly immigrants from non-Western contexts - to fit in. He calls the Law of Jante "subconscious," which makes it difficult to battle. According to Annie, the Law of Jante becomes harmful when it prevents people from taking initiative to speak up about diversity: "[...] if you have this difference, then don't raise your hand and be like 'I wanna be the gay in the company', you know. So I think this creates some sort of hesitance for people to start these sorts of initiatives. Because then all of a sudden you are calling a lot of attention to something which could potentially lead to

---

[11] "[...] dybest set er det: vi har bygget en verbal kontekst der hedder: hvis du ikke gør som os er der ballade."
Ronja. "Det er en udfordring at sådan gør vi her, på arbejdspladserne?"
Niels: "Ikke bare på arbejdspladserne - i Danmark er der en meget stærk kultur for homogeniteten, et helt ordsprog og etik om at vi er dem vi er, og det vil være gerne fortsætte med [...] Så når man kommer og spiser noget andet, ser anderledes ud og har en anden religion, så skal man arbejde målrettet mod clashes."

discrimination." The risk of discrimination, then, lurks right under the surface if an organizational actor diverts from the Law of Jante and calls attention to their own - or others' - difference. This echoes Ahmed (2012), who shows that "institutional passing" is regarded as much more desirable than calling attention to or asserting one's difference. Institutional passing means "[...] passing as the "right kind" of minority, the one who aims not to cause unhappiness or trouble" (p. 157). In her book, Ahmed refers to the "political and emotional labor" (p. 158) which racialized minorities have to do in order to avoid disturbing the whiteness of the institution. Similarly, as Annie shows, sexual minorities should not call attention to themselves, because it would disturb the heterosexual order of the organization. In this way, if discrimination happens, it becomes the responsibility of those who talk about differences and who assert their own differences. Ahmed is drawing on many black and critical race writers who have "[...] shown us over generations how the experience of racism is the experience of being the problem" (p. 152). I want to stress that homophobia and racism have certain mechanisms of exclusion in common; however, they are neither identical nor mutually exclusive, as intersectional theory has shown (Ward, 2008, p. 33-34). Complexities and specificities in their respective histories are different, also in terms of geographical location, since Ahmed is writing in a UK context. Ahmed's analysis of how exclusion and inclusion function is, however, relevant in many different contexts, including the one Annie described above. In Denmark, the very awareness of the Law of Jante becomes its excuse: it is ingrained in the culture; it is subconscious, as Niels calls it. It is 'just how we are', something to be shrugged and chuckled at.

What is perhaps even more difficult than 'just' talking about and asserting differences, is to talk about discrimination, although many of the participants do not even get to that point, or aim to do so. As Annie explained when I asked her if organizations are hesitant because they fear discrimination: "I think they don't even think that far ahead. They think 'everyone is so tolerant, we don't even need to talk about this issue.' And because of this, coupled with Janteloven and that you shouldn't be talking about your differences anyway, 'this is a non-issue we don't have to talk about.'" Eva explained the kind of resistance she is often met with:
"Silence. In the form of 'there is no time'. Silence in the form of 'hmmm....' And then nothing happens; nothing is done. It can also be outspoken: 'we haven't done anything like that

before,' 'it was fine before,' 'we are doing fine here in our working group,' 'we haven't done anything like that before here, so why do we have to work with it.'"[12]

All of the participants in this study recounted experiences of being met with what I call the 'non-issue argument' in different forms, because of a basic self-perception of openness and tolerance by organizational actors. Ahmed (2012) explains how diversity can be avoided on both an individual and institutional level by claiming diversity is already happening: "To be seen as "being diverse" can be a way of "not doing diversity," because the organization says it "is it," or that it already "does it," which means that it sees there is nothing left to do" (p. 76). Certain issues are harder to bring up than others, and as such, the participants all had different experiences of which things are possible to bring up, and which are not, as I will elaborate on below.

Triggering resistance

As Ahmed (2012) explains, words have a strategically central role in diversity work, and practitioners constantly have to make language choices in order to get through to their audiences. It is a constant balancing act in which practitioners have to listen to their audiences and use the words they use, while also making their own judgments about what audiences are capable of hearing: "You keep using different language at different times, until you hit the right one: the right one is the whatever works for the audience with whom you are working" (p. 73). A similar point on the importance of language is stressed by Swan & Fox (2010) in their study about strategies in diversity work. They stress that diversity practitioners can be "[...] profoundly aware of the way that diversity could attract certain types of vocabularies and ignore others" (p. 177). In this vein, Gudrun avoids words that might have a negative connotation, since, in her experience, the "more dogmatic and preachy"[13] approach does not work in practice. Negative words, then, are the ones who can be perceived as intentionally humiliating and condescending. Gudrun largely avoids the Danish word for diversity - 'mangfoldighed' - because a former colleague saw her use it on a web site, and told her that he was sick of it: "Mangfoldighed [diversity] - I don't use it that much, but in English - diversity - that is being used a lot, well, that's what I use, but maybe I'm not up-to-date on the recent trends in the U.S."[14] Not only are potentially negative connotations a concern, then, concepts

---

[12] "Stilhed. I form af 'der findes ikke tid'. Stilhed i form af 'hmm...' og så sker der ikke noget; det gøres ikke. Det kan også være udtalt: 'sådan har vi ikke gjort før, det gik fint før, vi har det fint her i vores arbejdsgruppe, vi har ikke ----sådan noget her så hvorfor skal vi arbejde med det'"

[13] "mere dogmatiske og belærende"

[14] "Mangfoldighed - jeg bruger det ikke så meget, men på engelsk, diversity, det bruges rigtig meget, det bruger jeg i hvert fald, men måske er jeg ikke helt opdateret på de seneste trends i USA"

which might be out-dated, or out of place, are also. Like Niels, Gudrun avoids what she calls the "discrimination agenda."[15] Niels notes that he prefers to use words that are known in the management world, and that "discrimination is absolutely not a management word."[16] Discrimination, and similar concepts, are kept at a distance by Gudrun and Niels because they are deemed irrelevant and too troubling for the positive agenda they aim to sustain. This approach of steering away from certain concepts is explained by Ahmed as "[...] an avoidance technique: a way of avoiding being avoided [...]", because "[...] to avoid jading people, you have to avoid using certain kinds of language" (2012, p. 64).

Interestingly, Britt, who also avoids 'mangfoldighed' and occasionally uses the English word 'diversity', likes the Danish synonym 'diversitet':

Britt: "I never use 'mangfolighed' [diversity]. Never. I can say 'diversitet', because it's more neutral."

Ronja: "But it means the same thing?"

Britt: "That's completely irrelevant, the point is how it is being read [...] I think *a lot* about which road I choose not to go down. Because every time you say something, so much other stuff comes along with it, which has been defined by other people; you don't want that with you, but it does come with you, right."[17]

Britt knows how important language is, and chooses her own carefully. She has very strong aversions toward common, Danish usage of the concept 'mangfoldighed' because she feels it is being misinterpreted: people claim they do diversity, when really they are focusing on one or three "'we feel sorry for you'-groups;"[18] such as women or ethnic minorities. In Britt's opinion, diversity in a Danish context is being used with too much negativity and simplicity, and not enough focus on the productive, positive and nuanced sides of it. Much like Niels, then, she is frustrated with a general Danish lack of knowledge about what diversity can and should do. But where Britt has, in her own words, "closed the door" on the Danish word for diversity, Niels finds it useful because he can make certain positive words stick to it - "growth" and "value," for example. Swan & Fox's study also shows that 'diversity' has many different usages and that "[...] the term, diversity, can change its meanings depending on what it gets linked with" (2010, p. 177). Ahmed (2012) similarly concludes in her account of the

---

[15] "diskriminationsdagsordenen"
[16] "Diskrimination er absolut ikke et management ord."
[17] Britt: "Jeg bruger aldrig mangfoldighed. Aldrig. Jeg kan godt sige diversitet, for det er mere neutralt."
Ronja: "Men det betyder jo det samme?"
Britt: "Det er fuldstændig lige meget, pointen er hvordan det bliver aflæst [...] Jeg tænker MEGET på hvilken bane jeg ikke går ud i. For hver gang du siger noget, så ryger der alt muligt med op, som nogen andre har bestemt, det vil du ikke have med, men det kommer med, ikke."
[18] "'synd for jer' grupper"

usage of 'diversity' by her participants: "The circulation of diversity certainly allows it to accumulate positive affective value [...] Diversity becomes a positive tool for action because of its status as a positive term" (p. 67). Because Niels - as well as Eva and Liv - know that 'diversity' has a more positive ring to it than other words, it becomes a useful tool.

Eva, in a Swedish context, mentioned that she usually avoids using 'racism' since it is a very sensitive topic, and can trigger a lot of resistance. When writing about the commitment of organizations to diversity, Ahmed (2012) states that "[...] a condition of commitment becomes the demand to use happy words and a probation on unhappy words. "Racism" is heard as an unhappy word, as one that would get in the way of our capacity to fulfill our commitment" (p. 154). "Unhappy words," then, such as 'racism,' are seen by organizations as the cause of a lack of commitment: in order for organizations to be committed, diversity practitioners need to use "happy words." For the participants in my study, the limit between "happy" and "unhappy" words is difficult to find, and it also varies from participant to participant: discrimination - and everything that might stick to it - is avoided by Niels, while Eva might be able to talk about discrimination in certain contexts. For all of the participants, though, words such as 'racism' remain hard and unhappy: they can trigger resistance.

Britt explained that resistance and objections are particularly common when some organizational actors realize that their privileges are "threatened". Similarly, Liv said that "a lot of resistance" can occur when she talks with organizational actors about "[...] the importance of reflecting on when you are the norm, and not just when you are the divergent [...] the resistance is practically always there."[19] Eva concludes that talking about norms is "sensitive" because it is "[...] about looking at yourself. That *is* uncomfortable if you have never had those thoughts before."[20] Some of the participants, then, know that it will be uncomfortable for the organizational actors to reflect on norms. However, they seem to think about it as unavoidable and necessary, as a kind of resistance they are used to, and would not want to soften at all costs. For several of the participants, however, being 'too hard' was an issue of concern, as Britt recounted:

"I have learned a lot from my opponents. Once, a boss [from the company she was working in at the time] came over and said to me: 'I can feel that when you are talking about that we have to fight and so on, I get really provoked, because you will get a fight when you ask for a

---

[19] "en del modstand" - "vigtigheden af at reflektere over når man er normen, og ikke kun når man afviger [...] modstanden findes praktisk taget altid."
[20] "følsomt" - "handler jo om at se på sig selv. Det ér ubehageligt hvis du aldrig har tænkt de tanker."

fight.' I learned from that, I thought: 'he's right about that' [...] they shouldn't see it as a fight; them against us."[21] Because language affects how organizational actors perceive the diversity practitioner and their message, words that are perceived as confrontational - such as 'fight' - can provoke the actors *too much.*

Hard words can be replaced with 'softer' words, as Eva explained, or hard words can be entered through using softer ones: "Racism and discrimination is a bit negative. I more frequently will talk about diversity; it's a bit softer, and then I can explain, and then talk about racism - which is more difficult - later." Eva, though, as mentioned above, will not turn to softer expressions at any cost: "Masculinity culture I have used - I think that you should call things by their rightful name. We don't talk about SD [Sverigedemokraterna/The Sweden Democrats] as 'hostile to change;' we talk about them as racist. But if I talk about masculinity culture, then it raises [crosses her arms in front of her chest, signifying 'closed']." Eva knows the potential pitfalls of bringing up masculinity culture, but she will still do so, out of a commitment to calling things what they are. Eva, then, has her own limit for euphemisms: getting too far away from the 'rightful names' of oppressive systems, as her example about SD shows. Eva, then, links her ambivalence toward using soft expressions in her work directly to a concern for public Swedish discourse around racism - in both cases, being too soft can derail the conversation away from systems of oppression, a topic which Eva repeatedly showed a great deal of commitment to in the interview.

Off limits: non-binary gender

Navigating what it is possible to talk about is of course not restricted to avoiding 'unhappy' words. It is also a matter of regarding some topics, some people and some concepts as completely off limits, as too extreme or difficult to consider. Being too hard can, for example, be to bring up non-binary gender, as I will show in this section. I asked Eva about which changes have occurred in the decade she has worked with diversity and inclusion:
"There's a lot of talk about female and male - the binary terms for gender. There is an understanding that 'it' exists somewhere out in the periphery: 'I've heard about that,' but it shouldn't be implemented. It's a change that *I* have gone through, since new research has

---

[21] "Jeg har lært meget af mine modstandere. En chef kom engang og sagde til mig: jeg kan mærke at når du taler om at vi skal kæmpe osv, så bliver jeg provokeret, for I får jo en kamp når I beder om en kamp. Det lærte jeg af, jeg tænkte det har han ret i [...] så skal de ikke se det som en kamp - dem mod os"

appeared about how we should go from tolerance to the norm critical, about how we should approach change work. But perhaps I don't experience that the organizations are with me."[22]

By 'it', Eva is referring to non-binary gender, to an *understanding* of gender which goes beyond the binary. Because 'it' - non-binary gender - is too difficult to understand, 'it' also becomes difficult, and even irrelevant, to implement. In effect, then, transgender and genderqueer people are not 'implementable.' They are simultaneously outside of what it is possible to understand and outside of the organization: non-binary people are not relevant to include because they do not exist in the organization - a sentiment which is implicit in the 'non-issue argument'. This 'gender limit' is echoed by Annie, who explained:

"I think gender is where people start to get really touchy. Because people are normally really protective of their gender. For some reason, I don't know why [....] Talking about cis, versus trans, versus not being on either side of the binary, is when it starts to break down with communication with the hetero-cis society, normally, they don't get it; so I normally stay with sexuality when I talk. That's where they are still ready to listen, that's where we can make progress, gender identity has to be a step beyond - a next, yeah."

Importantly, Annie and Eva are the only participants who talk about non-binary gender, including trans issues, as a limit which bothers them and affects their ability to properly do their work. This implies that the rest of the participants do not give these issues much attention, if any at all. Arguably, it is only possible for a diversity practitioner to bring up diversity issues with clients if they are *known* and deemed relevant by the practitioner *in the first place*. As I have showed in chapter 1, the Danish law does not mention gender identities beyond the binary, which might affect the legitimacy and level of knowledge about the issue. The following quote by Annie shows how institutional resistance in the form of a financial argument highly influences which kind of diversity organizations are willing to commit to:

Annie: "There's always a but: 'it's so true, what you're saying is exactly right. Buuut, right now we're just trying to focus on staying alive,' whatever. 'But when we feel more comfortable, we'll come back and revisit that.' Or, if they are gonna start focusing on HR now, then they are *only* talking about gender: 'We'll get to LGBT - give us ten years.' There's a priority list when it comes to diversity. LGBT is at the bottom, down with disability."

Ronja: "So it's gender, and then..?"

---

[22] "Man taler meget om kvindeligt og mandligt, den binære betegnelse for køn. Der findes en forståelse for at "det" findes ude i perifirien, "det har jeg hørt om", men som ikke skal implementeres. Det er en udvikling som *jeg* har gennemgået; da der er kommet ny forskning, om hvordan vi skal gå fra tolerance til det normkritiske, hvordan vi skal gå til forandringsarbejde. Men jeg oplever måske ikke at virksomhederne er med."

Annie: "Ethnicity. Yeah. And then age, probably, and then you talk LGBT and disability, that's how I experience it."

Some participants are willing and able to bring up topics they know can trigger resistance, while they leave some topics - however important they find them to be - behind. Other participants choose less triggering behaviours and vocabularies and effectively minimize resistance from organizational actors. In addition, some topics or issues trigger resistance in some organizations, but not in others - this might be related to country-specific conditions, as this quote by Annie shows: "Even when I'm trying to take it from a positive perspective [...] People get offended [...] I don't try to bring up negative words, and when I do, I always say: 'I don't think that Danes discriminate.'" Because of a Danish self-perception as *already* inclusive and positive toward diversity, it becomes difficult to bring up inclusion and diversity. As Ahmed (2012) notes, the diversity practitioners is "[...] heard as an obstacle to the conversational space before she even says anything. She poses a problem because she keeps posing a problem" (p. 62-63).

In this chapter I have highlighted the importance of language and the way organizational actors as well as diversity practitioners make use of diversity discourses and "[...] selectively appropriate them" (Zanoni et al., 2010, p. 17). My aim has been to show that "[...] discursive micro-analyses are important because they shed light on interstitial, every-day forms of resistance" (p. 17). Additionally, I have shown how the experiences of resistance brought up by the participants reflect a number of carefully interlinked hierarchies of what is worthy of attention, reflection and resources: not only is human resources at the bottom of the priority list for organizations, and diversity at the bottom of the human resources list, but there is also a priority list for which issues and norms it is possible to bring up, and which of these will, ultimately, be invested in with time, money and attention.

5. Affective arguments

Introduction

In this chapter I wish to examine what I call affective arguments. By 'affective' I mean arguments that have an emotional appeal; arguments that can make the project of diversity more affectively relatable. Ahmed (2010) offers a definition of affect as "[...] what sticks, or what sustains or preserves the connection between ideas, values, and objects" (p. 230).

Ahmed does not draw a sharp distinction between emotions and affects (p. 230). Furthermore, she perceives objects as not only material things, but also "[...] values, practice, styles, as well as aspirations" (p. 29). "Objects of emotion" (Ahmed, 2014, p. 11) become relevant when dealing with diversity work, since this type of work "[...] attempts to facilitate transformation by altering organization members' beliefs, values, and ideologies in dealing with difference at the workplace" (Prasad & Mills, 1997, p. 8). An emotional response to something depends not only the object itself - diversity, for example - but also on what is around it, and on "the conditions of its arrival" (Ahmed, 2014, p. 25). Thus, which objects are perceived as happy, unhappy, threatening, difficult, reasonable and so on, depends on what surrounds that object, and what it is associated with (p. 24). Ahmed is interested in "[...] how words for feeling, and objects of feeling, circulate and generate effects: how they move, stick, and slide. We move, stick and slide with them" (2014, p. 14). In this chapter, I am particularly interested in how the participants work affectively, that is, how make certain affective objects stick together, and how they move and slide as part of their work.

Making diversity relatable

In order to be able to introduce new concepts without encountering too much resistance, Annie uses concepts already known by organizational actors as a bridge. In the interview she explained how she can talk about heteronormativity (a new, difficult word) by linking it to feminism (an old, familiar word):

Annie: "People do not know that heteronormativity exists. That's why it persists, you know. So a lot of the times when I hit them with this [powerpoint] slide; 'this is what heteronormativity means,' people are like 'wow, what is that, this crazy word [...] I always bring it [feminism] in as well. Because people can relate much more to feminism, they've talked about it for a long time, learned about it in school, right, you don't have LGBT history in school; not when I was a kid. But you had women's suffrage, the right to vote, own land - it's a more relatable subject. Someone will say: 'yeah, I'm the union representative, I'm female, I represent some masculine cis men' - yeah, so you are breaking out of the heteronormative gender world, so you can understand what this gender role thing is."

Ronja: "So you can appeal by saying that they are already breaking with the norm, that they already know it?"

Annie: "Yeah, making it more relatable, how they are experiencing the world. And even though I don't agree with all these gender role stereotype things, but they still persist, an idea that men are more aggressive and powerful."

Annie can refer to a certain type of feminism in order to make her points on heteronormativity understood: feminism as historically situated in the past, as concerning women's rights, and as restricted to certain stereotypical ideas of how men and women are. Although Annie is not necessarily a big fan of this type of feminism, it is still her best option, because it is widely understood and will not cause too much trouble. If (a certain type of) feminism is considered a happy object, then by making it "circulate" and "stick" to heteronormativity, the latter can also "accumulate affective value" (Ahmed, 2010, p. 38) and become more relatable. Eva, likewise, has experienced making something which is considered hard and unhappy - discrimination - more relatable by linking it to something less so - bullying:

Eva: "Yes, there was resistance, but I also experienced this 'aha, yes' [...] there is an interest; that's positive."

Ronja: "Why are they more open?"

Eva: "I do also talk about discrimination; they are close to each other. They [the managers] don't have ill will - it's about stress, time pressure, ignorance; and then they realize - they get this knowledge, and then they feel like they can do something about it, they can easily get information, they don't need to do anything themselves. There is good will, they want to make things better, and open their eyes."

Ronja: "It's easier for them to talk about bullying with their employees?"

Eva: "Yes, it's easier to talk about than for example sexual harassment or homophobic jokes, but it is an opening because they are so closely related, you can get an understanding of discrimination."[23]

By talking about bullying - which was defined by Eva as harassment which is not linked to the causes of discrimination - Eva can create an opening through which she can talk about discrimination. This opening happens for two reasons: firstly, because the organizational actors have good intentions - they are interested in opening their eyes, and thus in the opening Eva can create for them. Secondly, bullying is seen as something which the managers can "do something about" *without* doing "anything themselves." Importantly, the managers Eva works with are *required* to work with discrimination - it is written in the policy for the city's

---

[23] Eva: "Ja, der var modstand, men jeg oplevede også at der var lidt "aha, åh ja" - cheferne skal så gennemgå det med deres medarbejdere, og mange har sidenhen bedt mig om hjælp til at løse problemer. Der findes en interesse - det er positivt."
Ronja: "hvorfor er de mere åbne?"
Eva: "jeg taler jo også om diskriminering, de ligger jo nært. De har ikke ond viden - det handler om stress, tidspres, uvidenhed, og såindser de - får de den viden, og så føler de at de kan gøre noget ved det, de kan få let info, de behøver ikke at gøre noget selv. Der findes en velvilje, de vil gerne gør ting bedre, og åbne øjnene."
Ronja: "det er lettere for dem at tale om mobning med deres medarbejdre?"
Eva: "ja, det er lettere at atel om end fx sexuel chikane og homofobiske jokes, men det er en åbning, fordi de ligger så nært, man kan få en forståelse for diskriminering"

workplaces, which in turn is required by the Swedish law, as already shown in chapter 2. The managers are required to be committed to prevent discrimination. However, as Ahmed (2012) shows, being "committed" can be a way of not doing anything: "Statements of commitment can thus be described as non-performatives: they do not bring into effect that which they name. A commitment might even be named *not to bring into effect*" (p. 119). Just because the managers are required to do something about discrimination, they might not, and Eva knows this. By approaching discrimination via bullying - which they are also required to being committed to - Eva can make discrimination a less difficult, slightly happier object. Harassment based on gender or sexuality is not necessarily being dealt with, but Eva hopes it might be possible to talk about eventually, because of its proximity to bullying. In the end of this chapter, I will engage more with the temporality of this hope.

Another way of making difficult, unhappy objects more relatable is for the participants to define a framework they want to work within, which cannot be off-putting for the organizational actors. As Kirton & Greene (2009) note, diversity practitioners have to avoid resistance in the form of "backlash" from privileged groups such as "white male[s]" while "[...] faced with the mixed message of challenging discriminatory practices and achieving organisational targets" (p. 167). Avoiding initial resistance can for example be done by making disclaimers, that is, explicitly distancing oneself from certain associations. Britt occasionally does this, as the following quote shows. At this point in the interview, she has denied including gender as a subject she raises in her work. I asked her if it ever becomes relevant to bring it up:

Britt: "For the most part I can joke about it. Then I can say there's a pink elephant in the room. I can ask which differences there are in the room, I can go down that road - but only after a certain amount of time; when I have set the frame which I think is professional right there, because it's so controversial. You're entering a battle field. There are so many misunderstandings, you are being appointed all these agendas and motives and so on. Then you first have to say: 'I don't mean that, I don't mean that either.'"

Ronja: "so, first you create a frame..."

Britt: "... which is relevant for the people in that room. Then you can make all kinds of detours from there, which can be made relevant. But it's not where I start. Because then I will have already made a highway into a place where I don't know their experiences or what they think about it."[24]

---

[24] Britt: "Langt hen ad vejen kan jeg lave fis med det. Så kan jeg sige at der er en elefant i rummet. Jeg kan spørge ind til hvilke forskelle der er i rummet, jeg kan godt gå ind på de der baner - men det er efter et stykke tid. Når jeg har sat den

Britt knows that certain topics will be so controversial - gender, for example - that she has to talk around them. This can be done in the form of "detours:" by joking or by establishing a conversation which is explicitly not about that topic. As she recounted elsewhere in the interview, she also uses certain metaphors, such as one where she explains privilege by referring to it as having "the wind in your back on the bike path."[25] For Britt, going with great speed and no option of turning back - as implied by her highway metaphor - will be damaging to the professional framework she is attempting to establish, since she will end up on a highway going far away from where the organizational actors are located. Detours are useful, though, if they are metaphorical, humorous and made relevant to the people in the room.

Annie and I also talked about how she can establish a framework within which it is possible to approach the sensitive topics of discrimination and inclusion:

"That initial reaction of 'we are not discriminatory, we are free, and an open land,' if you can squash that argument by saying: 'I realize that. We are on the same page, I totally agree with you, Denmark is an amazing place to live, and even much better than the U.S. in terms of freedoms and not being discriminated against'. Um... But, yeah, so, we just try to change the conversations around it. To say, we have to move from tolerance to inclusion, and that means we have to change the way we talk."

Like Britt, Annie can attempt to establish a framework, in this case by changing the conversation and by providing disclaimers, which will assure her audience that they are "on the same page." Annie, then, is in danger of being appointed the role of the unhappy, ungrateful American - she has to "pass" as "the "right kind" of minority" (Ahmed, 2012, p. 157), as I have already showed. Because it matters "who introduces which feelings to whom" (Ahmed, 2010, p. 69), it matters that she, as a foreigner, is the one who introduces these difficult issues.

Telling the good story

The participants all used what I call 'storytelling' in the interviews. For the purposes of this thesis, I broadly define storytelling as the usage of anecdotes and recounting hypothetical or 'real' examples or cases. Squire, Andrews & Tambouku (2008) argue that narrative research is

---

ramme som jeg synes er professionel lige der - fordi det er så kontroversielt. Du går ind på en kampbane. Der er så mange misforståelser, du bliver tillagt alle mulige dagsordener og motiver, osv. Så dem skal du først sige: det mener jeg heller ikke, det mener jeg heller ikke. "
Ronja: "så du skaber først en ramme..."
Britt: "... som er vedkommende for dem som sidder i rummet der. Så kan man lave afstikkere derfra til alt muligt, kan gøre meget vedkommende. Men det er ikke der jeg starter. For så har jeg allerede lavet en motorvej ind et sted hvor jeg ikke kender deres erfaringer eller ved hvad de synes om det."
[25] "medvind på cykelstien"

a field constituted by a multiplicity of methods and theories with no fixed set of tools, since "'narrative' is strikingly diverse in the way it is understood" (p. 3). By examining stories, the authors stress, "[...] we are able to investigate not just how stories are structured and the ways in which they work, but also who produces them and by what means; the mechanisms by which they are consumed; how narratives are silenced, contested or accepted and what, if any, effects they have" (p. 2). The participants used stories on two different levels: firstly, to explain their experiences to me, and secondly, to engage organizational actors in their work. In this thesis, I will limit myself to the second kind, and will simply note the following about the first kind: telling stories in the interview situation became, for many of the participants, a way of reflecting on their experiences while explaining them to me. I repeatedly asked them for examples of situations that stood out to them. Often, though, the participants told anecdotes or stories without me prompting them, which I think connects with their general expertise as storytellers: they tell stories and narrativize consistently as part of their work, and so it was not unfamiliar for them to do the same in the meeting with me. Telling stories is widely used in organizational development, as Tyler (2007) highlights in her article on storytelling as it is used by human resource development practitioners: "The idea of stories as a convention for shared learning and the development of collective understanding or meaning making is common across the body of literature focused on organizational learning and knowledge management" (p. 565). During the interviews, then, I was often wondering if an experience I had just heard about was being recounted for the first time in front of me, or if it was a 'regular' item on the long list of stories, anecdotes and cases that the participants could draw into the light from their toolboxes. For example, when Annie and I talked about the mismatch between people's self-perceptions and their actions, she told me a story to illustrate her point: "a friend said that his coworker had said: 'no, I'm not homophobic; I would not beat up a guy if I found out he was gay - and I'm like, 'that is not the definition of homophobia!' - so, a lot of people have a skewed idea: 'because I would not beat you up, I am tolerant' - you might wanna try to take the next step: be open, make friends, etcetera." This story is quite effective in showing the difference between homophobic attitudes and actions, and Annie might be using this in her talks in front of organizations as well - perhaps framed differently. However, she might also have told me this story because she sensed I would agree with her, and understand her point. Regardless of whether or not Annie has used this story before, its function would be the same in any situation: the story creates - or has the potential to create - images, identifications and strong emotional reactions in the listener from which general arguments, connections and conclusions can be made. To development practitioners,

"identifying compelling experiences of others and use of solid narrative structures are of interest [...]" (Tyler, 2007, p. 567). Stories, then, have great potential as affective arguments. As Ahmed explains, "affective conversions" - the transformation of objects as negative instead of positive, or vice versa - happens through narratives, where objects are located and distributed (2010, p. 45). Narratives give direction, they direct us toward a point, even if that point is never reached (p. 236).

As shown in the previous sections, it is vital for most of the participants to be able to create a proper framework. Stories are a way for some of the participants to do that. Gudrun uses many different stories, exercises and cases in her work, and so she began the interview by telling me the same story she also tells organizational actors in the public sector: "I have an entry: what got me into this work? I begin with the story of how people with little resources get a worse [medical] treatment than people with many resources, and that has to be general for all public institutions, that you don't get equal access to the welfare state."[26] Linking her own motivations with structural discrimination - however, not naming it as such - allows Gudrun to create a framework in which she will be seen both as an experienced professional, and as someone her audiences can relate to. She enjoys getting her "hands dirty"[27] when she does workshops, and relies on her ability to explain cultural differences in a simple way. For Gudrun, the most affective and effective way of creating "aha-moments" is for the organizational actors to reflect on different scenarios and cases, whether they are their own or some she brings in. Mease (2012) similarly states that many of her participants would engage organizational actors by making them reflect on their own "personal experience" (p. 393). The key to "aha-moments" is to "activate some feelings": "Where you can create change, is where you can hit people - or, boring expression - where you can activate some feelings within themselves, because if you don't have any realizations or aha-moments..." Gudrun goes on to explain that "[...] awareness of culture and openmindedness and diversity does not happen automatically, it demands a lot of the individual."[28] In her pioneering work on the importance of emotion in the contemporary capitalist and commodified economy, Hochschild (1983) defines "emotional labor" as "[...] the management of feeling to create a publicly observable facial and bodily display" (p. 7). Emotional labor, in Hochschild's terms,

---

[26] "Jeg har en indgang: hvad fik mig til at arbejde med det her? Jeg starter med historien om, at resursesvage får en ringere behandling en resursestærke, og det må være generelt i alle offentlige indstandser, og man får ikke den samme lige adgang til velfærdssamfundet."
[27] "jord under neglene"
[28] "Der hvor der sker forandring, det er der hvor man kan ramme folk - eller, kedeligt udtryk - der hvor man kan aktivere nogle følelser hos dem selv, fordi hvis man ikke har nogen erkendelse eller får aha oplevelser [...] kulturforståelse og rummelighed og mangfoldighed det kommer ikke af sig selv, kræver meget af den enkelte."

is primarily concerned with the work employees do to and with their *own* feelings, although she does stress that the purpose of emotional labor is to produce "[...] the proper state of mind in others" (p. 7). In the case of Gudrun, she has to do emotional labor herself in order to engage organizational actors in the "demanding" emotional labor of committing themselves to diversity. Gudrun, then, manages not only her own feelings, but also those of her workshop participants: "In managing feeling, we contribute to the creation of it" (p. 18). Not only is diversity something which has to happen, practically, it is also something which has to be felt by the individual, according to Gudrun. Opening one's mind to diversity requires a lot of work, though, and this work can be facilitated through exercises, cases and stories. For Ahmed (2014), I would like to add, emotions are of great importance, but not in their own right. Rather, "[...] it is objects of emotion that circulate, rather than emotion as such" (p. 11). Gudrun's stories - and the stories of her participants - become objects of emotion which become sticky with what they are associated with: the value of cultural differences. Gudrun has to make diversity appealing by appealing to organizational actors' feelings, by making *them* do the emotional labor of turning diversity into an object of emotion.

Liv also highlights that stories and cases are a good way of getting the conversation going: "We talk a lot about dilemmas. Cases. And talk freely about the situations, initially, to get the conversation going. About norms and so on in the workplace [...] They talk from their own realities, from their own workplaces. We usually work on from that, how we can make it concrete, from action plans. We see an advantage in letting the members of an organization putting it into words initially."[29] Like Gudrun, she appears to see her role as a facilitator, as someone who can set the appropriate framework - a relatable one - in order for the organizational actors themselves to reflect, contribute and find solutions. Liv's emphasis on "free" discussions is interesting: it seems to entail a rather democratic approach, in which all organizational actors are valued, and encouraged to contribute. Liv, then, is not aiming to be a figure of authority. As I have shown in the previous chapter, avoiding resistance involves not being preachy, not being too hard, and avoiding that organizational actors shut down. A relatable, free, democratic space for discussion would involve doing the opposite. Perhaps, then, Liv has few experiences of resistance with even difficult topics like examining norms because the framework she sets up is perceived as open and relatable by the organizational actors.

---

[29] "Vi taler meget om dillemmaer. Cases. Og taler frit om situationerne, indledningsvis, for at få samtalen i gang. Om normer og så videre på arbejdspladsen [...] De taler ud fra deres egen virkelighed, fra deres egen arbejdsplads. Det plejer vi at arbejde videre med, hvordan kan vi gøre det konkret, ud fra handlingsplaner. Vi ser en fordel i at medlemmerne i en organisation får lov til at sætte ord på det først."

That stories are a powerful way of getting an affective response is also brought up by Annie, who, as I mention, told me several stories, which she might also be using in her talks in organizations. Some of the stories she told me were even stories she had heard in talks given by other organizations - as she notes about one particular story, in passing: "a classic story - I've been to so many LGBT conferences, you hear so many stories." The stories she told me in the interview were from IBM, Microsoft and Lenovo, three international companies that are quite known for their successful diversity policies, according to Annie. She used one of IBM's stories to convey to me that if you are inclusive to LGBT people, then you will include "everybody else" as well. This particular story is about a job fair in China, where IBM participated with rainbow flags and LGBT stickers on their stand. They were surprised that a lot of women came over - the conclusion is, if you include LGBT people, you also include women. It is a story that "many of them [IBM employees] tell." The story circulates, not only within IBM, but also outside, via diversity practitioners like Annie. I asked her if the story reflects IBM's way of dealing with inclusion, and she replied: "No, I don't know if that was the strategy. That was one of the stories they tell." Importantly, then, recounting successful or funny episodes, stories which will 'prove the point,' are not necessarily evidence of a strategy. A *good* story can be powerful, it can be very affective, and, following Ahmed (2010) it can circulate and obtain even greater affective value (p. 38). But it might not *prove* anything general, except the point of the successful diversity initiative. As Prasad & Mills (1997) stress, the majority of management literature on diversity initiatives are "showcases," with the sole purpose of exhibiting the success stories of individual organizations: "In general, corporate exemplars are powerful testimonies of both the value and virtue of workplace diversity programs." However, the authors continue, these testimonies "[...] rarely explore the subterranean domain of race tensions, gender frustrations, and ongoing resistance. They present the happy face of diversity without paying much attention to what lies behind it" (p. 12).

Niels's organization places a lot of confidence in showcases: they once produced a brochure about diversity in which "[...] 20 cases describe exactly how value is created, how management experiences it, and so on. It's a question about recreating the dialogue from 'here's a new Dane who would have otherwise been on benefits' to 'here's a company who hired a skilled coworker, and in addition, it's an extra service that the coworker has a different ethnicity'. We completely turn the image on its head. Look at the half full instead of the half

empty glass."[30] In Niels's example, one good story is not enough; 20 are needed. The 20 happy cases make 'diversity' sticky with success, they make it impossible to ignore the value of diversity. Following Prasad & Mills' (1997, p. 12), the brochure "showcases" Danish "frontrunners" in the diversity field and efficiently puts a positive spin on diversity, and the immigrant can go from being a sad, unhappy burden to a happy, productive member of the organization. The potential reader of the brochure - perhaps a CEO of a for-profit company - will read the good stories, all the cases which prove the point, and feel hopeful and optimistic about the future. The temporal aspect of the brochure is important: it promises more good stories for the future, and as such, it works like the half full glass Niels invokes: "[...] both optimism and pessimism involve the temporality of the promise: they see the future in terms of what it promises to deliver or not to deliver, in terms of what there is or is not left to drink from the glass of the present" (Ahmed, 2010, p. 174). Following Ahmed, then, the reason why the brochure works - Niels talks about it as one of their most successful products - is because it promises "to deliver" a happy future where 'diversity' is associated with the affective positivity of 'growth' and 'value.' Importantly, though, the brochure as a document will not necessarily cause actual change, as documents can become substitutions for change (Ahmed, 2012, p. 86). In addition, the happy brochure is a "friendly document," one which appears to circulate widely. However, as Ahmed notes: "If circulatability relies on friendliness, then documents might even be passed around *more* when they are doing *less*. More challenging documents are more likely to get stuck" (p. 96). My point here is not to claim that the brochure published by Niels's organization is *necessarily* "doing less." Rather, my point is that its affective value as an object of optimism makes 'diversity' sticky with optimism. As an object of emotion it acquires value by being associated with value.

In this chapter, I have showed how some participants can make unhappy words more appealing and relatable by making them 'stick' to other, more familiar words. I have also showed how the participants use examples and cases - both from their own and organizational actors' lives - as a way of making 'diversity' relatable and affective. Changing perspectives can lead to aha-moments, and aha-moments become promises of the change that might happen. Finally, I examined how good stories, or "showcases" (Prasad & Mills, 1997, p. 12), can be a way for organizations to exhibit their successful diversity initiatives and promise the

---

[30] "[...] 20 cases beskriver præcis hvordan der bliver skabt værdi, hvordan ledelsen oplever det, osv, det er spørgsmål om at omskabe dialogen fra at være "her står en nydansker der ellers ville have været på kontanthjælp" til "her er en virksomhed der har ansat en dygtig medarbejder, og udover det, er det en ekstra service at medarbejderen har en anden etnicitet" vi drejer fuldstændig billedet. Se på det halvfulde i stedet for det halvtomme glas."

same success for others who follow their examples. However, these showcases are *not* a guarantee that anything will actually happen, just because they are brimming with optimism.

6. Flexible outsiders

Introduction

Although several of the participants view theories and new research as something to exclusively "have in the back of the head"[31], as Gudrun calls it, most of the participants did draw on theorists and theoretical concepts in order to explain their work to me in the interviews. Their work, then, is theoretically grounded, which can have a positive effect on their ability to attract clients: they can justify their work by positioning themselves as knowledgeable in their field, and, if necessary, reference the theoretical basis for what they are doing. Expert status, though, does not depend narrowly on formal education, even though all participants - except for Annie - have university degrees in fields either peripherally or directly related to equality, diversity, inclusion, culture and/or management. Importantly, the participants all operate with related but quite distinct theoretical foundations. They may not mention it explicitly in their work with organizational actors, but the differences in paradigms was quite striking to me, and is perhaps the most influential factor for how the participants approach and conceptualize their work. In this chapter, I wish to engage closely with these paradigmatic differences between the participants, as well as their roles as 'flexible outsiders': external consultants or experts, who need to justify their expertise and the importance of their work, and utilize a variety of tactics and strategies in order to facilitate change in organizations.

Being an outsider

As Benschop points out, external change agents may rely on their status as experts, but they are ultimately dependent upon the organizational actors who have to "[...] perform the actions needed to transform the organization" (2010, p. 9). This point is echoed by Mease (2009): "Consultants advise and provide services, but do not have the power to implement organizational initiatives" (p. 11). The position as organizational outsider, then, is a

---

[31] "have i baghovedet"

precarious one. In this section I will examine how the participants negotiate their role as outsiders.

Niels positions himself as more of a facilitator than an exceptional expert: "It's rare that I've been sitting around, acting clever about it; I'm not a researcher, and I have become a specialist because very few people have my level of experience, but I don't hold any specialized knowledge. What I do is: clearly present the issues at hand, bring in the right people into a solution model; point them in a direction. You can reach the right solution with the right people."[32]

Even though Niels has a university degree in management and has stated his preference for management language, he maintains that he is a specialist due to experience, not through academically approved knowledge. Furthermore, Niels's role is to find "the right people" to work with. As Mease explains, "the field of diversity consulting is best described as a networked field" (2009, p. 12), since consultants often have a large network of collaborators which they can refer to for "projects on a contract-by-contract basis" (p. 12). According to Niels, the "right solution" also depends on balancing expectations. A "good dialogue," as he calls it, is an important condition for a successful collaboration. Diversity consulting is, ultimately, a service which organizations buy, a product which should live up to their expectations. One of the ways in which Niels's organization ensures that they deliver a good service, is by staying up-to-date: "Even if they've been talking about inclusion for 20 years, the agenda is still very fresh; you have to be extremely good at catching on to the vibe which is important for the companies, in order to make it relevant for them to work with us. The same goes for the politicians. Convincing those with the money that this is important."[33] Whoever has money, whoever is a potential customer - they have to be convinced of the relevance of the diversity agenda. Because diversity issues are constantly changing, he has to change with them.

Flexibility over a long period of time is what Niels and Liv's organizations claim to offer their members, which is also important when an organization only wants a short lecture. Niels stressed that he is very willing to adapt to what organizations request, and that his organization would "[...] rather create a model where we teach them 30 percent diversity,

---

[32] "Det er sjældent jeg har sat mig og kloget mig på det, jeg er ikke forsker, og jeg er blevet specialist, for di der er få mennesker der har min erfaring, men jeg udgør ingen specialviden. Det jeg gør: sætte problemstillingerne klart op, bringe de rigtige mennesker ind i en løsningsmodel, bede dem pege på hvilken vej de skal gå. Man når en løsning med de rigtige mennesker."

[33] "Så selvom man har talt om inklusion i 20 år, men dagsordenen er meget fersk, man skal være ekstrem god til at fange den stemning som er aktuel for virksomhederne, for at gøre det aktuelt for dem at arbejde sammen med os. Det samme gælder for politikerne. Overbevise dem med pengene om at det var vigtigt."

than saying that we can't do anything at all unless we get two million [Danish kroner] [...]."
Diversity practitioners who are dependent upon the resources allotted them by organizations do not have the possibility of causing too much trouble or being too demanding. As Niels concludes: "If we get a window of two or four hours, we'll use it. We have to adapt optimally to the setup we are offered. If we do well, they will call again and buy some more"[34] Being flexible, then, is not only important in order to secure the integrity and quality of the diversity initiatives for their own sake - it also becomes a way of making sure the client, or member, comes back to "buy some more."

Liv does not explicitly talk about the members of her organization as customers, rather, she stresses that her position as an outsider has some distinct benefits:

Liv: "Maybe some things have happened, and they don't want to - or dare - tackle them in an organization; resistance can happen. It's difficult if it's only internal forces who are grappling with it, and it's easier that we come from the outside and run the place a bit."

Ronja: "So when you come from the outside, it's easier because you aren't invested in the organization?"

Liv: "Yes, exactly. It's easier for some people who are showing resistance to take it in when it's coming from an outsider."[35]

Being an outsider, then, becomes an opportunity for setting the stage or changing the conversation in a way which would not have been possible for Liv if she was part of the organization itself. However, as I have previously showed, resistance can happen *because* of outsider status: it becomes easier for organizational actors to claim that there is 'no issue' if an outsider claims there is one. As Niels and Liv's quotes show, knowledge of the organization and balancing of expectations is key to avoiding this type of resistance.

Like Niels and Liv, Annie sees clear benefits to her outsider role, because she can contribute with specific insights:

Ronja: "So, when you come from the outside, what can you contribute with that an insider would not be able to?"

Annie: "Just because we have a lot of experience talking and going to many different places, knowing what language usually works, you know, what people are doing other places, giving

---

[34] "[...] laver vi hellere en model hvor vi lærer dem 30% mangfoldighed, end at sige at vi ikke kan noget som helst medmindre vi får 2 mio.[...] Hvis vi får et vindue på 2 eller 4 timer, bruger vi det. Vi skal tilpasse os så det er optimalt til den ramme vi får. Gør vi det godt, ringer de igen, og køber noget mere."

[35] "Det kan være at der er nogle ting der er sket, og man ikke vil og tør tage fat på i en organisation, så der kan opstå modstand. Det er svært hvis det kun er interne kræfter der tager fat, og det er lettere at vi kommer udefra og styrer stedet lidt."
Ronja: "så når I kommer udefra, er det lettere, fordi I ikke er investerede i organisationen?"
Liv: "ja præcis. Det er lettere for visse personer der yder modstand, at tage det til sig når der kommer en udefra."

ideas and suggestions, because the more of that you have, the better. Of course people can do it themselves, from the inside, a lot of it is just feeling like you have a support system - like the LGBT Business Network - you need someone driving the locomotive with you, you don't wanna feel so alone. Because it can be really hard."

[...]

Ronja: "So you feel like your task is to be a supporter?"

Annie: "Yeah, like an interactive knowledge base. Not just Googling, it gets tedious, and if you don't know what to search for... If you can just ask: 'this is my problem, be my interactive Google, and tell me what you've come up with before'."

Not only does Annie see her outsider role as something which qualifies her to collaborate with organizational actors as an expert, or an "interactive knowledge base" as she describes it, being an outsider also provides insiders with a "support system," someone who can help "driving the locomotive." The kind of support Annie is referring to is not exclusively the kind which is centered around providing expert knowledge. It is also *emotional* support. The reason why this support is necessary, is because pushing for diversity is emotional labor, it involves working with and through your own and others' emotions, as I have showed in the previous chapter.

Although Eva certainly sees herself as a support system for the managers she has to train, she also emphasizes that it is difficult for her to balance her ambiguous status as both insider and outsider: she work within the same administration as those she consults, while not being a part of the daily life at the different workplaces. In the terms of Kirton et al., she is an "organizational diversity specialist" who is "responsible for policy formulation and advice [...] usually located within the human resources department [...]" (2007, p. 1983). Eva reflects on this role in comparison with her former job in the organization Liv currently works for: "It's difficult because I'm in the company - in my former job I could go out and be a lot tougher, because I wasn't depending on them. There, I could be more clear. Here I can't burn my bridges. It's a difficult balancing act; being tough and getting things through and simultaneously create understanding and interest. If I'm too tough it will backfire, since I'm still here, and I have to meet them again."[36] Because a long-term, mutual relationship exists between Eva and the organizational actors she trains, she has to be firm without triggering resistance. The nature of the emotional labor she has to engage with is different, then, from

---

[36] "Det er svært, fordi jeg er i virksomheden - i mit gamle job kunne jeg gå ud og være meget hårdere, for jeg var ikke afhængig af dem. Der kunne jeg være tydeligere. Her kan jeg ikke gå ud og brænde mine broer. Det er en svær balancegang - at være hård og få ting igennem og samtidig at skabe forståelse og interesse. Er jeg for hård giver det bagslag. Jeg er her jo stadig, og skal møde dem igen."

consultants who engage in short-term commitments. Like Niels and Liv, Eva needs organizational actors to appreciate her work. Not because she needs them to hire her again - the frequency and intensity of her presence is decided by political actors - but because she needs them to show an *interest*. I will elaborate on the importance of support from organizational actors in the final section of this chapter.

'Meeting them where they are:' discursive mergers

In this section I wish to engage more closely with the paradigmatic differences between the participants, as they were expressed in the interviews through preferred approaches to diversity work. As I have showed in the previous chapter, the participants have to draw on certain narratives and affective repertoires in order to make diversity appealing. In this section, I will continue to look at argumentation, by focusing on the usage of "discursive mergers." Coined by Mease (2009; 2012), the term "discursive mergers" describes how consultants merge different discourses; for example merging 'the business case' with not only a social change discourse, but also with the financial and management discourses that might dominate organizations (2012, p. 400). In the majority of the management literature the business case is seen as "at the core of diversity" and the reason for its relative success (Zanoni et al., 2010, p. 12). Mease's point is that the business case is not the only argument available to diversity consultants, but that it is "[...] a discursive tool that consultants use strategically rather than a discursive structure that leads to inevitable outcomes" (2012, p. 385). Similarly, Swan & Fox stress that "[...] binaries between good diversity (social justice) and bad diversity (the business case) may not always be helpful" (2010, p. 571). For the participants in my study, the business case was, likewise, largely used as one "discursive tool" among many. Some placed larger emphasis on it than others, as I will show in this section, depending on their paradigmatic entry points.

Britt's many years of experience allows her great flexibility regarding what she can bring up with organizational actors: "[...] I'm so old now, that they know I've been in the game for a long time. So, unrestrained, I draw from what I have learned and taken with me."[37] To Britt, her age, reputation and experience in the field is what gives her arguments leverage, allowing her to use discursive mergers as she pleases while maintaining a legitimized position. Furthermore, though, Britt also attributed her secure position to another factor: her successful dis-association from diversity:

---

[37] "nu er jeg så gammel, at de ved godt jeg har været på banen længe. Så jeg bruger uhæmmet af hvad jeg har lært og fået med."

Britt: "[...] It is the most difficult change field you can work in, because there are so many feelings and private attitudes in it. Everything we call diversity - that is, not the way *I* work - it's not seen as a professional field; it's seen as something everyone has an opinion about."

Ronja: "Are you met with that?"

Britt: "No, not the way I work now. I don't meet it, because I have so many experiences to play on. I'm saying, one has to be careful, because we have so many private attitudes. In many other fields in the organization, they might say 'oh, I don't know much about that,' but here, where it's a part of your everyday and home life, they think 'oh, I know just as well as they do.'"[38]

In her view, Britt manages to position herself as someone with expert knowledge exactly because she is (no longer) seen as someone who works with diversity; the "most difficult" field in terms of facilitating change processes. Instead, she works with differences, but without actually naming it as such in her work: "So you see, I go in and say: 'your team, are you wasting your time?' so I don't call it differences - I enter somewhere else, I go into the business, and say: 'are you getting enough out of your resources? Are you wasting your time or do you bring out the best in each other?' [...] Bringing the best out in each other - that I use a lot in order to use simple terms. It hits a soft spot."[39] As is evident in this quote, and as I have previously showed, using language which organizational actors can relate to and understand is crucial for the participants in order to create a useful framework. In her work, Britt merges her own approach - an emphasis on team cultures and the benefits of differences - with the discourses already available to the organizational actors: being productive and using resources, such as time, in an optimal manner - the business case, in short, although subtly. This quote also shows an interesting point about Britt's way of creating aha-moments: she tries to hit a "soft spot" by challenging the organizational actors to reflect without triggering resistance. Following chapter 3, and Britt's claim that diversity work is not seen as a professional field, it is not surprising that the practitioners I have interviewed in general have to draw on a number of legitimizing tactics in order to appear properly professional.

---

[38] Britt: "Det er det vanskeligste forandringsfelt du overhovedet kan arbejde på, for der er så mange følelser og private holdninger i det. Alt det vi kalder mangfoldighed - altså, ikke den måde jeg arbejder på - det bliver ikke set som et professionelt felt, det bliver set som noget alle har en holdning til."
Ronja: "bliver du mødt med den?"
Britt: "nej, ikke sådan jeg arbejder nu. Jeg møder den ikke fordi jeg har så meget erfaring at spille på. Jeg siger man skal passe på, fordi vi har så mange private holdninger. I mange andre felter i organisationen, der siger man måske "nårh, det ved jeg ikke så meget om", men dér hvor det er en del af ens hverdag og hjemmeliv, der tænker man "nårh, det ved jeg ligeså godt som dem"."

[39] "Så kan du høre, jeg går ind og siger: 'Jeres team, spilder I jeres tid?', så jeg kalder det ikke forskelle - jeg går ind et andet sted, jeg går ind i forretningen, og siger: 'Får i nok ud af jeres resurser? Spilder I jeres tid, eller får I det bedste ud af hinanden?' [...] Får I det bedste frem i hinanden - det bruger jeg meget, for at bruge nogle simple udtryk. Det rammer et blødt punkt."

Gudrun is another participant who does not rely heavily on diversity as a concept in her work. She is, instead, very focused on what she calls "cultural differences": "My hobbyhorse is this thing: if you see a figure 6 it is a figure 9 from the other side of the table. And who's right? No-one isn't right [...] it's this thing about the norm: who creates the norm which we all act and evaluate each other from."[40] As this table-metaphor implies, Gudrun places great emphasis on *perspective*. In her workshops and exercises, she recounted, she wants to make organizational actors realize that reality is subjective, and that they have to change their perspective in order to understand the person on the other side of the table. An unintentional risk to this approach is that it might be overly relativist, and position *all* norms as valuable instead of examining *who* has the power and privilege to create them. Gudrun's approach is based on *individual* change: on how the individual can become more open and accepting by understanding that everyone has their own, subjective world view. A prerequisite for this approach is that perspectives from different cultures are perceived and treated with equal value and appreciation in Danish society. That, I would argue, is unfortunately not the case. As Risberg & Søderberg's research on the diversity policies of major Danish corporations shows, there is consistently a strong focus "on individual qualities and unique competencies of the individual employee". This focus on the individual seems to eliminate the fact that certain groups are structurally discriminated against" (2008, p. 434), as they conclude.

Gudrun denied really speaking about discrimination, such as racism, in her work. However, she brought up one example of overtly dealing with discrimination. She recalled that a few years ago, Dansk Folkeparti [the Danish Folk Party] implemented a law saying that patients who had been in Denmark for more than seven years were no longer allowed access to a free translator in the health care system. Gudrun described this law as "extremely discriminatory"[41] and that she used it as an example in her workshops for a few years, while the law was active, to talk about which kind of "view on humanity"[42] necessarily facilitates such a law. However, she generally finds these kinds of political examples a bit too risky, but this was a case "[...] that I felt very strongly for, so I wasn't afraid of coming forward."[43] Gudrun was politically motivated to include the case in her work, forcing her to 'come out' as political, as someone anti-Dansk Folkeparti, and, in effect, as someone who wants to disrupt

---

[40] "Min kæphest er det der med: hvis man ser et 6-tal er det et 9-tal fra den anden side af bordet. Og hvem har ret? Der er jo ingen der ikke har ret. [...] Det er jo det med normen: hvem skaber den norm som vi alle sammen agerer og vurderer hinanden ud fra."
[41] "Helt ekstremt diskriminerende"
[42] "menneskesyn"
[43] "[...] dét følte jeg meget stærkt for, så der var jeg ikke bange for at stå frem."

systematic discrimination. Gudrun also recognizes that she was taking a risk by including the case since she might provoke resistance from organizational actors. Gudrun stresses that it is a balancing act: "There's always a balancing when you've been hired in by someone; if you should stand there and be political, and it easily becomes that [political] when you enter those kinds of situations. However, anyone who's been to a workshop of mine will have no doubt about my attitude towards discrimination, and so on, because everything I try to speak from is inclusion. *That* is the focus I have."[44] To Gudrun, balancing means avoiding being overly political, so that politics will not dominate her work in a way which will trigger resistance and shift the focus away from her aim of inclusion. In her work, Gudrun also draws on a basic business case argument which, like Britt's, places a great emphasis on optimal usage of resources. As she said when explaining the discursive shift regarding immigrants which has happened in Denmark after the financial crisis: "We simply need these people - there is a real need for these people to come and solve some tasks for us, and that's completely different than viewing them as weak and in need of help, and who we would really rather wish were someplace else, right, they are a bother, and on benefits, because now they're here, and so we need to make sure they don't die of hunger - like, it's a completely different way of selling it, and talking about it [...]"[45]

In this quote, Gudrun firmly positions herself within a paradigm which views immigrants as people whose contributions are needed, in contrast to "talking about how they need help."[46] Importantly, in this quote, being beneficial to society is positioned as someone who can work and contribute to the welfare state - "solve some tasks for us" - instead of being "on benefits." Although Gudrun does rely on a social justice discourse about welcoming people to the country, rather than simply preventing them from dying, she does it through a financial argument which closely links Danish hospitality with the proper exploitation of resources: we (the nation) should welcome them (the immigrants) because they can be a productive asset. This logic is echoed by Risberg & Søderberg (2008) who state that "the Danish public debate is now focusing on the need to deal constructively with an increasingly diverse population, primarily in terms of ethnicity [...]" (p. 426). This 'constructive' and 'productive' view on

---

[44] "Det er altid en afvejning, når man er hyret ind af nogen, om man skal stå og være politisk, og det bliver det meget nemt når man går ind i sådanne situationer. Alle der har været til mine workshops er dog ikke tvivl om min holdning til diskrimination og så videre, fordi alt hvad jeg prøver at tale ud fra er inklusion. Det ér det fokus jeg har."

[45] "jamen vi har jo simpelthen brug for de her mennesker - der er et reelt behov for at de her mennesker kommer og løser nogle opgaver for os, og det er jo noget helt andet end at se dem som nogle der er svage og skal have hjælp, og som vi i virkeligheden helst ville have var et andet sted, ikke, som er til besvær, og som er på overførselsindkomst, fordi nu er de her, og så bliver vi nødt til at sørge for at de ikke dør af sult - altså, det er jo en helt, helt anden måde at sælge det på, og tale om det på [...] at tale om at de har brug for hjælp."

immigrants and ethnic minorities, which both Gudrun and Risberg & Søderberg position as positive and dominant in Denmark is, however, not entirely unproblematic, as Mulinari & Neergaard (2013) argue. This position borders what they call 'exploitative racism', or 'winner's racism', which "[...] focuses on the construction of (cheap) labour through racialisation" and is "[...] a central aspect in the global reproduction of capitalism in its neoliberal form" (p. 45). Exploitative racism is contrasted by 'exclusionary racism', or 'loser's racism', which is characteristic of right-wing attitudes towards migrants with its aim of preventing immigration altogether (p. 45). While I am not arguing that Gudrun or Risberg & Søderberg are necessarily guilty of 'exploitative racism', I find it a useful concept to describe hegemonic narratives about ethnic minorities and immigrants in the Danish and Swedish labor markets, in which being 'beneficial' and 'productive' are the very *conditions* of one's acceptance into the nation-state.

The participant who most firmly stressed productivity as a key argument for diversity, was Niels. He relied heavily and explicitly on the business case throughout the interview. This is not surprising though, since he is also the participant who most clearly aligned himself with the diversity management paradigm, as can for example be seen in the following exchange:

Ronja: "The argument you use [to convince organizations] is mostly an economic one?"

Niels: "It won't mostly be that, it will *only* be that."[47]

Niels recounted that his organization is unique exactly because of its emphasis on the business case: "[...] it's quite simple: we're good at the business angle, we're special that way."[48] He positions his organization in direct opposition to "rights based organizations" who have "great difficulty engaging in good collaborations with the companies, because basically, they don't want the same thing [...] we only want the same thing as the companies." Niels basically finds it "deeply untrustworthy"[49] to rely on both positive and negative motivations. The credibility of Niels's organization, in his view, hinges on its ability to stick with one argument: the business case. Furthermore, according to Niels, the business case is what companies want to focus on - they do *not* want to take human rights as a starting point. The areas in which his organization present diversity management as valuable are: "innovation, [...] new markets and customer groups, [...] satisfaction among employees and customers" and

---

[47] Ronja: "De argumenter I bruger er for det meste økonomiske argumenter?"
Niels: "det vil ikke for det meste være det; det vil *kun* være det."
[48] "[...] det er helt enkelt: vi er gode til forretningsvinklen, der er vi ret specielle."
[49] "rettighedsbaserede organisationer [...]utrolig svært ved at indgå i gode samarbejder med virksomhederne, fordi i sidste ende vil de ikke det samme [...] vi vil kun det samme som virksomhederne [...] dybt utroværdigt."

the " [...] recruitment case. Branding."[50] All of these rely primarily on the business case. When I asked Niels if the work environment is also improved, he replied: "That's a given. The reality of the company is diverse, whether you want it or not [...] If the manager is briefing clearly on diversity, then the holism improves, and the employees can relax."[51] In this quote Niels argues for an improved work environment through merging the business case with a discourse on happier employees. Ultimately, though, Niels's organization has the business case as its explicit epicenter around which all of their activities and services are organized. This also affects how employees in Niels's organization deal with their personal motivations, as I will examine in the next chapter.

Annie's organization has done several surveys among Danish LGBT people in order to figure out which discriminatory practices they experience in their workplaces. These surveys add a weight to Annie's arguments. When I asked her what the most convincing argument is, she says: "The strongest argument is definitely how many people are not out. People like to see concrete numbers and hard statistics; that speaks something to them. You might think there's no issue, but 1 out of 5 of your employees are not out." If organizational actors draw on the prevalent 'non-issue' discourse, which I elaborated on in chapter 3, Annie can counter it by referencing "numbers and hard statistics," since they cannot be denounced as easily as other - perhaps softer - arguments. Aligning one's own goals with those of the organization is a useful strategy for diversity practitioners if they wish to be taken seriously, as Kirton et al. argue (2007, p. 1992). For Annie, alignment of goals means aligning the overall goals of increased diversity and equality with business goals. The statistical argument cannot stand alone, then, it needs to be developed. According to Annie, "the natural progression of the argument" is as follows: "Happier employees, who are more loyal, more productive, adds to your bottom line. And when you start to have a visibly inclusive workplace, they are going to attract more diversity which means further innovation which means your business will prosper. It means something positive for your bottom line, basically. And retention is a huge thing for companies, to replace an employee costs one and a half times their salary, so it costs money if they are constantly flipping people." As is obvious from this quote, Annie relies on many of the same business case arguments as Niels does: innovation and happy, loyal employees will make the company "prosper" and save money. The argument can be boiled down to the following, as it was stated by Annie: "Generally, the

---

[50] "innovationen [...] nye markeder og kundegrupper [...] tilfredshed blandt medarbejdere og kunder [...]rekrutterings-case. Branding."
[51] "Det siger sig selv. Virkeligheden i virksomheden er mangfoldig, om man vil det eller ej [...] Hvis lederen briefer klart på mangfoldighed, så bliver holismen bedre, og så kan medarbejderne slappe af."

happier people are, the better its gonna be for your workplace." Although they both rely on the business case, on one important point does Annie's argumentation differ from Niels's: she specifically has the conditions and rights of a minority - LGBT people - as her focal point. She is, of course, aiming to convince the same kind of management that Niels is, but throughout the interview, she kept returning to how beneficial diversity management could be for the LGBT employees. At one point in the interview, we were talking about the "missing voice" of the company and the lack of explicit policies regarding inclusion of LGBT people: "[...] a lot of people are missing, especially in their paternal, maternal and bereavement leave, they forget to include 'your partner' [...]"

Ronja: "So people [management] need to make those changes, but they don't necessarily?"

Annie: "Right. They say: 'oh but people know that! We're so open here! Of course they're gonna get that leave.' I'm like: 'yeah, but you're not telling them that. It's standing explicitly; they are feeling excluded. They are not seeing themselves represented in this policy. So, even if you think you're the most open person in the world, if you haven't said it, nobody is gonna know it. How can they just guess?'" Exclusion, insecurity and confusion as it is experienced by LGBT employees is what prompts Annie to action. When dealing with organizational actors she uses these experiences of exclusion as an entry point which she can merge with the business case. In that way, then, she can ensure the "natural progression of the argument." Annie's approach reflects one which Mease (2012) found that a number of her participants engaged in as well: "For these consultants there is no opposition, binary, or exclusive contradiction between social justice motivations and capital-based motivations if people are willing to entertain, take up, and implement the ideas they put forth" (p. 395).

Another of my participants who similarly did not see any contradiction between the business case and the social justice case is Liv. She explained that her organization primarily relies on the business case, and then added: "Both the social, but also the economic. It depends on which organization we are in - the private ones see the business case, and then we work on that, and the public administrations are looking more at the social and which kind of workplace they want. So it varies a lot, and we work with both. It goes hand in hand."[52] This approach echoes the one called for by Benschop (2010), who argues that disregarding the business case is not a viable solution: " [...] a powerful diversity management should not dismiss business case arguments altogether, as they can be instrumental in challenging

---

[52] "Både det sociale, men også det økonomiske. Det afhænger af hvilken organisation vi er ude i - de private ser det forretningsmæssige, og så arbejder vi med dét, og de offentlige forvaltninger ser mere på de sociale, og hvilken arbejdsplads vi gerne vil have. Så det veksler meget, og vi arbejder med begge. Det går hånd i hånd, synes vi."

patterns of inequality. This diversity management should live up to its critical potential to actually change organizations". (Benschop, 2010, p. 18). When asked about whether or not Liv views her organization's work as political, she confirms: "Yes, it's political change work, even if we aren't party poitical [laughs]. But we do take a political standpoint, absolutely. It's obvious that it's political work."[53] However, as I will return to in the remainder of the thesis, not all participants quite as smoothly aligned themselves with a political purpose. I also asked Liv if she thinks the members of her organization view the work as political: "I think many are very careful about articulating it as radical and political, but rather see it as a work environment issue. Maybe they are afraid of taking a stand. But indirectly you see it, but you don't articulate it."[54] The political agenda is implicit, not spoken about, if it exists at all. As such, there is a potential mismatch between Liv and her organization's ideals, and the ideals of their members. It does not, however, sound like this is surprising or even a problem to Liv. As I have shown, the participants in this study have to keep a lot of different aspects of their work to themselves; in the back of their head - political goals are one of them, as Gudrun's example in this section also shows.

The participant who most clearly focused on a social justice discourse during the interview was Eva. Her framework is norm critical and intersectional, and when I asked her what ideal change is for her, she replied:

"Going under the skin, that they [workshop participants] understand that we are all a part of - we all maintain these power orders. And making the working groups understand that we are doing this unknowingly, and it's not about evil will, they aren't ideological homophobes [...] It's about planting a seed - to me, change work is if that little seed grows [...] I want us to change things on a structural level, but I think we need to show the individual that we're a part of the structures [...]."[55]

Although Eva believes that change has to start on an individual level, the awareness needs to move on to a systematic level. As mentioned, this ties in with her norm critical framework. Norm critical approaches have developed primarily in Sweden in the last 15 to 20 years, and have their theoretical foundation in poststructuralist and queerfeminist research traditions, as well as in queer pedagogy and activism (Bromseth, 2010, p. 29, 38-40). Norm criticism has a

---

[53] "Ja, det er et politisk forandringsarbejde, selvom vi ikke er parti-politiske [griner]. Men vi tager jo poitisk stilling, absolut. Det er klart at det er et politisk arbejde."
[54] "Jeg tror at mange er meget forsigtige om at udtale det som radikalt og politisk, men vender det mere som et arbejdsmiljøarbejde. Måske de er bange for at tage stilling. Men indirekte ser man det, men man udtaler det ikke."
[55] "At man når ind under huden, at de forstår at vi alle er en del af, at vi alle opretholder disse magtordninger, og at få arbejdsgrupperne til at forstå at vi gør det uvidende, og det handler ikke om ond vilje, de er ikke ideologiske homofober [...] Det handler om at så et lille frø - for mig er forandringsarbejde hvis det lille frø vokser [...] jeg vil at vi skal forandre på strukturelt niveau, men jeg tror at vi skal vise individet at vi er en del af strukturerne, og ikke det individualistiske [...]."

fundamental aim of questioning, examining and *changing* norms, privileges and power structures. Importantly, Eva wants the organizational actors she works with to understand that they are not "evil," but that she has faith in their good intentions. To Eva, then, convincing organizational actors that they are *good* becomes an opening through which she can create an increased awareness about the individual's position in societal structures. Since Eva works in the city administration, her tasks are defined by the city council. However, she is also able to influence the politicians and other administrative staff. When I asked her if she is being listened to, she replied: "They have faith in my competence. I have a competence they don't have - I mean, they are competent at other stuff." Eva links the trust she feels from her superiors to the fact that the majority in the city council is "leftist-social democratic-environmental."[56] Whether or not a paradigm - such as norm criticism - is accepted by stakeholders in power, such as politicians, depends on their understanding of what counts as knowledge. And, in Eva's experience, a leftist governing body is more likely to acknowledge norm criticism as a serious paradigm, which in turn makes it easier for her to incorporate it into her work without encountering institutional resistance. She has the following reply when I asked her if change regarding diversity will come with time: "No, we have to force it, with gentle violence [smiles]. Write it into our plans and policies, explain what it is, how we should work. It will be our task, who work with this, to constantly bring it in. Generally I think that we - now I'm including myself in this 'we' - who are working with these questions, that we work norm critically and intersectionally: that's not how I think it is. Many are still working with the tolerance perspective. It's complex."[57] In this quote, Eva reflects on how she thinks change can happen: through forcing it in, keeping it on the agenda, and adapting policies. In this regard, she differs slightly from the other participants - not with her emphasis on policy changes, which all the participants mention in one way or another. Rather, the way she talks about persistence is different: she uses the words "force" and "violence" - arguably unhappy words, especially when compared to the vocabularies preferred by the other participants in the interviews. She continues by acknowledging this difference: she knows that the paradigm she works within - a norm critical, intersectional one which emphasizes systematic change - is not exactly mainstream, even if it is not contested by her employer. As

---

[56] "De har en tiltro til min kompetence. Jeg har en kompetence som de ikke har - jeg mener, de er kompetente til andre ting [...] venstre-socialdemokratisk-miljø"
[57] "nej, vi må tvinge. Med mild vold [smiler]. Skrive det ind i vores planer, og policies, forklare hvad det er, hvordan vi skal arbejde. Det kommer ikke hvis vi ikke kræver det på forskellige måder. Det bliver vores opgave, der arbejder med det, at hele tiden løfte det frem. Generelt set tænker jeg, at vi - nu inkluderer jeg mig selv i det 'vi' - som arbejder med de her spørgsmål, arbejder normkritisk og intersektionelt - sådan tænker jeg ikke at det er. Mange arbejder stadig med tolerance-perspektivet. Det er komplekst."

a concluding remark for this section, I can only agree with her that the field of diversity practioners is "complex," and I understand her ambivalence about placing herself within a collective "we:" as I have shown in this section, the preferred discourses of the participants and the paradigms they represent are not expressive of a united or homogenous approach to diversity and how it should be fostered.

On intersectionality, single issue approaches and contesting diversity

In this section I will examine which topics, categories and issues of inclusion and diversity the participants find relevant to address in their work. As Ward argues, certain kinds of differences are often preferred to advocate for in diversity work, such as race and gender on a general level, rendering "[...] other forms of difference irrelevant, especially those that cannot be easily professionalized or marketed" (2008, p. 40). Diversity practitioners, then, might make choices about which kinds of difference they bring up, and which they do not, according to this business case logic.

Liv's organization tailors solutions according to what is asked for by members and other clients. Accordingly, it varies in which way her organization addresses issues of inclusion and discrimination. Most organizations, though, want to work with several issues, and preferably with the discrimination law as a point of reference. I asked her if her organization prefers to work holistically: "yes, the point is the structure of discrimination according to norms. And then we engage more with racism and ethnicity because we are the organization we are, and because we work explicitly for that target group [...] But basically the employer also has a responsibility for working from the causes of discrimination; the [Discrimination] law."[58] Because Liv's organization - just like Niels's - has an explicit expertise on inclusion of ethnic minorities, the clients the organization attracts will be interested in that aspect. However, because the discrimination law also includes religion and gender, organizations see the value of addressing these issues as well. As I mentioned in chapter 1, Liv thinks that the downside of the law is that it renders other causes for discrimination less appealing.

When he encounters a lack of understanding about diversity issues from the managerial side, Niels links this to the lack of seriousness around diversity management as a discipline, and especially the lack of diversity management as an actual program at Danish

---

[58] "Ja, det handler jo om diskrimineringens strukturer ud fra normer. Og så kommer vi mere ind på racisme og etnicitet fordi vi er den organisation som vi er, og at vi arbejder for den målgruppe udtalt [...] Men i det store hele har arbejdsgiveren også et ansvar for at arbejde ud fra diskrimineringsgrundene, loven."

business schools. As a result, many managers have no idea about what diversity management really is: "What exists instead is fragmented management: Some are good at women in management, others are good at disabilities, others have a good grasp on integration, so there are lots of partial aspects. If you look at the coordinated aspect, which diversity management is, then there isn't... Then the Danish managerial foundation still has a lot to learn. Which makes it relevant to work with."[59] Niels stresses that only addressing refugees and immigrants, which are the key groups his organization is supposed to work for, would "make no sense," since the organizations Niels engages with need holistic solutions. Niels referenced management research to explain me his point: "[...] we recommend not having majority clusters of more than 70%, regardless if it's gender, education, age, etc., because research shows that with constructions with 70% majority you lose the innovation competence."[60] Throughout the interview, Niels relied heavily on both management literature references, statistics, and on constantly maintaining a link to the business case. Keeping the workplace diverse is, quite simply, good for business - something which many Danish companies have not fully comprehended yet, as Niels stressed.

At one point in the interview Britt distanced herself from an engagement with what she called "[...] that American un-cool [approach] where you have to be both black, working class, and a single mom and a small time criminal; then you can get in to university. You're compiling the minority categories."[61] According to Britt, the reason why this is harmful to an equality project is that the "minorities are hit in the head with each other," meaning, it is not enough to "just" be a woman, as she said, you also have to be oppressed in other ways. To Britt, this is an approach which will prevent any change from actually happening. To me, Britt's statements are interesting for several reasons: firstly, she expresses dislike for that "American" approach which remains unnamed where only the 'very' oppressed should benefit from diversity initiatives. Secondly, Britt's way of listing attributes has a mocking feel to it: she finds it counterproductive and almost silly to engage with an 'oppression olympics' paradigm where minorities have to compete with each other for rights. It is honestly difficult for me to figure out exactly what Britt's point is with her statement,

---

[59] "Det der derimod findes er en fragmenteret ledelse. Nogle er gode til kvinder i ledelse, andre er gode til handicap, nogle har godt fat om integration, så der er en masse delaspekter. Ser man på det koordinerede aspekt, som mangfoldighedsledelse er, så er der ikke... så har det danske ledelseslag grundlæggende stadig en del af at lære. Det gør det virkelig relevant at arbejde med".

[60] "[...] det giver ingen mening [...] der anbefaler vi ikke at have majoritets-clusters på over 70%, uanset om det er køn, uddannelse, alders, og så videre, fordi forskningen viser at med 70%s majoritetskonstruktioner, så mister du innovationskompetencen."

[61] "[...] den der amerikanske ufede med at man både skal være sort, og arbejderklasse, og enlig mor og småkriminel, så kan man komme ind på et uni. så lægger man minoritetskategorierne sammen."

because throughout the interview she stressed that she prefers an approach where differences are not seen as separate, but, clearly, she also lashes out against initiatives which might 'overdo' this unification of differences. After beginning her career fighting for women's rights and equal access, she slowly "[...] began to see that there were also downsides to working with one difference at a time, because you can also become part of the problem [...] you dig ditches. It's useful to discover that a difference exists, but if you keep going it becomes a problem."[62] Britt went from working almost exclusively with gender to working with multiple differences, and around year 2000 she co-wrote "[...] the first book about diversity in Denmark [...] We tried to advocate for 'diversity' [uses the English word] as it came from Canada, the U.S. and the UK, but I was critical toward minority 'diversity:' It was exclusively gender, ethnicity, race, disability, and so on; sexuality. In that book we advocated for talking about 'diversity' in Denmark with *all* differences: also education, personal differences, organizational differences [...] In that book we lost the definition battle. Because right after, the ethnicity agenda rushed forward [...] what happened was exactly what I didn't want to happen: it was only minority differences, not other differences."[63]

I am quoting Britt at length here because she paints an interesting picture of the trajectory of the diversity agenda in Denmark: diversity arrived from an Anglophone context and, according to Britt, was taken hostage by what she calls the "ethnicity agenda," and she could no longer utilize the concept of diversity without being misinterpreted. Britt has closed the door on it in favor of working with a wider conceptualization of differences which allows her to view differences as "a resource" instead of as "we feel sorry for you-groups," as I have previously touched upon. In fact, she rarely even mentions gender or any other identity category in her work. In one way, it could be argued that Niels is doing exactly what Britt accuses Danish diversity initiatives of doing: his organization places ethnicity firmly as a focal point for their activities. However, he also insisted that it would be useless to look at ethnicity in isolation. Niels and Britt, then, represent interesting views on diversity that may not differ as much as they appear to at first glance. However, where Britt refuses to frame her

---

[62] "[...] jeg begyndte at kunne se at der også var ulemper ved at arbejde med én forskel ad gangen, for man kan også blive en del af problemet [...] man graver grøfter. Det er nyttigt at opdage at der er en forskel, men hvis man bliver ved, bliver det et problem."

[63] "[...] den første bog om mangfoldighed i Danmark [...] Vi forsøgte at slå et slag for diversity - som kom fra canada, usa, uk - men det jeg var kritisk over for var at det var minoritetsdiversity: Det var udelukkende køn, etnicitet, race, handicap, og så videre, seksualitet. I den bog slog vi et slag for at tale diversity i Danmark med ALLE slags forskelle: også med uddannelse, personlige forskelle, organisationsforskelle [...] I den bog tabte vi definitionskampen. For lige efter bulrede det frem med den etniske dagsorden [...] Der skete lige præcis det jeg ikke ville have skete: Det var kun minoritetsforskelle, ikke andre forskelle."

work in terms of diversity, inclusion and equality, Niels embraces these terms because he finds diversity management a useful paradigm to work with.

Both Niels and Britt, then, are in favor of an approach to diversity and inclusion which aims at promoting equality based on *multiple* identity categories and - especially in Britt's case - emphasizing a wide variety of human differences. In neither of the interviews were these approaches referred to as 'intersectional.' In fact, only one of the participants I interviewed - Eva - ever mentioned intersectionality. She repeatedly referred to it as central to her understanding of her work, but she would not bring it up with organizational actors. Although all of the participants displayed an awareness, and sometimes a keen interest, in working with multiple identity categories simultaneously, only one of them linked this interest with the concept of intersectionality, which might reflect a lack of knowledge about contemporary feminist debates, or simply a disinterest in that particular word. If, as I have argued, the theoretical and discursive repertoires and frameworks of the participants deeply influence the way they approach their work, then *not expressing knowledge* about intersectionality as a concept is significant. Diversity culture, according to Ward, has meant the mainstreaming of intersectionality. However, she argues,"[...] mainstream versions of diversity - almost always additive in their approach - are a far cry from intersectional analysis" (Ward, 2008, p. 30). It is neither surprising, then, that only one participant talked about intersectionality, nor that the majority of them appeared to view the multiple identities they did talk about as distinct from one another. For example, because Niels repeatedly talked about ethnicity and women/gender as separate issues, I left the interview imagining that the new Danes his organization advocated inclusion for were exclusively men. Likewise, after Annie's interview, in which she explicitly stated that her organization does not work with other than categories those regarding sexuality and gender, I kept imagining LGBT people exclusively as white. My point here is not to say "this is racist" or "this is sexist", but rather to raise the question of which issues it is possible for my participants to engage with in their work, and which frameworks are either unknown or useless to them.

Support from organizational actors

Support from organizational actors is very important if any change process concerning diversity is going to succeed, and especially one where organizational outsiders, such as consultants, are involved. According to Kirton & Greene (2009), the management literature in general characterizes diversity management as heavily dependent upon support from senior managers, since they are seen as "catalysts of change" and their engagement ultimately as the

hallmark of a successful process (p. 163). As a consequence, diversity practitioners need to assure "[...] either that their personal values and goals are in tune with those of mainstream managers or that they have to make compromises and perhaps face personal dilemmas" (Kirton & Greene, 2009, p. 162). Although their study is concerned with internal diversity practitioners, such as Eva, a similar balancing of pursuing or compromising goals is at stake for external practitioners, who may not need to maintain an ongoing relationship with management in order to keep their job, but who will have to maintain a relationship if they are to ensure a good reputation or hope that the organizations will call them back and "buy more", as Niels recounted. Accessing the organization in the first place is obviously also vital and "[...] a definitive occupational demand of diversity consulting," as Mease (2012) states, "since diversity work cannot be accomplished without access to organizations" (p. 390).

Annie recounted that it is " [...] rare in the Nordic countries that you have a diversity head." Because she works in a Danish context, Annie usually does not have the option of building alliances with "the staff of the Equality Department," as Benschop recounted above. Annie stressed that international companies with offices in Denmark are more likely to show an interest because they see branches in other countries engaging with diversity initiatives, a point which is also highlighted in Risberg & Søderberg's study of diversity management in Danish companies. They state that "[...] very few larger companies had made greater efforts, except for the foreign-owned companies or larger Danish companies operating in an international environment" (2008, p. 433). The status of diversity as an international management issue clearly influences how it is dealt with in the local (Danish) context. Later in the interview, Annie elaborated on how she can gain access as an outsider: "It's not the best approach to go in and say: 'you're doing it wrong'. In order to make companies listen, I always go for the excited employee. Doesn't matter where in the company, but someone who will support an LGBT initiative. And start working and talking with them - what is it like, what do you need, what would the company be willing to do, how do we work together - you have to have a connection inside the company that's willing to do something." Ultimately, in order to sustain momentum, it is not sufficient with support form *either* management *or* employees, as Annie concludes: "I think you need the excitement from the employees, definitely, to make sure there are people who are willing to support the project; you need the support from management, somehow, either HR or CEO level, you need support, so you have some sort of alignment of goals." In general, in my interview with Annie, support was a recurring issue. One of her own greatest sources of support is a Danish LGBT Business Network which meets once every quarter in Copenhagen: "We are different

people coming together to talk, because even the big companies here tend to be small; even a big international company like Google only has like 15 people in Denmark. They don't need an LGBT network for the one gay employee. So it's important to have *this* network, where we can all come together and talk about issues." In order to avoid feeling like "the only gay in the village," as Annie humorously calls it, the LGBT Business Network provides a platform for people to meet, since *internal* LGBT networks are not big in Denmark.

The city administration Eva works within is arguably a large organization, with more than 1400 employees. Eva, though, is the only one working exclusively with equality and diversity. She wants a network in order to facilitate "influence from more sides," as she said. As it is now, she only deals with the 120 senior managers, and when I asked her if there is a "trickle-down effect" from them, she replied:

"Yes, because if we have to increase the level of knowledge, we have to get a hold of the managers, because we can't demand that of the employees on the shop floor without initially getting a hold of the managers. But I also hope we'll get this network, so it will come from more sides; then further education is possible. I hope it will happen; a proposal has been put forward."[64] While Eva insists the current top-to-bottom approach is effective and necessary, she thinks an employer network would be a valuable addition, because change would be coming from 'more sides:' knowledge and awareness would not be restricted to one individual - in this case the managers Eva is training - but rather to a *support system.* For the reasons Annie mentioned, support from others in similar positions can be a powerful vehicle, not only for change, but also for increased confidence and, ultimately, legitimacy.

Liv and Niels also highlighted that diversity initiatives concern multiple actors in the organization. However, they both emphasize the importance of initiatives being anchored in the management group first. Niels recounted: "I have a demand which is that the management has to participate; otherwise it won't be seen as important. [...] Management commitment is a must."[65] Because Niels knows that diversity is a precarious issue in Denmark, and often not viewed as worthy of time and resources, it adds urgency to the commitment of the management level. In addition, in order to secure a good working environment, diversity has to be the responsibility of the management level: "The lack of diversity management creates a deep sense of insecurity for colleagues and employees. No

---

[64] "Ja, for hvis vi skal kræve at højne vidensniveauet, så skal vi have fat i cheferne, for vi kan ikke kræve det af medarbejderne på gulvet uden først at have fat i cheferne. Men jeg ønsker også at vi får det her netværk, så det kommer fra flere sider, så er der mulighed for videreuddannelse. Jeg håber at det sker, der er stillet et forslag."
[65] "Jeg har et krav om at ledelsen skal deltage, ellers bliver det ikke anset som vigtige [...] Ledelsesengagement er et must."

management means a straight way to conflict."[66]. However, Niels's organization has tools for all levels in an organization, recently also for the general employees, which he views as an innovative step.

Someone who is very aware of the importance of the employees, is Gudrun. She stresses that management *is* important, because they are responsible for regulations. However, her main interest is teaching and facilitating workshops with organizational actors at all levels. I asked her why teaching was appealing to her:

"[...] my experience is that a lot of what I did at the city hall [in her former job], that was hot air in binders. I *was* placed in a high position, so that wasn't the intention, but when you are in a strategic position you aren't on the floor with people, talking to them about their challenges."[67] To Gudrun, the appeal of her current job as an independent workshop facilitator is that she gets to interact with people and assist them with their challenges instead of working out strategies that may not reflect those challenges. "Hot air in binders" is Gudrun's metaphor for documents that do not work - statements of commitment which fail to commit people. As Ahmed states while referring to an interview with a diversity practitioner, "if diversity work becomes paper work, then practitioners can end up feeling as if it's "all a paper exercise." [...] the detachment of the diversity worker [...] becomes an institutional detachment." (2012, p. 87). Gudrun, arguably, felt detached in her previous job and finally quit it because she finds it much more satisfying to work directly with people.

Keeping strong alliances with organizational actors appears to be a central way for my participants to prevent resistance on many levels as well as ensure them a legitimized position in spite of their outsider status. This is done in a variety of ways, as I have shown throughout this thesis: balancing expectations, alignment of goals, reaching out to a varity of organizational actors, to name the most important ones. One way of securing a legitimized position is by creating rapport based on *similarities* between the diversity practitioner and the organizational actor(s). As Kirton & Greene conclude in their study: "most of our respondents did not perceive themselves as marginalized, possibly because they were predominantly white, relatively high status, high earners and had mostly come from the ranks of internal managers who had therefore already achieved success and legitimacy. But, they also felt that they had the support of key senior figures (usually white males, often CEOs) with whom they

---

[66] "Manglen på mangfoldighedsledelse er dybt utryghedsskabende for kollegaer og medarbejderne. Ingen ledelse er den sikre vej til konflikt."

[67] "[...] min erfaring er at meget af det jeg lavede på rådhuset, det var jo varm luft i ringbind. Jeg sad jo også højt placeret, så det var ikke intentionen, men når man sidder i en strategisk stilling, så er du ikke på gulvet med folk og taler med dem, om deres udfordringer"

built strong alliances that enhanced their own authority and the credibility of the diversity policy" (2009, p. 166). Kirton & Greene are referring to internal diversity practitioners, but their point translates well to my study: some of the participants are perhaps able to appeal to the typical "key senior figures" because they share certain characteristics with the managers they have to work with (and for). If I - like Kirton & Greene - assume that the majority of senior managers belong to dominant groups in Sweden and Denmark (for example; white, cis-gender, heterosexual, Christian or non-religious, highly educated, able-bodied, 30-60 years of age), then the participants in my study all have the possibility to appeal to management by appealing to sameness. This, of course, is highly complex, and differs vastly between the participants. All of the participants are within the 'proper adult' age range of circa 30 to 60, all of them are able bodied, and none of them are religious. 5 out of 6 participants are white, and the same distribution goes for gender (cis), high education level, and having the local language as native. For some of the participants it is particularly possible to create rapport based on recognition as belonging to multiple dominant groups: Niels, Liv and Britt all identify as heterosexual, Christian or non-religious, and I read them as white and cis. I would argue that in some situations it *can* make their work - especially with senior managers - easier because they *seem similar*. In some of the interviews, it appeared more obvious that creating rapport based on some degree of mutual recognition was valuable. In Niels's case, for example: because his organization firmly places the needs of their member organizations in the center, and because they work explicitly with diversity management as their approach of choice, it is significant that he, himself, looks like, sounds like and indeed *is*, a CEO. Niels explained why his organization's mentorship program is a great success. Percentage wise, a majority of the ethnic minority mentees are able to begin and maintain education or work. He recounted:

Niels: "Honestly, they aren't the main actors in our projects; we turn it around: what the essential resource is, is the business person. They are the resource; passing it on. Companies and business people are our focus. The new Danes come second. There are plenty of unemployed new Danes, and not so many companies; they need to be nursed. So first, we listen to them, and then the new Danes."

Ronja: "Because they are the ones in power?"

Niels: "Yes, a lot of people tend to forget that."[68]

---

[68] Niels: "Helt ærligt, er de ikke hovedrollerne i vores projekter, vi vender den om: det der er den væsentligste resurse er erhvervspersonen. De er resursen, giver det videre. Virksomheder og erhvervspersoner er i fokus for os. De nydanske kommer i anden række. Ledige nydanskere er der masser af, men virksomhederne er der ikke så mange af, de skal nurses. Så vi lytter først til dem, så til nydanskerne."

Niels has to appeal to those in power, those who are and have resources: the "business people." And these people are *not* ethnic minorities. Mease explains this point as follows: "The imagined participant is likely White (or another dominant identity) because those who are disadvantaged by the current power relationships of organizations don't necessarily need a ''business case'' to see a need for and to participate in change" (2012, p. 392). Importantly, then, one consequence of Niels's reliance on the business case in order to motivate members of dominant groups, is that " [...] using the business case for motivation normalizes already privileged identities by positioning them as the ''normal'' audience of the argument" (Mease, 2012, p. 392). Additionally, although Niels has previously highlighted that his organization produces diversity tools for all organizational actors, regardless of their position or level, in the quote above he stressed that the organizational actor of highest interest to him is the one at the very top of the organizational - and, implicitly, class - hierarchy.

In this chapter I have examined the participants' positions as organizational outsiders: I have looked at the precarious nature of consultancy work and how the participants negotiate their status as experts, remain flexible and find a way to deliver what organizational actors expect from them. Using "discursive mergers" (Mease, 2009; 2012) is a way for the participants to align themselves with the business case while incorporating other discourses as well. Support from organizational actors is crucial to all of the participants, abeit in different ways. Support can, for example, depend on wether or not you can position yourself as similar to those you need to convince about the value of diversity. Ultimately, the approaches chosen by the participants are shaped both by demands by clients, and by the paradigms they align themselves with, including how the participants decide which markers of difference they work with. Basically, the strategies they choose depend on what they think the *purpose* of their work is - which differs somewhat. In the next chapter I will elaborate on this purpose by looking at the motivations of the participants.

Ronja: "fordi det er dem der har magten?"
Niels: "ja, det er der mange der glemmer."

7. Motivations

<u>On being 'the one' who is and does diversity</u>

In the interviews, a few of the participants expressed their thoughts about what it meant for them to be *part of* a disadvantaged group while arguing for the inclusion of that same group through their work. In the Anglophone diversity literature it appears as though diversity and equality professionals have most often, historically, been women, and/or part of ethnic or racial minorities themselves: "In practice, many of the people who do diversity work and who are familiar with the relevant legislation and all the concomitant discourses, arguments, tactics, techniques and training agendas are women, and many are from racialized minorities" (Swan & fox, 2010, p. 569; see also: Ahmed, 2012; Kirton & Greene, 2009). Being 'the one' who *does* diversity is seen as the task of those who *embody* diversity, as Ahmed (2012) shows - however, with the unfortunate consequence that others might be exempt from doing that work. As Ahmed recounts: "Becoming the race person means you are the one who is turned to when race turns up. The very fact of your existence can allow others not to turn up" (p. 5). Although Ahmed is referring to internal diversity practitioners, and not external ones, I find her contribution valuable in this context, because it highlights that challenging discrimination can become the task of those who *experience* that discrimination. However, talking about the discrimination which affects you, personally, can be a vulnerable position to place oneself in, as Eva explained when telling me about how tricky it can be to bring up "the exclusionary binary gender system:" "As cis I have a possibility and a responsibility for talking about gender identity in the same way that straight [people have regarding sexuality] - for example, my former colleague who is white and straight, when we were out [doing workshops] she could talk about racism, for example, because it was safe."[69] Eva, then, connects her position as a cis-gender person with both a possibility - it is "safe" - and a responsibility for talking about gender identity issues. In turn, some topics might be more difficult for her, because she embodies those identities herself - non-white and non-heterosexual, in this case. Eva recognizes both her personal boundaries as well as the limits of her privilege, and uses this recognition to navigate how and when to talk about certain issues. At a different point in the interview, Eva recounted how she can bring in her own experiences as a way of explaining gender identity norms: "[...] I talk about gender identity, how everybody has one, how it

---

[69] "ekskluderende binære kønssystem [...] som cis, har jeg jo en mulighed og et ansvar for at tale om kønsidentitet, på samme måde som straights - fx min gamle kollega som er hvid og straight, og når vi var ude, kunne hun tale om racisme, fx, for det var ufarligt."

manifests itself - then I talk from myself, about how I fit in, that no-one will react if I'm wearing nail polish or lipstick, that way I can talk around it."[70] Bringing in an example where Eva fits *in* rather than sticks *out* is a choice linked to the limits she has, which in turn are linked to Eva's grounding in norm criticism: keeping the focus on the norm rather than on those who do not live up to it. However, it is not easy work for Eva to talk about the cis norm, as I have previously elaborated on. Perhaps this is not only due to those issues being particularly difficult to bring up, but also due to "[...] an essentializing effect. For example, diversity workers become positioned as possessing knowledge about their own bodily experiences, such as being racialized or disabled. This limits what they can claim about different bodies that they do not inhabit, thus essentializing their own identities and bodies and constraining their own claims to wider expertise" (Swan & Fox, 2010, p. 580). Eva, then, like the other participants, has to make sure she firmly establishes her professional identity.

Britt also mentioned bringing in herself in examples, for instance when explaining how annoying it is to be read as something you do not wish to be read as: "I use myself, when I started working at [major transportation organization], and someone says 'what does the woman think about this' and I think 'oh God, I'm the only woman' - they [workshop participants] understand that: 'nooo, there you are as a professional, and then suddenly you are being read as a woman.' The question is if I'm also being read as a professional right then and there, right. Or I tell other stories."[71] Stories as well as examples and cases can be affective and useful ways for my participants to connect with organizational actors, which is exactly what Britt aims to do by telling a story like the one above. In her view, stories like this can be a "window" through which difficult conversations can be had. Although Britt no longer views her work as either political or specifically connected to gender, her past as a feminist activist and her many experiences of being 'the one' who deals with women's issues means that she is able to bring in gendered examples, like the one above, whenever she finds it beneficial to the point she wants to prove. I am deliberately not bringing in examples from Gudrun and Liv in this section, since they did not mention what it meant for them *as women* to work with diversity and inclusion. An interesting point, which might suggest that they fit more easily into the bodily norms of most workplaces than other minorities do (Swan & Fox, 2010, p. 580).

---

[70] "[...] jeg taler om kønsidentitet, at alle har en hvordan den tager sig ud, så taler jeg ud fra mig selv, om at jeg passer ind, at ingen reagerer hvis jeg har neglelak eller læbestift på, så kan jeg tale rundt om det."
[71] "Bruger mig selv, da jeg kom ind i DSB, og nogen siger 'hvad synes kvinden om det her', og jeg tænker 'Gud jeg er den eneste kvinde' - og det kan de godt forstå - 'neeej, du sidder der som professionel og pludselig bliver du aflæst som kvinde'. Spørgsmålet er om jeg også bliver aflæst som professionel lige der, ikke. Eller jeg kan fortælle andre historier."

Annie will also bring in her own experiences in her work, and for example tell stories about how she did not have any "gay role models" growing up. In the interview, she also joked that anyone can tell she's a lesbian by looking at her. Annie, then, does not hide her personal investment in promoting LGBT inclusion. However, she does not think that gay employees necessarily have to be the ones engaging with LGBT inclusion in organizations; quite the opposite can be an advantage. I asked her if anybody in the organization can be the ones who are vocally supportive, and she replied: "Oh yeah, it could be anybody - if you have a strong hetero-cis colleague high up, that is gonna be a stronger statement than if you have an out LGBT person."

Ronja: "Why?"

Annie: "Because they can also talk to the other hetero-cis people on their level - otherwise it will be: 'you're just saying that because you're gay.' But if you talk to another person who looks like you, and sounds like you, then they start listening to you as well, because you - 'oh, you're not gay, you have no agenda.'

Being suspected of having an agenda is a possible risk if you are advocating inclusion for your 'own kind' - there is a deligitimization risk: if, as a professional, you are perceived as acting based on your own interests, you can be deemed not trustworthy, too sensitive, too invested. As I have previously shown, by insisting that there is a problem, you can "[...] become the problem you pose" (Ahmed, 2012, p. 153). Thus, as Annie explained, an LGBT employee advocating LGBT inclusion is easily shut down with a 'non-issue' argument, while a hetero-cis person, who is naturally perceived as authoritarian and respectable, can convince someone "who looks like you, and sounds like you," as she recounted. As I have already argued, some of my participants are able to relate to organizational actors because of being 'like them', while others - such as Annie - will have to strategize differently, for example by relying on and emphasizing the business case, as Mease (2012) suggests based on her own study. She argues that controlling "personal interests and emotion [...] appeared particularly relevant to consultants and advocates from minority groups who met the challenge of being perceived as self-interested and who controlled emotion to help sustain credibility as advocates for diversity" (Mease, 2012, p. 396). In sum, practitioners like Annie and Eva need to balance their strategies carefully since they risk deligitimization both because they can be accused of having an "agenda," as Annie's example shows, or they can be essentialized and be perceived as unknowledgeable about anything except their own experiences, as Eva's example hints at.

<u>The personal, the political - or both</u>

All of the participants in my study are, arguably, working to create inclusive workplaces where diversity is valued. However, their specific motivations differ. A few of the participants stated an explicit desire about "contributing to make the world a more accepting place,"[72] as Gudrun put it. Based on their interviews with a variety of internal diversity practitioners in the UK, Kirton & Greene (2009) likewise conclude that, in spite of an increased alignment of the goals of practitioners with those of management, "[...] the opportunity to make a difference (in a social justice sense) was important and satisfying, especially but not exclusively, to those in the public sector" (p. 173). In my study, Eva (the only public employee) was certainly not the only one with a social justice motivation, as I will show. Gudrun called her motivation "banal" and "up in the clouds," indicating that she thought it sounded rather utopian; almost childish. She elaborated by saying that she aimed to create a "snow ball effect" by beginning with individuals and organizations - "from the bottom, definitely."[73] Anchoring motivation in the specific changes diversity work can facilitate was also emphasized by Liv, who sees diverse workplaces as much more pleasant and respectful. However, she also saw "structural obstacles for certain groups"[74] as a driving force. She also expressed a certain degree of fatigue with the tolerance perspective, which she said is a "[...] fashionable word within Swedish politics [...] These are important questions, and I don't really understand why we haven't come any further."[75] Liv also named the development in Swedish politics in the last decade as particularly frustrating: "Racist parties - that motivates one to work for change."[76] Frustration, fatigue, indignation and political will is an explicit driving force for Liv. The same is the case for Annie who, as I have already emphasized, repeatedly brought up exhaustion as an issue in her work: "It is hard to keep motivated. I think, um, I don't know. For me, in general, I wanna do something to help people, and when I hear a story - whether it's a personal friend or acquaintances, who have these horror stories, even though that's a negative way to be motivated, for me it's a big motivation: there's work to be done, and I wanna make sure I can help you, wanna help create the work environment that's gonna be inclusive of you, and people aren't gonna be homophobic or transphobic or whatever." Negative motivation - such as anger - is a central motivating factor for Annie. Like Liv and Eva she is driven by a sense of injustice on behalf

---

[72] "være med til at gøre verden til et mere rummeligt sted"

[73] "banalt [...] højtflyvende [...] sneboldseffekt [...] nedefra, i hvert fald."

[74] "strukturelle begrænsninger for visse grupper"

[75] "[...] modeord indenfor svensk politik [...] det er vigtige spørgsmål, og jeg kan ikke rigtig forstå at vi ikke er kommet længere."

[76] "racistiske partier, det gør at man vil arbejde for at forandre"

of certain minority groups. Ahmed finds negative motivation to be particularly central in feminism, and does not see what it is against "[...] as 'exterior' to feminism. Indeed, 'what' feminism is against is 'what' *gives feminist politics its edge*. If anger is a form of 'against-ness', then it is precisely about the impossibility of moving beyond the history of injuries to a pure or innocent position" (2014, p. 174). This importance of historization which Ahmed stresses, can also be seen in Eva's quote above, where she mentioned carrying on a "legacy." Negative motivation can, like the causes for it, be exhausting in the long run, as Annie describes, because it is impossible for her to move "beyond" it, and unto a "pure or innocent position." For Annie, exhaustion is also linked to the lack of general support she experiences. In her opinion, there is a lack of people who "[...] wanna drive the train. Sometimes it's just really tiring." Kirton & Greene's study indicates that "frustration [...] exhaustion" as well as "isolation, stress, marginalisation and career jeopardy" continue to be factors which influence many diversity practitioners, even in contemporary, more business case oriented approaches (2009, p. 167, 172), a point which my study confirms to a certain degree. Both Annie and Liv links their motivation to explicitly personal reasons. Annie explained it like this: "There is definitely a personal agenda, and every time somebody tells me some sort of negative story, I feel personally offended as well. So yeah, I guess there is some sort of... Yeah, it's like my family [laughs]." Looking out for a collective which she is part of - her "family" - helps Annie focus. The same goes for Liv, although in a less metaphorical way: "I'm married to a man from Kosovo, who has had a really hard time at the employment market [...] so my interest has also grown from the private. So, both privately and professionally."[77] In Liv's account the *dual* motivating factors of personal *and* political motivations come together, and make her work feel even more meaningful.

Two of the participants explicitly named "having a calling" as a reason for doing their work, naming specific experiences as important turning points. As I have already shown, Gudrun's encounter with the unequal, Danish health care system as a young nurse was significant: "that was the beginning of my calling regarding trying to do something about this extreme norm that rules about what is up and down - normal - what we do here in Denmark."[78] Niels also named an early work experience as significant, although with a quite different entry point than Gudrun. While working as a teacher at an international private school, he was *looking* for something to catch his attention, something to do: "I've always

---

[77] "Jeg er gift med en mand fra Kosovo, som har haft det virkelig hårdt på arbejdsmarkedet [...] så min interesse er også vokset frem fra det private. Så både privat og professionelt."
[78] "det var starten til mit kald i forhold til at prøve gøre noget ved den ekstreme norm der hersker i forhold til hvad der er op og ned på normal, hvad gør vi her i Danmark"

been good at learning stuff [...] it's fun to win, not so fun to lose. When I was almost done with my MSc(econ.) I wasn't the best at anything [...] I wanted to start something which was my corner, which I was gonna be best at."[79] This is the way Niels initiated the interview and the story of how he eventually ended up leading the organization he is today. He continued: "[...] I heard that the great challenges in the late 90's were getting the Danes and the New Danes to work together [...] I decided to set that as a goal. Via detours I ended up being offered getting this organization up and running, it was a calling, really."[80] In this story of how Niels found his "calling," he links his desire to be best at something to his urge to engage himself in improving tolerance and putting his business school background to good use. He is, by far, the only participant who places their desire to be *successful* and *unique* at the center of their story of being motivated and wanting to promote diversity: he incorporates his *personal* business case into his motivation narrative. In contrast, then, to the participants whom I focused on in the beginning of this chapter, Gudrun and Niels are motivated by "a calling" to help disadvantaged immigrants and ethnic minorities. They do not see their membership of the dominant ethnic group as problematic, but rather as an obligation: they have been "called" to deal with these issues. This has important implications for who inequality is an issue *for* - not in the sense of who is personally affected, but rather who should do something about it. As Ward highlights: "At the individual level, diversity culture has also expanded the range of people who feel a sense of ownership over social justice discourses" (Ward, 2008, p. 29), she elaborates that privileged and highly educated people in particular are the latest advocates to arrive at the scene of diversity. As I have already stressed, being 'like' the average senior manager can have its advantages when advocating for diversity to be put on the agenda. But it also has the potential consequence that it will end up excluding minority practitioners from the field altogether. If, as Annie argues, the words have more weight and value if they come from the mouth of a hetero-cis employee instead of the LGBT one, then this might have serious consequences for not only diversity work, but also for other areas of the social justice agenda. There is a risk, in my view, that diversity work can become very elitist and reserved primarily for those who can 'appropriately' and rationally argue for inclusion, and those who can successfully follow the 'right' education and career paths.

Mease notes that consultants have to position themselves "[...] as credible and motivating without appearing either too passionate or detached" (2012, p. 396). In the

---

[79] "[...] det er sjovt at vinde, ikke så sjovt at tabe, da jeg næsten var færdig med min cand merc, der var der ikke noget jeg var bedst til [...] jeg ville begynde på noget der var mit hjørne, som jeg skulle være bedst til."
[80] "jeg hørte at de store udfordringer i slut-90'erne var at få danskere og nydanskere til at arbejde sammen [...] Jeg besluttede mig for at sætte det som mål. Ad omveje endte jeg med at få tilbudt at få foreningen op at flyve, det var et kald, altså."

interview, Niels spoke at length about the balancing acts of his employees concerning motivation and passion. He tells his employees that he knows they have "[...] a deeply felt respect for diversity, which, in reality, makes them into people who get indignant at discrimination, no doubt about that, and they need to have attitude, but they also need to control it."[81] Niels's statements about the containment of passion which he demands from his employees is quite similar to Mease's point that diversity consultants feel like they need to control the "strong feelings" the work carries with it in order to not let them "'get in the way'' of their long-term goals" (2012, p. 399). Keeping motivations in line with the business case as it is dictated by the diversity management paradigm, is important for certain of my participants, in particular Niels. The rest of the participants appeared to adjust their passions carefully as well, in ways which allowed them to maintain their personal motivation and enjoyment about their work while keeping their ideological goals in sight.

8. Discussion

In this chapter I will reflect on the participants' views on the importance of legislation and regulation, and link it with a summarizing analysis of the overlaps and differences between the preferred approaches of the participants, and what these preferences convey about the participants' individual paradigms. I will conclude the chapter with a section on further perspectives, where I outline certain aspects of this research that could be expanded on in the future.

As I have highlighted throughout this thesis, Niels clearly aligns himself with a diversity management approach, relying heavily on the business case. His organization's work is based on the motivating factor that diversity is good for the bottom line, an argument which does not benefit from being linked with legislative imperatives, as he explained in his critique of the EU workplace discrimination legislation:

"The EU's work in this area - they also talk about the business case, but the entire approach is anchored in legislation, they tell themselves that they can say 'you have to do this because there is money in it, and if you don't, then it's discrimination'. And that's where I'm sure that the companies see through that, and realize that none of it actually works to their

---

[81] "[..] en dybfølt respekt for mangfoldigheden, som gør at de i virkeligheden er mennesker der bliver fortørnede over diskrimination, ingen tvivl om det, og de skal have en attitude, men de skal også forstå at styre det."

advantage."[82] Niels, then, prefers to rely on business oriented, voluntaristic arguments, and he does not believe that they mesh well with governmental requirements. His organization basically depends on the *absence* of discrimination legislation.

Much like Niels, Annie positions the business case as a central argument in her work: creating an inclusive workplace is good for the entire organization, including the bottom line. However, she also merges the business case with social justice arguments, and unlike Niels, she would like the workplace discrimination legislation in Denmark to demand more of organizations:

"The difference between the U.S. and Denmark is that there's a sort of laziness in Denmark, because there is this [attitude]: 'it already says it in the law; we don't need to have a specific discrimination policy at our workplace, we're gonna use the one from the government.' And so then, in that way, people are not necessarily aware of these discrimination policies. Because it's not standing - if someone read their HR bylaws, if an employee read them, there would not necessarily be a non-discrimination policy, because it's standing in the law [...] I think there's some sort of bad circle happening. The employee cannot see it, and the company is assuming that the employee knows that of course you can't discriminate, because that would be illegal."

Annie's work involves convincing organizations that they need to have policies to supplement, or perhaps even go beyond, what the law requires. However, because of "laziness," most organizations do not have diversity or anti-discrimination policies. Instead they rely on the assumption that inclusion is common-sense, which leads to what Annie calls a "bad circle." She stresses that organizations "[...] have to make their own policy, because every company knows what's best for their environment. It has to be individualized, personalized. You can't just say 'you have to have 30% LGBT people on the board,' it's not gonna work [...] You have to think about it and write it down, that is a good start."

When she was working in the public sector, Gudrun also experienced first hand how ineffective discrimination legislation can be in Denmark. Having removed herself from that sector, she is working within a field where she depends more on the business case and social justice discourses, and less on legislation. However, in the interview she did express frustration with the lack of political will, and how precarious it can be, as I have already showed.

---

[82] "EUs indsats på området: De taler også om business cases, men hele indsatsen er forankret i legislation, de bilder sig ind at de både kan sige 'I skal gøre det fordi der er penge i det, og hvis I ikke gør det så er det diskrimination'. Der er jeg sikker på, at virksomhederne gennemskuer at ingen af tingene faktisk er til deres fordel."

Even more so than Gudrun, Britt has removed herself from the field of diversity and anti-discrimination, and she briefly expressed in the interview that she is deliberately not very concerned with the law.

Working in the public sector, Eva is quite aware of the relevant legislation and regulation in her field. Her work depends directly on political will, and she prefers detailed, preventive legislation. She has a norm critical, intersectional approach, and relies heavily on social justice discourses. In the interview, she linked her own political orientation - to the left - with her attention to structural discrimination. When I asked her about the difference between Denmark and Sweden, she recounted that "[...] we [Sweden] have more space in the laws, absolutely, there's a big difference - the political attitude is the big difference, definitely. What's normalized, and what isn't, is the big difference. But there is a perception that we are 'good.' There is the opinion that there is a limit, for example in the division of parental leave between the genders, that there is a free choice, for example: 'it isn't about structures.'" In this quote, Eva positions Sweden as politically prioritizing issues of inequality in a way which Denmark is lacking. Simultaneously, she stresses that there appears to be a limit to this prioritization, stemming from the refusal to recognize certain issues as linked with structural inequality. Parental leave is one such issue.

Liv and I discussed legislation repeatedly in the interview, as I have already showed in chapter 1. It became apparent that she finds anti-discrimination legislation important, and that she would like it to be expanded to include more pro-active measures, since she thinks there is a lack of legitimacy surrounding prevention of certain kinds of discrimination which are not included in the law - Liv mentions age as an example. Liv's approach mixes norm criticism and social justice with a diversity management tradition which emphasizes the business case. Like Niels, then, she adjusts her approach to fit the needs of her member organizations, and she often stresses the financial benefits of diversity, since this argument is important to most members. However, unlike Niels, by bringing in other approaches, she does not let the business case stand alone. She can bring in social justice and equality arguments because they are seen as legitimate by the organizations she is hired by: "This is often a perspective which the employers see: 'even if we follow the discrimination law, it doesn't mean we will have an inclusive workplace.'"

The differences between Niels and Liv's approaches are the best examples of the subtle, yet significant, differences between Denmark and Sweden concerning anti-discrimination, equality, inclusion and diversity in the workplace: the two participants have both chosen approaches which resonate with the organizations they work for, but where Niels

consistently has to place the business case front and center, Liv can include multiple arguments for why a diverse workplace is beneficial, as well as use the anti-discrimination law to provide her work with legitimacy and relevance. She can, in other words, work *with* legislation, while Niels works *in spite* of it. Based on my analysis of the paradigms and attitudes of all participants, I would argue that detailed legislation which includes preventive measures can create more *space* for diversity practitioners to choose their approaches, combine arguments and vocabularies, as well as challenge organizational actors' perception of norms, privileges and social structures. In short, legislation can provide their work with much-needed legitimacy to a certain degree. Even though Niels is against preventive measures, I think it would actually make his work easier, since he would not have to fight so hard for it to be perceived as legitimate and important. The issue of legitimacy, as it is experienced by the participants in my study, is of course connected to the general legitimacy of issues such as diversity, inclusion, norm criticism, feminism, queer and trans rights, anti-racism, and so on in the two nation-states. As I have showed throughout this thesis, there are many different ways of approaching the task of creating inclusive, diverse workplaces. Each participant in this study has their own vision of how best to create the ripple effects they all see as crucial, and so my study shows that there is a multiplicity of methods and attitudes around what it means to do diversity work in Denmark and Sweden. Some participants, Gudrun and Britt in particular, have found their own professionalized and legitimizing niches focusing on workplace culture in general - this is fairly detached from the kind of politicized diversity work Annie and Eva prefer, for example. Niels's organization is built firmly around the business case, while Liv's prefers to merge it with a variety of with other arguments, discourses and methods.

Diversity work is a balancing act, but exactly *how* thin a line my participants have to balance in their work depends on legitimizing discourses, which, in turn, are intimately linked with the impact of social justice discourses and activist movements, as well as legislation and trends in the business world. Although in a global perspective, both Denmark and Sweden have made significant improvements to equality, my study supports the view that a more nuanced examination of the mechanisms of exclusion and equality are necessary in both countries.

Further perspectives

Going beyond the scope of this thesis, it would be interesting to further investigate how discourses around feminism, LGBT issues, immigration, ethnic minorities, inclusion and

identity politics are framed in the public and academic debates in Sweden and Denmark, for example by examining mainstream media texts. In addition, it would be valuable to continue doing research into both Swedish and Danish diversity work by looking at how it actually affects organizations. This can, for example, be done by interviewing employees and doing observations as well as examining organizational policies.

There are a few issues that came up in this project, which I would find particularly interesting to develop on, but which lie beyond the scope of this thesis. I will briefly outline four of these issues below.

Firstly, mentorships as a diversity initiative proved to be a key topic in a few of the interviews, and I think it would be very valuable to develop further on the reasons for why mentorships are popular, and which power dynamics are involved in them. Secondly, I find the temporal aspect of consultancy work quite interesting: what are the implications of predominantly approaching diversity work as short-term? And are long-term projects necessarily more productive? Thirdly, a central question when dealing with organizational outsiders, consultants and independent freelancers arose in this study: for whom is it possible to become a *successful* outsider? Who can leap into an unknown financial future and still land on their feet? I did not explicitly ask the participants about their salaries and financial situations, but the topics did surface in the interviews implicitly, especially when we were talking about resistance and whether or not they felt recognized as knowledgeable experts/professionals. The participants' status and the level of resistance they meet varies according to the conditions of their employment, and the resources they have in their positions. Gudrun, for example, was able to establish herself as an independent consultant in what is, according to her, a saturated market; and Annie was not. The factors which ultimately determine who can establish themselves as *professionals* and those who cannot, are many and complex, but they are not random nor exclusively an expression of the individual's ability to 'take chances,' be 'lucky' or have 'the right attitude.' My point is that personal factors and choices influence who can and will 'succeed,' but that these are interlinked with issues of class, as well as ethnicity, nationality, gender, sexuality and educational level. In sum, it would be interesting to examine the worklife trajectories of diversity consultants in order to further analyze the complexities of this kind of project-based, precarious labor. Finally, the focus and aim of this thesis raises a string of important questions about capitalism and the neoliberal market: does workplace diversity matter? Does inclusive policies and attitudes make a difference when the capitalist framework persists? Can attention to power asymmetries and structural discrimination solve any problems, when those issues are inherent

to neoliberal systems? It is my hope that this study can contribute to the global research on diversity culture, workplace inclusion and neoliberalism by adding a local, qualitative perspective, which has clear limitations, as I hope my final, unanswered questions highlight.

9. Conclusion

In this final chapter I will summarize the key analytical points I have made throughout this thesis by connecting them with the research questions I posed in the introduction:

In contemporary Danish and Swedish contexts, which discursive strategies are chosen by a selection of diversity practitioners in their work? Which paradigms do the practitioners align themselves with?

Subquestions: *How does legislation influence the participants' ability to do their work? Which resistance do they encounter in their work? What are their motivations?*

Working within a framework of feminist, queer, anti-racist and affect theory as well as critical diversity studies, I have analyzed six qualitative interviews with diversity practitioners from Denmark and Sweden. In chapter 3 I engaged with the participants' experiences of encountering resistance from organizational actors. Resistance appears at all levels in the organizational hierarchies, and at the managerial level it is most often expressed as material: there is no time or money to prioritize diversity initiatives. This type of argument was reported by all of the Danish participants, but was not as common for the Swedish ones. At the individual level, organizational actors often meet diversity initiatives with defensive attitudes, insisting that there are no issues of discrimination or exclusion at the workplace. All of the participants mentioned this kind of resistance, and described how they would counter it, or attempt to avoid it: by using certain words or phrasings, and not others, they could minimize resistance. However, some participants were more willing to risk triggering resistance than others, as they saw it as inherent to the kind of change work diversity work is to them. What this analysis on resistance shows, is that certain topics and issues are more difficult to talk about than others, and that this varies quite greatly from participant to participant according to their approaches and criteria for success as well as the level of legitimacy diversity issues in general are met with in the country where they work.

In chapter 4, I explored how the participants make diversity relatable and feasible for the organizational actors they work with. For all of the participants, it involves relying on

vocabularies that do not trigger resistance, but instead appeals to the actors. Telling stories - bringing in examples, cases and anecdotes - is another way of engaging audiences and workshop participants. For Niels in particular, telling the *good* story is important: showcasing diversity by referring to successful, profitable diversity initiatives in different companies.

Making diversity appear desirable and doable is especially important for organizational outsiders, which is what my participants are. In chapter 5, I examined how they remain flexible and adjust their approaches according to the needs and wants of their clients. Most of them utilize discursive mergers (Mease, 2012, p. 400), and combine the business case with social justice approaches, such as norm criticism. It became apparent in my analysis that the participants operate with distinct paradigms, which fundamentally influences how they conceive of both the purpose and the process of their work. For example, it varied greatly who the participants saw as primarily benefitting from diversity initiatives: the participants with an outspoken social justice approach tended to prioritize the benefits for minorities higher than those for organizational actors with privileged positions. The focus of the participants' work also varied: most were mainly concerned with the inclusion of ethnic minorities, others have cultural differences, broadly speaking, as a focal point, and one has LGBT inclusion as an expertise. Most of the participants, though, attempt to work holistically, and include issues of gender, age or disabilities occasionally. However, only one of the participants referred to her work as 'intersectional,' and only two mentioned non-binary gender as a concern. Thus, there are limits both to what the participants appear to find relevant themselves, and to what they consider relevant or attractive for their clients to engage with. Whether or not an issue is deemed relevant or not appeared to be connected to the personal identity markers of the participants: some, who were part of a minority themselves, expressed greater concern with the power dynamics of privileges and disadvantages. Finally, for some of the participants, it appeared particularly important to be able to support organizational insiders, who might need an outsider's input on how to create momentum and awareness around diversity in the organization. The position as an outsider is ultimately both powerful - providing fresh ideas and having no investments in the organizational culture - and quite powerless: as a consultant, you have no influence on the long-term effects of your work, or on how resources are spent.

In chapter 6, I further developed on my analysis of the concerns and focal points of the participants, by engaging with their motivations. All of the participants expressed indignation over the social and cultural devaluation of minorities, but only some of them have an explicitly politicized agenda, while others considered being 'too passionate' as an obstacle

to their work. Some participants linked their motivation with personal experience, while others considered it a kind of 'calling' to help the less advantaged.

In the discussion, I considered the participants' views on the role of anti-discrimination workplace legislation in their work. While some of them preferred less regulation, or considered legislation to be irrelevant to their work, a few of the participants would like more nuanced legislation with more demands for preventive measures. I summarized my analysis by linking the views on legislation with the individual paradigms of the participants. I can conclude that the paradigms of the participants vary greatly, and that their view on legislation is connected to their agendas: one participant, Niels (DK), has a diversity management approach which depends solely on the business case. Two participants, Gudrun and Britt (both DK), are politically motivated, but do not consider their work to be neither particularly diversity-oriented, nor political. They prefer approaches which allow them to discursively detach themselves from anti-discrimination work, and instead focus on the positive (social and financial) aspects of a culturally diverse workplace. Annie (DK) merges the business case with her political desire to make a difference for LGBT people in workplaces. Finally, Liv and Eva (both SE) lean toward an approach where the business case does not necessarily remain the focal point, and where it can be merged with social justice arguments and norm criticism. Both of them partly ascribed the relatively high levels of legitimacy and acknowledgement they experience to the explicitly preventive requirements in the Swedish anti-discrimination legislation.

This thesis confirms that 'diversity' is a highly contested concept. While some of the participants are happy to have their work associated with, or revolve around it, others actively distance themselves from it. The ambiguity felt by the participants shows that 'diversity' as both concept and practice is, perhaps, widely celebrated in Scandinavia, but it remains complex to the ones who work with and encounter it regularly. As such, in Denmark and Sweden, practitioners might not be as keen on 'diversity' as for example in the UK and the U.S. where it has been implemented in policies and legislation for much longer. This reluctance to celebrate diversity can be linked to the view that 'diversity' has come to connote unwanted agendas for some of those who work with it. However, it can also be attributed to the lack of legitimacy diversity work is often met with, as recounted by the participants in this study.

10. References

Acker, Joan. (2006) Inequality Regimes: Gender, Class, and Race in Organizations. *Gender & Society*. 20. p.441–464.

Ahmed, Sara. (2012) *On being included: racism and diversity in institutional life.* Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press

- (2014 [2004]) *The cultural politics of emotion.* 2nd Ed. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

- (2010) *The promise of happiness.* Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press

Bacchi, Carol. (2005) Discourse, Discourse Everywhere: Subject 'Agency' in Feminist Discourse Methodology. *NORA: Nordic Journal of Women's Studies.* 13 (3). p.198–209.

Benschop, Yvonne. (2010) The dubious power of diversity management. *Essec Diversity and Performance Chair Conference.* Cergy: Essec. p.1–21.

Bromseth, Janne. (2010) Förandringsstrategier och problemförståelser: från utbilding om den Andra till queer pedagogik. In Bromseth, Janne & Darj, Frida (eds.). *Normkritisk pedagogik: makt, lärande och strategier för förändring.* Uppsala: Centrum för genusvetenskap, Uppsala universitet.

Bryman, Alan. (2012) *Social research methods.* 4th Ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Den Store Danske. Gyldendal. (2015) *Janteloven.* [Online] Available from: http://www.denstoredanske.dk/Kunst_og_kultur/Litteratur/Nyere_motivskikkelser/Jantel oven [Accessed: 2nd May 2015].

DeVault, Marjorie L. & Gross, Glenda. (2007) Feminist Interviewing: Experience, Talk, and Knowledge. In Hesse-Biber, Sharlene Nagy (ed.). *Handbook of feminist research: theory and praxis.* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Due Billing, Yvonne & Sundin, Elisabeth. (2006) From Managing Equality to Managing Diversity: A Critical Scandinavian Perspective on Gender and Workplace Diversity. In Konrad, Alison M.; Prasad, Pushkala & Pringle, Judith K. (eds.). *Handbook of workplace diversity.* London: Sage Publications.

Duggan, Lisa. (2003) *The Twilight of Equality? Neoliberalism, Cultural Politics, and the Attack on Democracy.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Hochschild, Arlie R. (1983) *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feeling.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Jansson, Ulrika. (2012) Neoliberal Market Imperative in the Name of Gender Equality: Constructions of Gender in the Confederation of Swedish Enterprise. In Jansdotter

Samuelsson, Maria; Krekula, Clary & Åberg, Magnus (eds.). *Gender and change. Power, politics and everyday practices*. Karlstad: Karlstad University Press.

Kirton, Gill; Greene, Anne-Marie & Dean, Deborah. (2007). British diversity professionals as change agents - radicals, tempered radicals or liberal reformers? *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*. 22 (November). p.1979–1995.

Kirton, Gill & Greene, Anne-Marie. (2009) The costs and opportunities of doing diversity work in mainstream organisations. *Human Resource Management Journal*. 19 (2). p.159–175.

Konrad, Alison M.; Prasad, Pushkala & Pringle, Judith K. (2006). Examining the Contours of Workplace Diversity: Concepts, Contexts and Challenges. In Konrad, Alison M.; Prasad, Pushkala & Pringle, Judith K. (eds.). *Handbook of workplace diversity*. London: Sage Publications.

Liinason, Mia. (2012) Conceptual Dilemmas, Poltical Actions, Feminist Questions. In Jansdotter Samuelsson, Maria; Krekula, Clary & Åberg, Magnus (eds.). *Gender and change. Power, politics and everyday practices*. Karlstad: Karlstad University Press.

McRobbie, Angela. (2009) *The aftermath of feminism: gender, culture and social change*. London: SAGE.

Mease, Jennifer J. (2012) Reconsidering Consultants' Strategic Use of the Business Case for Diversity. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*. 40 (4). p.384–402.

Mease, Jennifer J. (2009) *Working Toward Diversity: Consultants' Strategies for Organizational Change*. Ph.D Thesis. The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Mulinari, Diana & Neergaard, Anders. (2013) We are Sweden Democrats because we care for others: Exploring racisms in the Swedish extreme right. *European Journal of Women's Studies*. 21 (1). p.43-56.

Nebeling Petersen, Michael. (2012) *Somewhere, over the rainbow: Biopolitiske rekonfigurationer af den homoseksuelle figur*. Ph.D Thesis. The University of Copenhagen.

Potter, Jonathan & Wetherell, Margaret. (1990) Discourse: Noun, verb or social practice? *Philosophical Psychology*. 3 (2/3). n.p.

Prasad, Pushkala; Mills, Albert J. (1997) From Showcase to Shadow: Understanding the Dilemmas of Managing Workplace Diversity. In Prasad, Pushkala; Mills, Albert J.; Elmes, Michael & Prasad, Anshuman (eds.). *Managing the Organizational Melting Pot: Dilemmas of Workplace Diversity*. London: SAGE.

Puar, Jasbir K. (2007). *Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Randorff Hegnhøj, Rikke; Olsen, Bente M. & Poulsen, Helle. (2007) Indledning. *Kvinder, køn og forskning*. 16 (1). p.3-7.

Rich, Adrienne. (2007 [1984]) Notes Toward a Politics of Location. In Freedman, Estelle B. (ed.). *The essential feminist reader*. New York: Modern Library.

Risberg, Annette & Søderberg, Anne-Marie. (2008) Translating a management concept: diversity management in Denmark. *Gender in Management: An International Journal*. 23 (6). p.426–441.

Saldaña, Johnny. (2009) *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers*. Los Angeles: SAGE.

Samuelsson, Maria J.; Krekula, Clary & Åberg, Magnus. (2012) From Research to Gender Politics: On Gender Relations, Identity Politics and Visionary Dialogues. In Jansdotter Samuelsson, Maria; Krekula, Clary & Åberg, Magnus (eds.). *Gender and change. Power, politics and everyday practices*. Karlstad: Karlstad University Press.

Sandemose, Aksel. (1936 [1933]) *A Fugitive Crosses His Tracks*. New York, N.Y.

Scott, Joan W. (1991) The Evidence of Experience. *Critical Inquiry*. 17. (4). p.773-797.

Smith, Dorothy E. (2005) *Institutional Ethnography: a Sociology for People.* Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press.

Squire, Corrine; Andrews, Molly & Tamboukou, Maria. (2008) Introduction: What is narrative research? In Squire, Corrine; Andrews, Molly & Tamboukou, Maria (eds.). *Doing Narrative Research.* 2nd Ed. Los Angeles: SAGE.

Swan, Elaine & Fox, Steve. (2010) Playing the game: Strategies of resistance and co-optation in diversity work. *Gender, Work and Organization*. 17 (5). p.567–589.

Tyler, Jo A. (2007) Incorporating Storytelling into Practice: How HDR Practitioners Foster Strategic Storytelling. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*. 18 (4). p.559–587.

Ward, Jane E. (2008) *Respectably Queer: Diversity Culture in LGBT Activist Organizations*. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press.

Widerberg, Karin. (1998) Translating gender. *NORA: Nordic Journal of Women's Studies*. 6 (2). p.133–138.

Zanoni, Patrizia; Janssens, Maddy; Benschop, Yvonne & Nkomo, Stella. (2010) Unpacking Diversity, Grasping Inequality: Rethinking Difference Through Critical Perspectives. *Organization*. 17 (1). p.9–29.

Legislation

Beskræftigelsesministeriet. (2008) Bekendtgørelse af lov om forbud mod forskelsbehandling på arbejdsmarkedet m.v. LBK nr 1349 af 16/12/2008. Denmark.

Kulturdepartementet. (2008) Diskrimineringslag (2008:567). Svensk författningssamling
2008:567. Sweden.

11. Appendix A. First email to participants

Kære _____

Jeg har læst om dit arbejde online, og jeg synes det lyder meget interessant. Jeg ville sætte stor pris på, hvis du har lyst til at mødes og snakke om dit arbejde og dine erfaringer, da jeg netop nu er i gang med mit speciale ved Kønsstudier på Lunds Universitet. Mit fokus er konsulenter der arbejder med mangfoldighed, lighed og forandring, og deres erfaringer og oplevelser. Jeg er klar over, at du sikkert har rimelig travlt, så jeg vil være meget taknemmelig for din deltagelse.

Interviewet ville være ret uformelt, og vare mellem en og halvanden time. Det kan foregå lige hvor du vil, men meget gerne indenfor de næste tre uger.

Jeg håber meget på at høre fra dig, og at du - ligesom jeg - synes at det kunne være interessant at snakke om dit arbejde og dit felt.

Hvis du har nogen spørgsmål eller kommentarer, så kontakt mig endelig.

Bedste hilsner,

Ronja

Dear _____

I have read about your work online, and I find it very interesting. It would be really helpful for me to have a talk with you about your work, because I am currently doing research for my master's thesis in Gender Studies at Lund University. My focus is on the experiences of consultants in the field of diversity, equality and change. I am aware you might be very busy, so I really appreciate any time you might share with me.

The interview would be quite informal and last between 1 and 1 1/2 hours, and can take place anywhere you feel comfortable. I would really appreciate if we could do the interview within the next 3 weeks.

I really hope to hear from you, and you - like me - think it would be interesting to talk about your work and your field.

Please contact me if you have any questions or concerns.

I really hope to hear from you, best,

Ronja

12. Appendix B. Second email to participants

Kære _____

som du ved, er jeg i fuld gang med at skrive mit speciale, som snart skal afleveres.

Først og fremmest tusind tak for din deltagelse i interviewet, det er virkelig spændende og relevant for mit skriveri. Jeg fremsender specialet, som aftalt, når det er færdigt.

I specialet skal jeg jo "præsentere" dig og de øvrige interviewpersoner. Det vil jeg naturligvis gerne gøre så præcist som muligt, samtidig med at jeg sikrer at alle er anonymiserede. Derfor vil jeg bede dig om at oplyse mig om hvordan du identificerer dig selv i forhold til køn, seksualitet, alder, etnicitet, religion, samt eventuelle funktionsnedsættelser og andre identifikationer du finder relevante at tilføje. Så er jeg sikker på at jeg præsenterer dig korrekt i specialet, samtidig med at det er nogle informationer som jeg har brug for for at min analyse kan blive så korrekt som muligt. Du behøver selvfølgelig ikke oplyse mig om noget du ikke har lyst til.

Lad mig vide om du har nogen spørgsmål eller kommentarer,

bedste hilsner, Ronja

Dear _____

as you know, I am in the process of writing my thesis, which I have to hand in shortly.

First of all, thank you for your participation in the interview, it's really exciting and relevant to my writing. I'll forward the thesis, as agreed, when it is finished.

In the thesis, I will have to "present" you and the other participants. I would obviously like to do this as accurately as possible, while ensuring that everyone is anonymized.

Therefore, I ask you to tell me how you identify yourself regarding gender, sexuality, age, ethnicity, religion and any impairments and other identifiers you find relevant to add. This way I am sure that I present you correctly in my thesis, while it is also some information that I need in order for my analysis to be as accurate as possible. You do of course not have to tell me anything you do not want to.

Let me know if you have any questions or comments,

Best regards, Ronja

13. Appendix C: Presentation of participants

Eva was the first person I interviewed. Because she went on paternal leave while I was finishing my thesis, I could not get in touch with her and have her provide me with her personal information. However, in the interview, it became apparent that she identifies as a non-white, non-heterosexual, cis woman. She works as an Equality and Diversity Officer in the administration of a large, Swedish city, a newly established position which she got six months prior to the interview. She studied sociology at university while being active in feminist organizations. Her first job was in a foundation which worked for equality between boys and girls in Swedish schools, and she also has experience with equality and diversity work from a university administration and the organization Liv works in. While she worked there, I met her for the first time: she is the only participant I had already (briefly) met before the project. She and a co-worker came to Lund University to explain about their work, and I was the only student who showed up. Hearing about their work, and the challenges it entailed, actually made me even more interested in diversity work than I already was, and gave me the idea to interview consultants for this thesis. Because she sparked my interest in this project, it was a great pleasure to be able to interview Eva in depth for it.

Liv is a heterosexual woman in her early 30s, and she was born in Sweden. Liv is project manager and one of three employees in a member-organization for other organizations who want to work with diversity and inclusion, specifically concerning ethnicity. The organization has roughly 40 members from various industries and sectors. Liv has an educational background in gender studies and strategic communication, and has worked widely with related topics in the past: integration projects, equality integration and projects concerning mental illness.

Niels works in a similar member-organization to Liv's: it also has a primary focus on inclusion of ethnic minorities in the workplace, but is slightly larger, with roughly 100 members. Niels is a heterosexual man in his late 40s, and born in Denmark. He has been CEO of the organization for more than a decade, and has roughly 15 employees under him. He has management degree from a Danish business school and worked primarily as a substitute teacher before he got his current position.

Britt is a heterosexual woman in her early 60s, born in Denmark, but with some Swedish heritage. Simlutaneously with her studies in cultural sociology, she was invloved as an activist in the women's movement of the 1970s. Upon graduation, Britt continued to

combine her activist involvement with various equality positons in, first, a university, then in a major Danish transportation organization. She decided to become independent two decades ago, and has been so ever since, focusing mainly on how to improve team cultures by focusing on human differences.

Gudrun is also independent, but has only been so for roughly five years. Originally trained as a nurse, she went on to finish two master degrees in culture, gender and inclusion. After a few years as Equality Officer in the administration of a large Danish city, she founded her own one-person company offering courses and workshops in cultural differences. Gudrun is a woman in her late 30s. In her email reply, she stressed that those were the only categories she wanted to be presented with, since the rest were irrelevent in her view, and constantly changing throughout life.

Annie is a female-assigned-at-birth genderqueer lesbian who was born in the U.S. She is co-founder and CEO of a small NGO dealing exclusively with LGBT workplace inclusion. She is in her early 30s, and studies electronic IT technology as her primary occupation. Prior to moving to Denmark and co-founding the organization, she volunteered as an LGBT youth councillor, and worked in the corporate world, primarily with sales and workplace issues.

14. Appendix D: Information for the participants about the project

Project: diversity practitioners and their experiences

Information for participants in the study

Researcher and interviewer: Ronja Mannov Olesen

Master's thesis, sping 2015

Gender Studies, Lund University

The research project concerns diversity and equality practitioners/consultants working in Denmark and Sweden, and their experiences. I will be interviewing 5-8 different practitioners, and you are invited to be one of them. The interview will be rather informal, and concern your thoughts and experiences in your current work life, your past experiences, and will also concern your personal motivations and opinions.

It is voluntary and unpaid to participate in the project. The interview will last between 1 and 1 1/2 hours, and will take place wherever you feel most comfortable. Ideally, the interview should take place in a place where we can be alone and undisturbed. Please let me know if that is not possible in the location where we have agreed to meet, and I will arrange for another place for us to meet.

If you agree to it, the sound of the interview will be recorded and stored safely, and will only be used for research purposes. If you wish, I can send you my transcription notes for your approval. You don't have to answer any questions you don't feel comfortable with, and you can back out at any point.

You will be anonynimized in all stages of the research, including in the final thesis. The final thesis may be available publically online, and the results may also be presented at conferences and in academic articles, but your identity will remain hidden. You are welcome to choose your own psedonym as it will appear in the final thesis. Any other suggestions you have for anonymization are also welcome.

15. Appendix E: Interview transcriptions

<u>Eva</u>

[Jeg introducerer samtalen - at der vil være temaer, men at hun også kan styre samtalen.
Forklarer min interesse ud fra mit første møde med E - specifikt om modstand og udfordringer.
Forklarer at vi gør det på svensk/dansk, med mulighed for at indsætte engelske ord.]

R: Fortæl om din baggrund - indgang til feltet, uddannelse.

E: Læste sociologi, samtidig aktiv i feministiske organisationer, mit første job var på en stiftelse, der var meget rettet mod ligestilling, drenge og piger, lærere i skolen. Vældigt stort fokus på ligestilling. Det var ca. 2005, sådan begyndte jeg. Metodeudvikling, hvordan kan man arbejde med det her så det ikke kun er policy, men også praktisk. Det var sådan jeg begyndte. Det var en stor stiftelse, og så var jeg på LU, men her [i kommunen] er det en vældig stor organisation. Så arbejdet er ikke så forskelligt, men stedet er.

R: Hvordan forskelligt?

E: Det intersektionelle og det normkritiske er nyt, spiller en større rolle. Men typen af organisation er den største forskel. Det går langsommere i større organisationer, sager skal visse trin igennem. På Mine kunne det gå ganske hurtigt, mht. forandring.

R: Mere bureaukrati? [E: Ja]. Hvordan har udviklingen været - fra ligestilling til mangfoldighed, mere intersektionelt? Er der sket et skift de sidste 10 år?

E: For *mig* er forandringen stor, for der er kommet en masse ny viden, men ude i virksomhederne er der stadig meget fokus på ligestilling - man taler meget om kvindeligt og mandligt, den binære betegnelse for køn. Der findes en forståelse for at "det" findes ude i periferien, "det har jeg hørt om", men som ikke skal implementeres. Det er en udvikling som *jeg* har gennemgået; da der er kommet ny forskning, om hvordan vi skal gå fra tolerance til det normkritiske, hvordan vi skal gå til forandringsarbejde. Men jeg oplever måske ikke at virksomhederne er med.

R: Så forskningen har påvirket jer der arbejder med det her?

E: Mm, det er svært - ligestilling har jo fundet sted i Sverige og Norden meget længe, vi hat talt om det vældig længe; helt fra stemmeretsprocessen, til at kvinder skal have mere plads, så der er en tydelig forståelse for at sådan *skal* det være, men det normkritiske, at sætte spørgsmålstegn ved normer, der er flere variable – 'hvordan skal vi så tænke, hvis det ikke er kvindeligt eller mandligt' - der bliver for mange bolde - hvordan gør man det...? Men det har jo været en kort periode hvor man har koblet heteronormen til kønsmagtsordningen, og så videre - forskningsmæssigt har det kun været 20 år, så det er en kort periode, og det er meget at kræve at folk der ikke arbejder med det her kan forstå det.

R: Kan det komme med tiden?

E: Nej, vi må tvinge. Med mild vold [smiler]. Skrive det ind i vores planer og policies, forklare hvad det er, hvordan vi skal arbejde. Det kommer ikke hvis vi ikke kræver det på forskellige måder. Det bliver vores opgave, der arbejder med det, at hele tiden løfte det frem. Generelt set tænker jeg, at vi - nu inkluderer jeg mig selv i det 'vi' - som arbejder med de her spørgsmål, arbejder normkritisk og intersektionelt - sådan tænker jeg ikke at det er. Mange arbejder stadig med tolerance-perspektivet. Det er komplekst.

R: Fordi der er stor forskel internt, mellem dem der arbejder med det. Du siger man skal have noget policy og lovgivning, for at tvinge processen, men det må komme fra regeringen og kommunen...

E: Ja, men vi kan også gøre det. Jeg kommer med forslag. Vi har jo kommunefuldmægtige, som er vores højeste organ, og så vi som forvaltning styres af vores nævn, og så er der tjenestemænd. Vi

sætter os 4-års mål. Og de spørger os tjenestemænd, de vil jo have hjælp. Der har jeg et ansvar for at give forslag til hvordan vi kan arbejde med det her.

R: Bliver du hørt?

E: Hidtil har de... korrigeret nogle måder hvorpå ting gøres... De har en tiltro til min kompetence. Jeg har en kompetence som de ikke har - jeg mener, de er kompetente til andre ting. Vi har jo en venstre-socialdemokratisk-miljø partisk flertal. De har jo fokus på ligestilling, anti-diskriminering og miljø. Det er typisk socialistisk. Så det er ikke så underligt at der er fokus. Det ville måske være anderledes hvis det var anderledes.

R: Så politikerne betyder noget?

E: Ja, det synes jeg. Men det handler også om min politiske overbevisning - der findes jo liberal feminisme, som er lidt progressiv.

R: Hvad er din politiske ideologi?

E: Venstre. Der ser man at vi skal arbejde med strukturerne. Vi skal arbejde med strukturforandringer, vi må se strukturerne. Med strukturforandringer kommer forandring af individet, men vi må jo se på strukturerne, magtfordeling, for at skabe forandring.

R: Hvordan gør man det, rent praktisk, hvordan rammer man strukturerne, og undgår at arbejde med for eksempel tolerance på individplan?

E: Jeg har en vis tiltro til at arbejde med chefer, at fokusere på normen, og ikke på tolerance, for eksempel. Når der kommer et toleranceperspektiv eller -snak op, så skal man føre det tilbage, og sige 'ja, men nu taler vi om normen'. For eksempel IS er ikke alle muslimers skyld. Så skulle kristne være ansvarlige for Breivik. 'Jo, vi kan tale om det, men det er ikke en gruppe der har ansvar'. Den er svær - det handler også for eksempel om informationsmaterialer, at få det ind. Ikke synliggøre afvigerne, vi skal synliggøre normen. Det er svært.

R: Det handler vel også om hvilke ord man bruger - at bruge buzzwords som kan styre det i den retning?

E: Ja, jeg tænker på da jeg arbejdede på LU [2009-10] var der ganske meget tolerance i policy-dokumenterne. Det tænker jeg, er et ord som er.... Tolerance er fint, på mange måder, men det handler om magtordningen, at forsøge at snakke om noget mere, på en inkluderende måde. Jeg tænker at ord *har* en betydning. At ikke tale om... Når man taler køn, vi har jo et krav om at man skal have kønsopdelt statistik - men der skal jo være en tredje mulighed. Jeg forstår at man vil have den kønsopdelte statistik, for så kan man se historisk. Der er en lille gruppe af vores medarbejdere som vil krydse af i det tredje, og det vil have meget stor effekt for den person, men fordi statistikken er stor, har det ikke så stor betydning. Men det viser på en måde at vi tænker lidt bredere. Det er meget vigtigt.

R: Ja, jeg har godt hørt om statistikkerne, og kan godt se at det skaber problemer. Kan du forklare lidt mere om dine konkrete arbejdsopgaver?

E: Jeg begyndte i august, så et halvt år. Og det er en ny enhed, der ikke har fundets tidligere. Jeg er chef-støtte, så chefer kan arbejde med anti-diskriminering og ligestilling. Der kommer centrale planer fra kommunen - fire forskellige planer/styredokumenter. Vi er en forvaltning på 1400 personer, og jeg er den eneste der arbejder med ligestilling og anti-diskriminering. Her på afdelingen er folk HR: Der står hvad vi skal i de fire planer - der er krav om at vi skal have dem. Vi skal arbejde for en diskrimineringsfri arbejdsplads og rekruttering. Der findes aktiviteter. Min rolle er at samle informationerne, så de kan blive til noget praktisk. Vi har fire områder i forvaltningen - skoler, skolerestauranter, kommune/teknik, kommunetjeneste [forsyner kommunen med forskellige services]. Det handler om at få planerne ud - at få et skolekøkken til at arbejde med det. Vi er ganske spredte i vores forvaltning. De andre forvaltninger har også en ligestillingsperson - eller nogle der arbejder delvist med ligestilling. Det er et krav. Det er 100% for mig, det er det jeg gør - det er forskelligt hvordan det er opbygget i de forskellige forvaltninger. På en måde er det godt, at det er 100%, men det

er også meget lidt, for det er meget arbejde, at nå ud og skabe forandring - at der skal ske noget konkret. Så det ikke ender med policies og planer.

R: Så der er meget arbejde for dig som enkelt person? Der er andre steder hvor de kun skal bruge noget af deres tid - og der er pros and cons?

E: Ja, det er op til forvaltningerne. I andre forvaltninger er der måske en hovedansvarlig, men der er andre i et netværk - det har vi ikke her. Det håber jeg vi får. Så det bliver lettere at nå ud. Der er mange medarbejdere, jo.

R: Så du skal påvirke mange mennesker?

E: Jeg arbejder med cheferne primært. 120 chefer. Så skal de påvirke deres medarbejdere. Det er jo godt - men derudover ønsker jeg mig et netværk, så man kan påvirke fra flere sider.

R: Der sker ikke så stor effekt når man er den eneste?

E: Nej, der findes jo modstand, i form af tidspres - cheferne har meget at lave, og så kommer jeg med noget yderligere.

R: Så tid er en udfordring. Men de skal lytte?

E: Ja, men jeg har jo ikke så meget at true med [griner], vi arbejder også med arbejdsmiljøspørgsmål her, så de kan gå ind eksternt fra og lave en undersøgelse, men der skal meget til før at vi kan sende dém ud, og sige, 'ej her er det galt'. Vi skal gøre ting, men hvis det ikke gøres, så har jeg intet at true med.

R: Kan du give nogle eksempler på den modstand du møder?

E: Stilhed. I form af 'der findes ikke tid'. Stilhed i form af 'hmm...' og så sker der ikke noget; det gøres ikke. Det kan også være udtalt: 'sådan har vi ikke gjort før, det gik fint før, vi har det fint her i vores arbejdsgruppe, vi har ikke sådan noget her, så hvorfor skal vi arbejde med det, der er ikke noget mærkeligt...'

R: Så de siger alt er godt, eller der er ikke noget problem?

E: Ja. 'Hvorfor skal vi tale om heteronormen? Det er det mest almindelige - det er ikke et problem. Her kan alle være åbne og være som de vil.' Og så har vi mange forskellige etniciteter - men jo højere op i hierarkiet vi kommer, jo hvidere bliver det. Vi har en meget normativ... omkring kønsnormen og heteronormen. Cis-norm er udtalt og stærk. Jeg synes at der findes en meget stærk hvidhedsnorm, selvom det er blandet. Og så sidder chefen - en hvid mand - og siger det er ikke noget problem- og jeg tænker, 'det er ikke et problem for dig, det er måske ikke et problem i arbejdsgruppen i dag, men vi ved det jo ikke, og vi ved ikke hvem vi misser'. Så det er vel en modstand, en uvilje. Men det handler også om tidspresset.

R: Så de bruger forskellige argumenter?

E: Ja, men det er også følsomt. At komme ind og tale om normer, handler jo om at se på sig selv. Det ér ubehageligt hvis du aldrig har tænkt de tanker. Så det bliver ubehageligt og klamt.

R: Hvad er din strategi når du møder modstand?

E: Det er forskelligt, afhænger af... Det kan være ret hårdt, men jeg kan sige, 'der står her at du skal gøre det her' - bruge dokumenterne og planerne. Enten skal jeg markere – 'her er grænsen'. Eller kan jeg få det ind i styresystemet - ind i budgettet - så skal det rapporteres. Hvis det er inde i budgettet skal det rapporteres kvartalsvis. Så kan man nemlig se, at der ikke sker noget. Det er en anden måde at håndtere modstand på. At sige 'nej, det har vi ikke gjort' til alle forslagene og aktiviteterne. Så vil politikerne jo se at der ikke bliver gjort noget. Det er to forskellige.

R: Du har nogle dokumenter, love - du har retten på din side?

E: Absolut. Men kulturen er: 'det her har vi ikke gjort før'.

R: Hvilke begreber bliver der reageret stærkest imod?

E: Cisnormen er svær at tale om. Og hvidhed er svær. Heteronormen, på en måde - men den kan godt gå, for der er en vilje til at være inkluderende, vi ved at det findes.

R: Så der er en vilje til at inkludere folk der ikke er heteroseksuelle?

E: Mja... Så længe personen falder ind under heteroordningen. Det er også forskelligt. Det er måske lettere på et kontor, men sværere i en kultur der er vældig maskulin. Der tror jeg det er svært. Racisme kan være meget følsomt. 'Jamen jeg er ikke det, jeg er ikke racist, jeg siger ikke n-ordet, jeg mener ikke noget ondt, jeg er ikke racist men de kommer jo her bla bla bla'.

R: Er hvidhed nemmere at tale om end racisme?

E: Hvidhed er en slags akademisk begreb - når jeg taler om det, så er det svært, og så skal jeg virkelig forklare hvad jeg mener. Jeg undgår ord som normkritik og intersektionalitet, jeg undgår også... cis og trans er også svære, jeg ville sige at vi bruger de ord, men så ville jeg tale udenom dem.

R: Hvad siger du så?

E: Jamen jeg taler om kønsidentitet, at alle har en, hvordan den tager sig ud, så taler jeg ud fra mig selv, om at jeg passer ind, at ingen reagerer hvis jeg har neglelak eller læbestift på, så kan jeg tale rundt om det. Men jeg oplever at det er ganske svært - følelsen af at det ikke findes hos os. Freak-følelse. 'Ja, ok.' Man ved at de findes, 'men ikke her hos os'.

R: På tv, for eksempel?

E: Ja.

R: Der er meget fokus på ligestilling, men møder du den, at det ikke er et problem mere? Er der sket et skift: er der noget der bliver set som et større problem end andet? For eksempel, 'her er et problem med etnisk inklusion, men ikke af kvinder'?

E: Ja, men så kan vi lade være med at tale intersektionelt, og dele det op - jeg har hørt om muslimske mænd, som ikke kan tage ordrer fra en kvinde for eksempel, men hvis en etnisk svensk mand ikke kan det, er det ikke et problem, det er ikke koblet til det patriarkalske. Men faktisk så opretholdes patriarkatet her jo af Göran og Erik - ikke af Ahmed og Ali, for de har ikke de magtpositioner. Det synes jeg er problematisk. Men det er mere interessant at diskutere ud fra at det ikke kun er Ahmed og Ali der gør det. Vi har en ret kønsopdelt arbejdsplads i skolekøkkener og i kommuneteknik - og man taler om at mændene skal ind i køkkenerne, hvordan skal det gøres, og så kommer de ind som chefer, og kvinder kommer ind i lave stillinger i kommuneteknik. Og det er problematisk.

R: Så du skal derud på de forskellige arbejdspladser, de vil gerne løse den ulige kønsfordeling, men løsningerne bliver ulige?

E: Ja. Det er jo forskellige problemer, for maskulinitetskulturen er stærkest og et større problem - og så snart man taler om den, siger man 'jaja, men vi har jo også skolerestauranterne' - jeg siger: 'jo, det er rigtigt, men nu taler vi om det her'. Det ér et større problem - maskulinitetskulturen - mere farlig, mere diskriminering, ignorerer sikkerhedsforskrifter, større konsekvenser arbejdsmiljømæssigt end femininitetskulturen, og det er ikke unikt her, også forskningsmæssigt bevist.

R: Har du eksempler på en forandringsproces hvor det er gået godt, hvor de har været særligt modtagelige?

E: Nu har vi haft en gennemgang, et seminar for chefer om krænkende særbehandling - grimme briller, udfrysning, fedme, med mere - som ikke er koblet til diskriminationsgrundene. Klassisk mobning. Ja, der var modstand, men jeg oplevede også at der var lidt 'aha, åh ja' - cheferne skal så gennemgå det med deres medarbejdere, og mange har sidenhen bedt mig om hjælp til at løse problemer. Der findes en interesse - det er positivt.

R: Hvorfor er de mere åbne?

E: Jeg taler jo også om diskriminering, det ligger jo nært. De har ikke ond vilje - det handler om stress, tidspres, uvidenhed, og så indser de - får de den viden, og så føler de at de kan gøre noget ved det, de kan få let info, de behøver ikke at gøre noget selv. Der findes en velvilje, de vil gerne gøre ting bedre, og åbne øjnene.

R: Det er lettere for dem at tale om mobning med deres medarbejdere?

E: Ja, det er lettere at tale om end for eksempel seksuel chikane og homofobiske jokes, men det er en åbning, fordi de ligger så nært, man kan få en forståelse for diskriminering.

R: Det er en åbning?

E: Ja, der var et krav ovenfra om at vi skulle fokusere på mobning. Så talte vi om chikane koblet til diskrimineringsgrundene. Det handler også om, at hvis cheferne tager fat i det - at de indser, 'ok, det er ikke let at tale om. Men det er meget lettere at tale om det nu, end når der ér en krise.' Det er der mange der indser.

R: Er der en risiko for at mobning kommer til at overskygge diskriminering?

E: Nej, for de skal tale om dem, for krænkninger kan lede til diskriminering. Vi kobler dem sammen. Det skal de... Men ja, det kan være svært, men jeg vil hellere se det som en åbning.

R: Er det seminarier, workshops?

E: Forelæsning. Der var krav, retningslinjer, men ikke konkrete. Der er også summegrupper, så der kan blive diskussioner.

R: Hvor lang tid varer deres uddannelse?

E: En time. 25 chefer pr gang. Ja.. jeg ved ikke... chefgruppen er 120, det er bedre at tage dem 25 ad gangen, så der er plads til spørgsmål.

R: Så de skal ud og implementere. Og kommer de ind igen på et senere tidspunkt?

E: De skal rapportere at de har gjort det. Det dobbelttjekker vi. Jeg træffer dem også på andre tidspunkter. Det næste er had og vold på arbejdspladsen. De skal også gå i gang med aktiviteter, som er koblet til anti-diskriminering og ligestilling.

R: Hvilke for eksempel?

E: De skal lave en ligestillingsanalyse, det er et centralt stillet krav, finde noget i sin virksomhed at analysere, om man gør forskel på køn, det handler om at lære sig at se og åbne øjnene. Det kan være seminarer for arbejdsgrupper [tænker] det er de to, som er de store. Indhente viden på forskellig måde.

R: Hvad er din opfattelse - virker det her top-down, virker den her trickle down effect?

E: Ja, for hvis vi skal kræve at højne vidensniveauet, så skal vi have fat i cheferne, for vi kan ikke kræve det af medarbejderne på gulvet uden først at have fat i cheferne. Men jeg ønsker også at vi får det her netværk, så det kommer fra flere sider, så er der mulighed for videreuddannelse. Jeg håber at det sker, der er stillet et forslag.

R: Hvor ofte uddannes de?

E: De uddannes både hos mig og centralt. Nu skal jeg ikke holde flere. De er indbudte til nogle frivillige. Hvis jeg ikke skulle på forældreorlov, ville jeg nok gøre det igen til efteråret. Man gør det gerne to gange årligt, med forskelligt fokus, for eksempel. Der er et krav om at de skal analysere deres egen virksomhed, så det at holde et seminar om hvordan man gransker sin egen virksomhed, for eksempel.

R: Hvordan virker dit insider/outsider forhold - du kommer lidt udefra, men er en del af den samme arbejdsplads?

E: Det er svært, fordi jeg er i virksomheden - i mit gamle job kunne jeg gå ud og være meget hårdere, for jeg var ikke afhængig af dem. Der kunne jeg være tydeligere. Her kan jeg ikke gå ud og brænde mine broer. Det er en svær balancegang - at være hård og få ting igennem og samtidig skabe forståelse og interesse. Er jeg for hård, giver det bagslag. Jeg er her jo stadig, og skal møde dem igen.

R: Jeg skal jo også interviewe i Danmark, så hvordan er miljøet generelt når man arbejder med de her spørgsmål, generelt i samfundet? Er der opbakning, eller er det svært at få opbakning?

E: Der er en politisk korrekthed som siger 'det her skal vi gøre', til et vist niveau, men når man kradser i overfladen, så: 'nej, nu har ligestillingen gået for langt'. Der er en udbredt forestilling om at Sverige er ligestillet, ligesom Danmark, vi vil gerne slå os på brystet, der er en forskel i visse sager. Jeg tænker at så fantastiske er vi ikke, jeg tænker på en SVT udsendelse om sexisme mod offentlige kvinder, var ligesom Ti Stille Kvinde i Danmark, der var ingen stor forskel i kommentarerne. Så hvilken rolle spiller det at danske medier er mere sexistiske i reklamerne, når strukturerne er der?

R: Så den politiske korrekthed fjerner de sexistiske reklamer, men strukturerne er der stadig?

E: Jeg vil ikke sige det sådan, for vi har jo et større rum i lovene, absolut, stor forskel - den politiske indstilling er den store forskel, klart. Hvad der normaliseres, og hvad der ikke gør, er den store forskel. Men der er en forestilling om at vi er gode. Der er en holdning til at der er en grænse - for eksempel i fordelingen af barsel mellem kønnene, det er frit valg, for eksempel – 'det handler ikke om strukturer'.

R: Hvordan ved du hvad der er størst behov for at italesætte med cheferne - hvordan arbejder du intersektionelt? Hvordan taler du om køn, etnicitet og så videre på samme tid?

E: Jeg må prioritere. Jeg ved, at hvis jeg går for hårdt på, så lytter de ikke. Men hvis jeg taler om ligestilling og en smule etnicitet, så er det ok, men jo mere jeg taler om det ekskluderende binære kønssystem, så taber jeg dem. Men som cis har jeg jo en mulighed og et ansvar for at tale om kønsidentitet, på samme måde som straights - for eksempel min gamle kollega som er hvid og straight, og når vi var ude, kunne hun tale om racisme, for eksempel, for det var ufarligt. Det er en balancegang, for ikke at tabe dem helt. Funktionalitet, fysisk, er ret nem og ufarlig, men ikke psykisk sygdom. Vi taler meget om at kvinder skal tage plads, men ikke så meget om maskulinitetskulturen, om hvad mænd gør, den er meget ladet og følsom.

R: Lad os afslutte med: hvilke ord kan man bruge? Feministisk, normkritisk, racisme? Hvilke er mere positive og negative?

E: Racisme og diskriminering er lidt negativt. Jeg taler oftere om mangfoldighed, det er lidt blødere, så kan jeg forklare, og senere tale om racisme, som er sværere. Det er lettere at tale om ligestilling end om kønsmagtsordning. Patriarkat skulle jeg ikke bruge. Maskulinitetskultur har jeg brugt - jeg mener, at man skal kalde ting ved deres rette navn. Vi taler ikke om SD som forandringsfjendtlige, vi taler om dem som racister. Men jeg ved at hvis jeg taler om maskulinitetskultur, så vækker det [krydser armene foran brystet - lukket]. Queer... 'hvad er det?' Racifiering - vækker forvirring, 'hvem er det, hvad betyder det?' Uforstående overfor ordet, når vi jo ligeså godt kunne tale om indvandrere, det er lettere.

R: Hvordan skaber man forandring, hvad er ideel forandring for dig?

E: At man når ind under huden, at de forstår at vi alle er en del af, at vi alle opretholder disse magtordninger, og at få arbejdsgrupperne til at forstå at vi gør det uvidende, og det handler ikke om ond vilje, de er ikke ideologiske homofober, det handler om uvidenhed, at vi er børn af vores tid. Det handler om at så et lille frø - for mig er forandringsarbejde hvis det lille frø vokser – 'aha, jeg er lysere i huden, eller jeg ser ikke de strukturer fordi jeg kan gå frit omkring', jeg vil at vi skal forandre på strukturelt niveau, men jeg tror at vi skal vise individet at vi er en del af strukturerne, og ikke det individualistiske, for det mener jeg ikke, at vi som individer ser at vi er en del af strukturerne, og at vi opretholder strukturerne.

R: Hvad er din motivation, hvad holder dig i gang?

E: Det er vel min politiske overbevisning, jeg ser... det skal gøres, det er politisk forandringsarbejde, der findes et ansvar for os, og at føre arven videre - at kæmpe for at vi ikke mister de rettigheder som andre har kæmpet for. Det er mit ansvar at vi ikke mister dem, at vi flytter vores positioner. Det er en stor ting. I mindre sammenhæng handler det om... den politiske drivkraft, at det er noget vi *må* gøre... Jeg har en meget stor overbevisning om, at når vi en mere ligestillet verden, så får vi det bedre, det kan være globalt, men også i en lille arbejdsgruppe. Arbejdsgruppen får det bedre, og kan give bedre service til borgerne i byen. Det er jo ringe i vandet, på en måde.

R: Der er forskellige niveauer?

E: ja.

[Afslutning: E beder om at godkende sine citater, og er ok med ikke at være komplet anonymiseret.]

<u>Gudrun</u>

[Jeg forklarer en del om mit projekt, bl.a. at jeg er interesseret i at høre om modstand, dilemmaer og så videre. G spørger om jeg skal skrive på engelsk eller dansk, og jeg forklarer om oversættelse. Jeg fortæller også at jeg vil sende hende mine transskriptionsnoter.]

R: Vil du fortælle om din baggrund, uddannelses- og arbejdsmæssigt?

G: Ja, jeg hedder Gudrun, og jeg har denne her lille virksomhed som hedder [navn på virksomhed], og jeg har sådan en sjov, blandet baggrund, blev færdig som sygeplejerske som 23-årig. Jeg arbejdede med etniske minoriteter, som fik en overraskende dårlig behandling. Jeg bruger altid det her eksempel, hvor min sociale indignation blev vakt: jeg havde en ung pige, som to gange var blevet afvist i systemet, afvist på grund af 'etniske smerter' - sådan et begreb man bruger i sundhedssystemet om etniske minoriteter der giver udtryk for smerter på en anderledes måde, det er selvfølgelig enormt diskriminerende, jeg går ud fra at det også er ulovligt af samme grund, men det er helt normal praksis, så personer der hyler og skriger når deres pårørende dør, giver udtryk for smerter på en måde, som vi ikke er vant til som almindelige danskere i Danmark. Det, der var problemet, var, at hun *havde* blindtarmsbetændelse. Derefter får hun abses, men bliver igen sendt hjem. Efter den anden operation møder jeg hende så i en aftenvagt, og bruger enormt mange kræfter på at overbevise hendes mor - som var bange, meget utryg, stolede ikke på nogen - der prøver jeg alt hvad jeg kan, så meget som jeg kan med min 24-årige pondus, på at overbevise hende om at vi nok skulle tage os af hende, og at jeg godt forstod, og at jeg det bedste hun kunne gøre var at blive. Anyway, det var starten til mit kald i forhold til at prøve gøre noget ved den ekstreme norm der hersker i forhold til hvad er op og ned på normal, hvad gør vi her i Danmark, hvis man ikke gør sådan, hvad gør vi så ved mennesker? Men det der skete, var at jeg havde et vikariat, og havde en ven der arbejdede på [stor, dansk medicinalvirksomhed], som spurgte om jeg ikke ville komme derud og arbejde, et halvt år, det kunne sikkert være meget sjovt. Jeg fik en fastansættelse, og var med i et HR-projekt, der havde fokus på mangfoldighed og integration på arbejdspladsen.

R: Var det noget du opsøgte?

G: Ja, der kom et opslag ud, og så meldte jeg mig som mentor for en af de nyansatte.

R: Der var en mentorordning?

G: Ja, men det var helt tilbage i 2001, 2002. Men fordi jeg var med i det projekt fik jeg lov til at tage en master-uddannelse på Syddansk Universitet i Gender and Cultural Studies med fokus på arbejdskultur.

R: Betalt af Novo?

G: Ja, og jeg fik fri til det. Så det var den teoretiske start på mit fokus på det her med kultur. Så stoppede jeg i Novo, og arbejdede igen som sygeplejerske, og så søgte jeg ind på RUC, for den der master var ikke anerkendt, kunne ikke bruges til at søge job, kunne ikke blive medlem af fagforeninger for højtuddannede. Så jeg søgte ind på overbygningen på Kommunikation og Kultur- og sprogmødestudier, skrev speciale om interkulturel kommunikation i sundhedsvæsnet, fulgtes med sygeplejersker på Hvidovre - rigtig sjovt, hvorfor siger jeg det? Og så søgte jeg en stilling som etnisk ligebehandlingskonsulent i [navn på kommune], og fik den. Der var jeg fra 2007 til 2013. Der lavede jeg alle mulige forskellige mangfoldighedsprojekter, jeg var ansat under Ritt Bjerregaard, og hun havde en masse meget ambitiøse projekter i forhold til mangfoldighed og kvinder i ledelse, og vi sad to konsulenter, en med fokus på køn, og så mig med fokus på etnicitet, men vi overlappede meget, var et team, og aflastede. Hjalp hinanden.

R: Skulle i implementere eller komme med forslag?

G: En kombination. Der var lavet et stort program, som Ritt gik til valg på, i forhold til etniske minoriteter, køn og kvinder i ledelse. De indsatser skulle der følges op på. Det handlede blandt andet

om at lave et mentorkorps, lave oplæringsstillinger: ansætte 30 højtuddannede etniske minoriteter. Lave sproglige opkvalificeringer.

R: Det var kun internt i [navn på kommune]?

G: Kun implementering af [navn på kommune]s projekter. Arbejdspladser i [navn på kommune]. Tværgående projekter på tværs af de 7 forvaltninger. Ansat i Økonomi-forvaltning, men jeg var øverste projektleder, med del-projektledere i de andre forvaltninger. Gigantiske projekter. Det var rigtig sjovt. Men de projekter vi lavede var jo tænkt og skabt i en tid før krisen. Ritt blev valgt ind i 2006, der var en helt anden konjunktur, der skete enormt meget i 08-09. Dengang jeg kom til, var der en forventning om at vi ville komme til at mangle arbejdskraft, så kom krisen, og mange bliver fyret. Sammenlægninger. Pludselig får man til alle stillinger 500 ansøgere. Derfor, af naturlige årsager, så blev fokus og momentum i forhold til inklusionsdagsordenen, og at udnytte de resurser vi har, en fuldstændig anden. Stort fokus på arbejdsløshed generelt.

R: Så lysten til inklusion druknede i generel arbejdsløshed?

G: Den er væk. Altså, de to stillinger de eksisterer slet ikke længere. Det politiske fokus der var, der er selvfølgelig også kommet andre politikere til i mellemtiden, ikke, men det er fuldstændig væk, der er ingen der kan se ideen i det for tiden, på rådhuset. Der er ingen konsulenter længere.

R: Er der kommet noget i stedet?

G: Der er beskæftigelses- og integrationsforvaltningen, der har de borgerrettede tiltag i forhold til integration. De har overtaget nogle af de faste opgaver. For eksempel en årlig rapport med statistik. 25 sider med årsager og forklaringer og forslag, 'hvad tror vi årsagerne er, og hvilke tiltag anbefaler vi'. Enten er statistikken afviklet, men den startede med at blive flyttet. Jeg er der jo ikke længere. Der skete en meget markant udvikling med dét, så i forhold til at arbejde med inklusion generelt, har jeg oplevet et meget stort udsving, både i forhold til hvem den øverste ledelse er, men også i forhold til konjunktur. Det har været meget interessant at se, at der var noget genklang, folk kunne forstå, at vi kom til at mangle hænder - det gør vi stadig, men det er måske skubbet nogle år.

R: Så det var meget dét incitament: 'vi skal jo have alle i arbejde'?

G: Jamen, vi har jo simpelthen brug for de her mennesker - der er et reelt behov for at de her mennesker kommer og løser nogle opgaver for os, og det er jo noget helt andet end at se dem som nogle der er svage og skal have hjælp, og som vi i virkeligheden helst ville have var et andet sted, ikke, som er til besvær, og som er på overførselsindkomst, fordi nu er de her, og så bliver vi nødt til at sørge for at de ikke dør af sult - altså, det er jo en helt, helt anden måde at sælge det på, og tale om det på, og en helt anden medvind i ryggen.

R: Og der har været et skift fra den ene til den anden diskurs?

G: Fuldstændig. Der er stor forskel på at tale om at man har bug for nogle mennesker og deres bidrag, og så at tale om at de har brug for hjælp. Men der blev mindre fokus på det *jeg* syntes var interessant, og ved siden af underviste jeg på sygeplejerskernes efteruddannelse i et humanistisk modul om interkulturel kommunikation, og har været rigtig glad for det, og har også uddannet mig i voksenpædagogisk teori, er blevet god til at undervise, synes det er supersjovt, og så tænkte jeg hvad jeg skulle stille op med mine faglige interesser, når nu [navn på kommune] ikke gjorde som jeg synes. Jeg kom meget mere over i sådan noget med lederudvikling, som jeg også synes er sjovt, men som ikke har det faglige aspekt i forhold til kulturforståelse og inklusion, som jeg også rigtig godt kan lide. Jeg tænkte, 'jeg må blive selvstændig, jeg må ud og lave nogle flere kurser, arbejde mere med inklusion på dén måde'.

R: Så det med at undervise tiltalte dig?

G: Ja, workshopdelen, det med at - du snakkede i starten om hvad der skal til for at skabe inklusion - min erfaring er, at meget af det jeg lavede på rådhuset, det var jo varm luft i ringbind. Jeg sad jo også højt placeret, så det var ikke intentionen, men når man sidder i en strategisk stilling, så er du ikke på gulvet med folk og taler med dem, om deres udfordringer. Nu sidder du her som leder med fem

ansatte, som opfører sig helt anderledes end du ville gøre, du forstår dem ikke, deres bevæggrunde - hvad er der på spil? Den rolle var jeg ikke ansat til, og den rolle synes jeg er sjov, og jeg fik også lov til tage en coach-uddannelse, alt det tilsammen gjorde at jeg tænkte, 'jeg må ud og have lidt mere jord under neglene'. Så sammenfaldt det med at min gamle RUC-vejleder skulle bruge én på deltid. Det blev startskuddet. Et år med deltidsløn, mens jeg startede op.

R: Så du et hul i markedet? Du kunne vel også blive ansat i et firma?

G: Godt spørgsmål. Jeg havde lyst til at være mig selv. Det var meget mere det, end en markedsanalyse. Der er ikke noget hul i markedet. På ingen måde. Jeg er i stalden hos ét konsulentbureau, jeg er underleverandør. De hyrer mig ind. Jeg skal bare komme og lave workshops. Der laver jeg sådan noget én til én intro til Danmark, lige nu har jeg et forløb med en schweizisk marketingchef: intro til Nordisk kultur, hvad er forskellen helt overordnet. Det sjove er, at jeg altid har været modstander af stereotype kasser og oversigter, har tænkt at de var ligegyldige, men jeg har måttet sande at det giver et udgangspunkt at tale ud fra, så længe man siger, at sådan er det jo ikke. Der ér forskel - på for eksempel hvor meget tillid man har i Danmark vs. Brasillien. Jeg kan bruge det som et værktøj, nu når jeg laver hands-on introduktioner til Danmark - sådan noget lavede jeg jo slet ikke før, der var det nemmere - der holdt jeg teoretiske og overordnede oplæg - apropos varm luft i ringbind. Hvis man skal bruge det til noget, og når man sidder overfor virkelige mennesker med virkelige udfordringer i den virkelige verden, så er det ikke specielt gavnligt at have de overordnede teoretiske betragtninger - det kan man selv have i baghovedet. Så har jeg oversigter over forskel på tillid, og de skal selv bringe eksempler på banen [giver eksempel på fransk møde]. Det kan være et godt værktøj til at snakke om ting ud fra, så længe man siger, at det er ikke sådan alle er, men det kan hjælpe til at forklare.

I gamle dage, da jeg startede, havde jeg citater med, højpandede ting med, for at vise hvor klog jeg var, og for at dække min ryg, så ingen kunne komme og sige at det ikke var teoretisk nok, den akademiske måde - brugte ikke mig selv, henviste hele tiden. Havde Hall med. Det er jo slet ikke det - hvis jeg har en én til én session med en chef fra Schweiz, så er han jo fuldstændig ligeglad med teorien, han skal bare vide hvad han skal vide hvis han skal til møde i Sverige eller Finland, noget der har undret ham, eller om der er nogle forskelle. Sarkasme for eksempel. Så skal jeg hands on kunne forklare ham hvad det handler om. Der kan man ikke bruge citater, har jeg erfaret. Det synes jeg er sjovt. Der er vi jo heldigvis forskellige, nogle kan lide at skrive teorier, nogle synes det er sjovere at tale med mennesker.

R: Så der arbejder du en til en? Ville du betegne det som et forandringsprojekt?

G: Jeg håber altid at - uanset om det er workshop eller foredrag. Der hvor der sker forandring, det er der hvor man kan ramme folk - eller, kedeligt udtryk - der hvor man kan aktivere nogle følelser hos dem selv, fordi hvis man ikke har nogen erkendelse eller får aha-oplevelser. Kultur er ikke noget man har, det er noget man er. Og verden er ikke på en måde, den er som man ser den, der er ingen sandhed, kun måden man ser på. For at blive opmærksom på det, skal man have en aha-oplevelse af at, 'nårh, hvis jeg fokuserer på det her, så får jeg ikke alt det andet med'. Jeg har en øvelse jeg altid har med, om selektiv opmærksomhed. Nogen spiller bold, man ser ikke gorillaen, man ser kun dét man gerne vil. Pointen er: du stirrer kun på én ting, alle andre detaljer fortoner sig. Sådan nogle øvelser kan give folk en følelse af... en sjov lille øvelse, der får folk aktiveret, hjælper folk, får dem til at erkende, 'nårh ja, jeg har selv en rolle'. Fordi kulturforståelse og rummelighed og mangfoldighed det kommer ikke af sig selv, kræver meget af den enkelte.

R: Hvilken rolle?

G: At få øje på, hvordan ens fokus er afgørende for hvad man ser. Hvis du for eksempel har en idé om at alle… stereotyp forestilling om, at alle med piercinger er ikke rigtig kloge, 'punkere, dem har jeg intet tilfælles med' - du er en forretningsmand der tænker sådan - det handler om, at så ser du ikke resten af det menneske, det er bare en lille øvelse. Så man kan få øjnene op. Så tænker folk i mine

workshops, 'nårh, det kan jeg også bruge i forhold til min svigermor', det er rigtig meget noget der er universelt menneskeligt i alle mulige sammenhænge, og derfor er det rigtig sjovt, for folk kan selv finde på eksempler – 'nårh, sådan jeg skal tale til min mand' [griner].

R: De skal selv kunne relatere, kunne ændre deres perspektiv?

G: Ja, det synes jeg er det aller-allervigtigste. Jeg har et andet slide, der viser to beskrivelser af nationaliteter - igen totalt stereotypt og forsimplet - den ene gruppe er fortravlet og så videre, den anden er smilende. Folk siger Italien vs. Finland, og så videre. Den første finte er at begge beskrivelser er af amerikanere.

R: Det kunne også lyde som danskere.

G: Ja, det er hele pointen, at begge beskrivelser er amerikanere. Brasilianerne ser dem som fortravlede, japanere ser dem som smilende. Det viser at alt handler om øjnene der ser, 'hvad er dit eget filter i forhold til din omverden?' Det er det, der er min evige kæphest, i forhold til at skabe mere åbenhed og inklusion i alle mulige sammenhænge

R: Du skal have tændt for en kontakt?

G: Ja, og jeg tror slet ikke det kan lykkes, hvis ikke man gør det.

R: Du bruger humor - hvilke strategier bruger du for at få tændt for kontakten?

G: Jeg forsøger altid at få folk til at bruge deres egne erfaringer. Jeg tror ikke på at man kan rykke ret langt hvis ikke man... ingen vegne hvis ikke man får tændt en relevans for folk selv. Nu er jeg også ude i nogle sammenhænge - bortset fra store foredrag, hvor folk griner og man bruger sig selv, udfordre mig selv - jeg ved jo noget om deres baggrund og deres sammenhæng. For eksempel Vanløse hjemmepleje, uddanne brobyggere, 8 med dobbeltkulturel baggrund som skal være brobyggere i forhold til andre ansatte, som skal ud til etniske borgere, og det er et fuldstændig genialt projekt. Der prøver jeg at relatere så vidt muligt til deres hverdag, opfordrer til at de kommer med egne erfaringer, det er det sjove med folk med praktisk erfaringer, de har masser af historier.

R: Du kommer med løsningsforslag?

G: Ja, jeg har mine oplæg, og kommer med mine cases, og beder dem om at byde ind, så snakker vi om deres egne historier. Jeg har selv materiale med til inspiration. Jeg bruger rigtig meget cases. Iben Jensens model, som er god for praktikere - to ansigter overfor hinanden: de fikspunkter som man altid bliver uenige om. Jeg laver en case med dem. De har begge en selvforståelse, forforståelse og erfaringer. Vi laver en case, og ser på deres reaktioner, og bevæggrunde, gennemgår dem for begge parter. Også en måde at tale generel konflikthåndtering på, især i forhold til kulturmøder.

R: Så de skal kigge indad, og spørge: 'hvorfor gør jeg det her?'

G: Ja, det er det ideelle, man ser på sin egen praksis som hjemmehjælper eller chef.

R: Man møder den anden...

G: Ja, jeg holder workshops for internationale receptionister – 'hvad er dine erfaringer?' - som tit handler om stereotyper, hvor man behandler alle fra et land ens. For eksempel en svensker, 'hun skal bare have et cpr-nummer, så er alt godt', eller det omvendte, som selvfølgelig er meget værre, 'her kommer en eller anden fra… hvad ved jeg, et eller andet; som ikke kan tale dansk overhovedet og som ikke ser ud som om vedkommende overhovedet kan skrive sit eget navn, og derfor gider jeg faktisk ikke rigtig at give dem en ordentlig service'. I de sammenhænge kommer man til at generalisere, det gør vi jo alle sammen, hele tiden, det er jo umuligt at undgå. Hvis man skal blive bedre til at reflektere, så må man tænke på de situationer hvor man igen er i en situation hvor man forventer noget, især noget negativt – 'okay, her er jeg så igen'. Endnu en øvelse - når jeg har lavet den, bliver det hele meget bedre. Folk bliver så overraskede - et simpelt kortspil [R har hørt om det], finten er at de ikke må tale sammen. Folk tror det handler om ikke at have sprog, men det næste der sker er at de flytter borde - hvem er det så der vinder, hvis diskurs bliver trumfet igennem, hvem har mest pondus, 'hvem får dine regler igennem som de rigtige', det er sindssygt sjovt, og jeg har oplevet folk der nærmest kommer op at slås, virkelig bliver vrede, rigtig godt at starte med, så man kan referere til den

– 'hvem er det, der har ret?' Min kæphest er det der med: hvis man ser et 6-tal er det et 9-tal fra den anden side af bordet. Og hvem har ret? Der er jo ingen der ikke har ret. Det er også det der sker i kortspillet - alle har jo sådan set ret. Det er jo det med normen: hvem skaber den norm som vi alle sammen agerer og vurderer hinanden ud fra?

R: Er det så bestemte typer der vinder hver gang?

G: Nej, det er et spørgsmål om magt i relationer. Det kan være en sjov opsamling på øvelsen. Hvem tør sætte sig igennem? De kan mærke det på egen krop. I sidste uge spillede vi det - hun lagde ikke mærke til det, en yngre kvinde: vi rykkede hen til et nyt bord. Vi sad to i 30'erne, og så lederen helt klart en senior, og så hende der havde arrangeret det hele. Som også er senior. Hende jeg flyttede sammen med overrulede alt, jeg gjorde ikke noget, de to ældre resignerede og rystede på hovedet og grinede bare. En pointe er, at hvis man er forberedt på at der kan være kulturforskelle, så klarer man det meget nemmere, så er det nemmere at have en dialog, man bliver ikke så ophidset. Man går til det på en anden måde. Hende der overtrumfede de gamle damer, lagde slet ikke mærke til det. Da hun så blev gjort opmærksom på det sagde hun 'nå - jeg troede bare det var de to gamle mennesker der var så gamle at de ikke forstod reglerne', det i sig selv er skidesjovt, det siger så meget om hendes automatpilot i forhold til at vurdere andre mennesker, hun sidder der og tænker 'de er ikke for kvikke, det er nok fordi de er gamle' - hvordan man drager alle mulige konklusioner...

R: Er der nogensinde hvor du taler om diskrimination eller... om racisme, eller om hårde ord?

G: Nej, det bruger jeg faktisk ikke ret meget energi på, nej, jeg laver ikke teoretiske oplæg. Enten så er det jeg laver meget corporate, en til en med en chef der skal introduceres til Norden, der er det ikke så oplagt at sidde og belære om diskrimination, ellers så har det være meget i sundhedsvæsnet, og de mennesker er utroligt oplyste. Når jeg tænker mig om, så har jeg haft skidesjove oplæg, dengang DF fik indført en forhandling i 2003/2008, at når man havde været i Danmark i 7 år, fik man ikke længere betalt tolk i sundhedsvæsenet. Helt ekstremt diskriminerende. I nogle år, da det var aktuelt, havde jeg den med som eksempel - i forhold til niveau. Hvilket menneskesyn har man, når man laver sådan en lov, hvad er hensigten - der har jeg haft sjove og spændende diskussioner med folk, aha-oplevelser. Der sætter man andre ting i spil, når man vover sig ud i det. Jeg er altid i tvivl om det, men lige dét følte jeg meget stærkt for, så der var jeg ikke bange for at stå frem. Det er altid en afvejning, når man er hyret ind af nogen, om man skal stå og være politisk, og det bliver det meget nemt når man går ind i sådanne situationer. Alle der har været til mine workshops er dog ikke tvivl om min holdning til diskrimination og så videre, fordi alt hvad jeg prøver at tale ud fra er inklusion. Det ér det fokus jeg har, 'hvordan finder vi ud af at undgå konfrontation?'.

R: Der er mere succes med den positive indgangsvinkel?

G: Ja, men også fordi jeg ikke har nogen erfaring for at det mere dogmatiske og belærende virker i praksis. Jeg vil hellere tale med dem om, hvordan de i konfliktsituationer kan... 'alle fra Somalia er også bare sådan'… så vil jeg hellere få dem til at reflektere over hvilken baggrund den anden kommer fra, end stå og belære. Jeg har en indgang: 'hvad fik mig til at arbejde med det her?' Jeg starter med historien om, at resursesvage får en ringere behandling en resursestærke, og det må være generelt i alle offentlige instanser, og man får ikke den samme lige adgang til velfærdssamfundet, for eksempel at man som forælder har svært ved at komme ind på intranettet, og så videre, er mere skræmt over sproget, og ikke ser almindelig dansk ud.

R: Det er et spørgsmål om adgang til resurser og institutioner?

G: Ja, det er min indgangsbøn i forhold til målgruppen - i forhold til offentligt ansatte.

R: Er der forskel på om du sidder med en chef eller en sosu, er der forskel på dine strategier?

G: Nogle øvelser, kortspil, kan jeg ikke lave med én, og når det er én til én er der også mere fokus på den enkeltes behov, meget mere konkrete facts om Danmark, det er en anden måde, men laver meget af det samme og taler om det samme, men det er en helt anden kontekst - chefen vs. de offentligt ansatte

R: Plus-ord?

G: Godt spørgsmål, hm, jeg kommer til at tænke på det modsatte, for eksempel mangfoldighed, jeg lavede noget for [navn på kommune], og jeg havde en kollega som arbejdede med noget helt andet, som havde set det på hjemmesiden, og han gad slet ikke åbne det, for han var ved at brække sig over det ord - mangfoldighed - og jeg var overrasket, 'hvad skal vi så sige?', det var 'so last year'.

R: Har mange det sådan?

G: Nej, måske er det lidt slidt, men måske sagde han det bare fordi han vidste de havde det meget sjovere os der arbejdede med det [griner]. Inklusion, rummelighed [gode ord]. Mangfoldighed - jeg bruger det ikke så meget, men på engelsk, diversity, det bruges rigtig meget, det bruger jeg i hvert fald, men måske er jeg ikke helt opdateret på de seneste trends i USA.

R: Hvad er de negative ord?

G: Diskriminationsdagsordenen, når det bliver løftet pegefinger, formynderisk, det gider folk ikke høre på, det kan man godt forstå, skolemesteragtigt. Reglerne skal være der, men jeg prøver at italesætte det overfor lederen - man skal sætte standarder for hvordan der skal være, men medarbejderne gider ikke.

R: Så lederen er vigtig, der kan du gå mere hårdt til?

G: Ja, men det er også mere oplagt, for medarbejderne kan jo ikke bestemme over hinanden, så ja. Det er vigtigt at gøre tydeligt 'hvad vil vi se, ikke se her hos os', og gøre noget ved det hvis man ser det, man ikke vil se.

R: Hvad er din hovedmotivation?

G: Det er helt, banalt, være med til at gøre verden til et mere rummeligt sted - højtflyvende - mere rummelig og mindre konfliktfyldt. Det gør jeg ved at starte med enkelte mennesker som så forhåbentlig kan starte en sneboldeffekt, fortælle om hvad de har lært og lavet.

R: Starte med individet?

G: Ja, og også gerne organisationer, men nedefra, i hvert fald.

Niels

[Jeg fortæller om min interesse, jeg vil høre om hans motivationer, udfordringer, nemme og svære ting i branchen - forandring og mangfoldighed.]

N: Motivation: lang historie, der findes mange måder at få et job på, jeg hørte om foreningen en morgen, jeg tænkte 'der vil jeg sgu arbejde', tre uger efter blev jeg ansat.

R: Hvorfor ville du det?

N: Jeg har altid været god til at lære ting, rockmusiker, det er sjovt at vinde, ikke så sjovt at tabe, da jeg næsten var færdig med min cand.merc., der var der ikke noget jeg var bedst til, jeg blev skolelærer på en international privatskole, jeg ville begynde på noget der var mit hjørne, som jeg skulle være bedst til, der gik jeg blandt en masse dejlige unger og spekulerede over det, fordi jeg er uddannet cand.merc. i personaleledelse, da jeg hørte at de store udfordringer i slut-90'erne var at få danskere og nydanskere til at arbejde sammen. Og jeg gik på en skole med en masse flygtninge, mit dna fra jeg var lille, selvom jeg var arbejdersøn og den første uddannede i min familie, så var dna'et tolerance overfor andre religioner og folkeslag, og det her med at engagere sig. Jeg besluttede mig for at sætte det som mål. Ad omveje endte jeg med at få tilbudt at få foreningen op at flyve, det var et kald, altså. Jeg blev ansat et år efter opstart, hvedebrødsdagene var forbi. Planen var ikke faldet heldigt ud. Ingen indtægt. Den havde ikke fået formuleret sin mission statement, hvordan den skulle udføres, ingen forventninger.14 af vores 15 år har jeg sat de strategiske retningslinjer. Vi har lavet opgaver der stak i all retninger. Kompetenceafklaring, ordbrug, 2000-2008 har vi arbejdet med retningslinjer, jeg har lavet cirka 25 forskellige PowerPoints - de kan sjældent bruges mere end en måned ad gangen, så var

dagsordenen ændret, nye udfordringer. Så selvom man har talt om inklusion i 20 år, men dagsordenen er meget fersk, man skal være ekstremt god til at fange den stemning som er aktuel for virksomhederne, for at gøre det aktuelt for dem at arbejde sammen med os. Det samme gælder for politikerne. Overbevise dem med pengene om at det var vigtigt. For at gå tilbage til start, så er jeg med i foreningen fordi jeg virkelig synes det er vigtigt, føler ikke jeg har lavet det samme 2 år i træk.

R: Hvordan finder man ud af hvad man rent praktisk skal gøre, hvad der er brug for?

N: Min opgave har været at tage de udkrystalliserede opgaver, gøre dem klare, for vores medlemmer, presse, politikere - i en situation hvor de blev nødt til at pege på løsningsmodeller. Det er sjældent jeg har sat mig og kloget mig på det, jeg er ikke forsker, og jeg er blevet specialist, fordi der er få mennesker der har min erfaring, men jeg udgør ingen specialviden. Det jeg gør: sætter problemstillingerne klart op, bringer de rigtige mennesker ind i en løsningsmodel, beder dem pege på hvilken vej de skal gå. Man når en løsning med de rigtige mennesker.

R: Så du skal finde ud af hvem du kan arbejde sammen med? Finde dem der er eksperter?

N: Ja, vi har i høj grad været facilitatorer, nu skal vi lave mangfoldighedspolitik i virksomhederne, skal vi finde 10 virksomheder, og når de så lykkes, skal de op på ølkasser og præsentere deres politikker, men det er os der har sørget for pengene, kampagnen der kommer efter.

R: Jeres medlemmer er virksomheder, som forpligter sig til mangfoldighed?

N: De bestemmer selv. Vi påvirker dem med medlemskontakter, emner, og så bestemmer de selv. Vi har faste kontakter, kontakter dem hvert år, de behøver ikke lave noget. Nogle har et beredskab. Vi har nogle som er ret fremmelige, som ved hvordan man arbejder aktivt og fremadrettet. Vi har mange slags virksomheder.

R: Hvordan ser jeres konkrete redskaber ud?

N: Hvornår - det har ændret sig? Det sidste nye er vores app: 'Mangfoldig hverdag'. Vi har prøvet at pakke så meget operationel viden i overskueligt lommeformat, så man på cirka 2 minutter kan finde svar på det meste af det, der optræder af mangfoldighedsudfordringer i hverdagen. Og den er gratis for alle.

R: Har den været efterspurgt?

N: Ja, vi laver ikke noget som vores medlemmer ikke har efterspurgt. Vores medlemmer siger: 'på HR kontoret kan den der flotte pamflet godt stå, og bruges', men mangfoldighed ude i produktionen, forretningen, virksomheden, så nytter det ikke noget at man lige skal tilbage på kontoret og tjekke manualen. Så det var på deres opfordring.

R: App i stedet for pjece, overgangen mellem teori og praksis bliver nemmere?

N: Vi har aldrig nogensinde være tættere på at ligge nede i lommen på en hvilken som helst medarbejder når udfordringen rammer, enten fordi kunden eller en kollega bringer den ind. Nu med en app, kan du på meget kort tid, står du med en side i forhold til det konkrete mangfoldighedsproblem du har, kan læses på 2 minutter, der er en række links med mere omfattende redskaber. En grønspættebog. Med de mest kendte integrationsudfordringer, mangfoldighedsudfordringer [<- retter sig selv].

R: Den er til alle medarbejdere, på alle niveauer?

N: Ja, præcis. Vi har strategiredskaber til ledelsen, og vi har HR-redskaber til HR-afdelingen, og tillidsmandsredskaber, det vi aldrig har gjort før, det er at lancere mangfoldigheden til hvilken som helst medarbejder. Lanceret for et halvt år siden. Foreningen N er Danmarks repræsentant i det europæiske samarbejde for mangfoldighedsstrategier og mangfoldighedscharters, og da de så den her, var der flere der ville have den og oversætte den, så hvis man downloader den uden for landet, kommer den automatisk på engelsk. Vi kan konstatere at det er vældig succesfyldt. Vores højtidskalender har også en app. Den er downloadet 100.000 gange, kun 20% er fra Danmark.

R: I er gået væk fra kun at uddanne lederne?

N: Det har aldrig - vores mission statement er: 'nedbryd barrierne mellem nydanskerne og arbejdsmarkedet', og det adresserer absolut ikke kun lederne, men i starten var det sådan, at vores fokus i starten var at give lederne redskaber, for vi gik ud fra, ligesom med andre ledelsesaspekter, at de ville gå ud og lave en top to bottom ting. Der kan vi konstatere, at det har ikke virket mange steder. Mangfoldighedsledelse er ikke et fag på handelshøjskolen. Vi har en ph.d. i mangfoldighedsledelse på CBS, hun har arbejdet hos foreningen i 4 år, rigtig god, lavet forskning med MCD, hun er den eneste, der brillerer. Det vil sige på trods af aktualiteten, trods én fra Aarhus Universitet, så er mangfoldighedsledelse ikke et redskab der har vundet markant frem, det er det ikke.

R: Så når I får medlemmer ind, og de viser interesse, er det svært for dem at finde ud af hvad de skal gøre?

N: Nja, der er en del logik i mangfoldighedsledelse, og så er det også diskuteret, for eksempel når man ser på det aspekt der hedder 'kvinder', så er vi jo godt klar over i hvilken retning det trækker, men der er ikke mange ledelser der ad hoc har en udbredt viden om at mangfoldighedsledelse er… de har et begreb om at… du får flakkende blikke, og ukomplette svar. Der mangler en grundlæggende forståelse af mangfoldighedsledelse. Det der derimod findes, er en fragmenteret ledelse. Nogle er gode til kvinder i ledelse, andre er gode til handicap, nogle har godt fat om integration, så der er en masse delaspekter. Ser man på det koordinerede aspekt, som mangfoldighedsledelse er, så er der ikke... så har det danske ledelseslag grundlæggende stadig en del at lære. Det gør det virkelig relevant at arbejde med.

R: Så den koordinerede indsats, det er det mangfoldighed betyder for dig?

N: Vores indsats i foreningen er - vores mission statement handler om flygtninge-indvandrere. Men det giver ingen mening, men ude i en virksomhed, har de sjældent den fragmenterede vinkel - derude giver det altovervejende mening at lave en koordineret indsats, det er vi opmærksom på, så vi har en form for ledelse som indbefatter de der 14 basismangfoldigheder, vi bruger eksempler fra den nydanske verden, men principperne er de samme som hvis du arbejder med kvinder, handicappede, og så videre. Jeg var i en kommune i går, hvor vi lancerede deres strategi, og hvor vi talte om hvordan man løfter de forskellige personalegrupper, hvordan man rekrutterer, sammensætter teams, og så videre, og der anbefaler vi ikke at have majortiets-clusters på over 70%, uanset om det er køn, uddannelse, alder og så videre, fordi forskningen viser at med 70%s majoritetskonstruktioner, så mister du innovationskompetencen.

R: Så innovationen er bedre på mangfoldige virksomheder?

N: Hvis du ser på forskningsresultaterne, så viser de med al sikkerhed at mangfoldigheden vinder over - tager du Hongs studie - hvordan at hvis fagpersonale opdeles i performers, så vil det hver gang være de sammensatte grupper der out-performer, high-performer gruppen, ikke.

R: Det har jeg også læst mig frem til. Hvad er firmaernes motivation for at arbejde med jer?

N: Fem områder hvor værditilvæksten ved mangfoldighed skabes, overordnet: innovationen: nye servivces og produkter. 2: nye markeder og kundegrupper - du tager eksisterende produkter og afsætter dem på nye markeder - for eksempel i radiometer, en ansat penetrerede det østafrikanske marked. Sætte eksisterende produkter eller markeder sammen på en ny måde 3: tilfredshed blandt medarbejdere og kunder. Man skaber, med mangfoldigheden... Dengang TDC åbnede en infotelefon på forskellige modersmål, for eksempel tyrkisk, ikke de samme problemer, kunderne blev rigtig glade. 4: klar rekrutterings-case. Branding. Hvis man er god til mangfoldighedsledelse, kan man få fordele, nogle kundegrupper begynder at søge job hos én. Kan ikke huske den sidste. Vi har lavet en folder for integrationsministeren: 'Når mangfoldighed skaber værdi', og det var den første publikation. Vi fandt 20 virksomheder, og fandt eksempler på hver af disse områder. søg på det - værdi eller var det vækst. Vi går ind og siger, det er her festen er, I kan skabe værdi, og alt efter hvad de har lyst, så kigger vi på det.

R: Hvad med arbejdsmiljøet, det bliver bedre?

N: Det siger sig selv. Virkeligheden i virksomheden er mangfoldig, om man vil det eller ej. Kunderne er mangfoldige, mange forskellige aldre og køn, og forskellig etnicitet, og så videre, i al sin enkelthed: hvis ikke ledelsen har sat en marker for hvordan man løser mangfoldighedsledelse, så er der kun én person der kan løse det, og det er den person der kommer til at stå med det fredag eftermiddag. Det vil sige, hvis der ikke findes mangfoldighedsledelse, så skal problemet nok blive løst, men det bliver ikke løst ens i de forskellige afdelinger. Det er op til den enkelte medarbejders humør den dag. Hvis lederen briefer klart på mangfoldighed, så bliver holismen bedre, og så kan medarbejderne slappe af. Så har de ikke røven i rundsaven. Hvis der ikke foreligger instrukser, skal de stadig løse det, ud fra hvad de tror at de synes de kan stå inde for, og 'hvad synes min chef og medarbejderne', og hvis det ender galt, og på forsiden af EB, så er de selv i rundsaven. Manglen på mangfoldighedsledelse er dybt utryghedsskabende for kollegaer og medarbejderne. Ingen ledelse er den sikre vej til konflikt.

R: Hvad hører du fra virksomhederne, hvilke konflikter vil de løse?

N: Kunden kan komme og brokke sig… En klassiker: Hvis kommunen ansætter en meget dygtig, to meter høj neger, til at tage sig af hjemmehjælpen blandt de ældre, hvad gør man så når de ældre bliver bange for ham og smækker døren i hovedet på ham, ikke.

R: Ja, hvad gør man så?

N: Jamen, jeg har jo ikke svaret, jeg spørger dem – 'hvad er instruksen?' Er instruksen at kommunen siger 'sådan er dét, vi har ét tilbud', eller er instruksen at man sender en ny medarbejder, og kunden siger 'ej, hvor dejligt' – 'det er op til jer'.

R: Uanset problemet, så handler det mest om at ledelsen tager ansvar, har en kurs, og selve løsningen er ikke så vigtig?

N: Fuldstændig rigtigt. Vi doserer ikke løsningen. Vi kender ikke virksomhedens historie, eller ledelsens fokus, eller det der ligner. Derfor ville det være forkert af os at sige hvordan 'man' skal gøre. Det vi gør: 'hvad er den rigtige løsning for jeres virksomhed?' Vi oplever ofte at ledelsen kigger på de forskellige løsningsmodeller og tænker, 'wow, det havde vi ikke tænkt på'.

R: I prøver at påvirke dem i en retning, tænke selv?

N: Ja, vi præsenterer dem for den virkelighed der er i mangfoldigheden, 'hvordan ønsker I at, som ledere af denne virksomhed, at I skal gøre?', hvilke værdier skal de bruge, når de ikke er der, og hvad de skal gøre.

R: Sætte det på spidsen, hvad er problemet med hjemmehjælpen, han arbejder kun på kontor, så de gamle damer ikke skal se ham - det er én løsning, men det er vel på en måde en løsning der bare opretholder de her gamle damers racisme, eller? Ville det være en god løsning?

N: Det der er meget vigtigt for os at forstå, at vi kunne selvfølgelig ikke arbejde derinde, hvis ikke en stor del af deres hjerte lå i at skabe et samfund hvor der er plads til os alle sammen. Og det er deres drivkraft, de er ildsjæle. Men vi får intet ud af at komme ud og sige hvordan de lever i verden. Inde hos os findes ordet diskrimination stort set ikke. Det er der andre der er gode til, det er deres arbejde, IMR, og så videre, deres arbejde at finde ud af hvad der er og ikke er diskrimination. Det interesserer vi os ikke for. Hvis jeg kom ud til en virksomhed, som finder løsningsmodeller, som har et kedeligt element af for eksempel ikke at være pro-aktive. Jeg vil gerne gøre dem opmærksom på, at det er dårligt virksomheds... 'Hvis I ikke hyrer ikke-hvide hjemmehjælpere, så får I en rekrutteringsudfordring, og med tiden får I besvær med at få besat stillingerne'. Det ville være mit modargument, et økonomisk funderet modargument. Mit modargument vil ikke være at det er synd for nydanskeren, eller at det er diskriminerende praksis, jeg kan gøre dem opmærksom på at det er på den forkerte side af loven, men det er det maksimale jeg ville sige.

R: De argumenter I bruger er for det meste økonomiske argumenter?

N: Det vil ikke for det meste være det; det vil KUN være det. Jeg fortæller alle mine kollegaer at jeg ved at de inderst inde i hjertet har en dybfølt respekt for mangfoldigheden, som gør at de i virkeligheden er mennesker der bliver fortørnede over diskrimination, ingen tvivl om det, og de skal

have en attitude, men de skal også forstå at styre det. Ligesom i Crossroads filmen: man kan ikke "serve two masters at the same time", du kan ikke være troværdig og god til noget, hvis du tror at du både kan spille klassisk og heavy rock, det kan man ikke. Man kan kun være rigtig godt til det ene. Det vi er rigtig gode til i foreningen, det er helt enkelt, vi er gode til forretningsvinklen, der er vi ret specielle. EUs indsats på området, de taler også om business cases, men hele indsatsen er forankret i legislation, de bilder sig ind at de både kan sige 'I skal gøre det fordi der er penge i det, og hvis I ikke gør det så er det diskrimination'. Der er jeg sikker på, at virksomhederne gennemskuer at ingen af tingene faktisk er til deres fordel. For det første, ér der ikke særlig mange diskriminationssager i Danmark; og chancen for at blive dømt for diskrimination, den er utrolig lav. Hvis nogen fortæller dem at det både er god business, og at de ikke må diskriminere, så er det ikke virksomhedens sag.

R: I fokuserer mere på guleroden end på pisken?

N: 100% på det positive, ikke på pisken. Det er dybt utroværdigt at komme med begge dele. Derfor har IMR og mange af de rettighedsbaserede organisationer utrolig svært ved at indgå i gode samarbejder med virksomhederne, fordi i sidste ende vil de ikke det samme.

R: I vil det samme som virksomhederne?

N: Vi vil kun det samme som virksomhederne.

R: I finder en løsning ud fra hvad de vil?

N: Ja.

R: Arbejder I nogensinde med nogen virksomheder hvor I ikke ved hvad I skal gøre, eller der er dårlig stemning?

N: Jamen, det sker virkelig tit. Vi arbejder altid med virksomheder med begrænsede budgetter, og hvor denne dagsorden har begrænset legitimitet, og mange virksomheder starter med et måltal på 5 komma et eller andet, og de er på 0,5, og har ikke penge eller tid til det. Det er kun halvdelen af de ansatte der forstår problemstillingen, og HR chefen, der har været på et godt kursus, og vil gerne, han skal slås med de andre chefer om budgettet.

N: Så der er meget modstand?

R: Nej, men hvis der skal være penge, og man skal gøre det alvorligt, så er der modstand - men ikke mod mangfoldighedsledelse, det er bare svært at få prioriteret - to slags definitioner af modstand.

R: Resursemæssig modstand?

N: Ja, i en undersøgelse skulle en række ledere rate 15 emner, og mangfoldighedsledelse var det emne der blev ratet lavest. Så er det lige meget om det rigtigt, og så videre, for hvis ikke man gøre det utrolig tilgængeligt, billigt, nemt og simpelt, så er det svært at få det igennem. En person der arbejder med mangfoldighedsledelse er nødt til at være sindssygt konstruktiv og præcis, og god til at aflæse virksomheden og deres behov skarpt for at lave en god løsningsmodel. Så laver vi hellere en model hvor vi lærer dem 30% mangfoldighed, end at sige at vi ikke kan noget som helst medmindre vi får 2 millioner... boldreference…

R: I må have forskellige løsninger - langsigtede og kortsigtede?

N: Ja. Vi er - ikke så appetitligt udtryk - der er lidt konsulent over os. Hvis vi får et vindue på 2 eller 4 timer, bruger vi det. Vi skal tilpasse os, så det er optimalt til den ramme vi får. Gør vi det godt, ringer de igen, og køber noget mere.

R: Foden i døren?

N: At vise dem, at vi har en integritet, at vi udfordrer dem lige tilpas, så vores provokationer og udfordringer aldrig bliver for meget, men heller ikke for lidt. Vigtigst: vi præsenterer ikke en større pakke end de kan kapere, altid de mest relevante forandringsprocesser. Kan vi det, har vi løst vores opgave. Og ellers skal vi gøre det bedre næste gang.

R: Eksempler på noget der ikke gik godt, og noget der gik godt?

N: Gik godt kunne jo være at de gerne vil, men at de ikke kan få folk internt til at mødes, eller de ikke har pengene, det ku være én måde at have en god proces - de havde viljen, men formåede ikke

sammen at få den i mål. Dem har vi en del af. Gode - de giver sig selv. For eksempel en fagbevægelse, vi har arbejdet sammen i 1 1/2 år, stort projekt for syrere der kommer til Danmark, superspændende, der brainstormer vi på hvad deres kernekompetencer er, og så videre, et samarbejde vi har bygget videre på.

R: Jeg tænker på ord: 'diskrimination' bruger I ikke - hvilke ord er plus, og andre er negative, minusord?

N: Mangfoldighed - vi kæder det sammen med vækst, værdi, og mentorskab; ord der er kendte i management-verdenen, hvordan bruger vi det. Diskrimination er absolut ikke et management ord. For eksempel vores folder: 20 cases beskriver præcis hvordan der bliver skabt værdi, hvordan ledelsen oplever det, og så videre, det er spørgsmål om at omskabe dialogen fra at være "her står en nydansker der ellers ville have været på kontanthjælp" til "her er en virksomhed der har ansat en dygtig medarbejder, og udover det, er det en ekstra service at medarbejderen har en anden etnicitet" - vi drejer fuldstændig billedet. Ser på det halvfulde i stedet for det halvtomme glas.

R: Fokuserer I meget på ligheder eller forskelligheder?

N: Vi fokuserer på forskelle. Ellers giver mangfoldigheden ingen mening. Aral, ISS, og så videre, deres synspunkter om 70% majoritet, for eksempel i forhold til mænd, at få nogle kvinder ind. Vi forsøger at identificere forskelle, og samspillet mellem forskelle.

R: Er der sket en udvikling over tid i forhold til hvilke services der efterspørges?

N: Ja, helt sikkert. Om det er fordi vi har ændret os, eller... Vi har rigtig meget mentorarbejde, masser der gerne vil være frivillige mentorer. Det havde vi ikke for fem år siden. Om det er fordi vi ikke var kvikke nok dengang, men dengang virkede det ikke som en rentabel proces. Det er det nu. Det er fordi frivilligheden, både politisk og lokalt, efterspørges mere. Frivillighed er helt klart det nye sort i øjeblikket. Det er ikke en gammeldags frivliighed. Min far var frivllig. Han stillede andre krav, ikke så mange. Vores frivillige vil have lige så professionelle kår som de har på arbejdspladsen. Gider ikke fodformet. Hvis de skal, skal det være supertjekket, og de skal være i centrum, og de skal selv lære noget. Ellers gider de ikke.

R: Hvad er jeres feedback fra nydanskerne i mentorprogrammerne?

N: Vi måler alt hvad vi laver. Successraten er at 71% af de unge med mentor kommer tilbage i uddannelse og arbejde. På den lange bane: de 100 første blev interviewet 3 år efter, og fastholdelsesprocenten var 93%. Ja, vi taler med dem, og retter ind efter dem. Men helt ærligt, er de ikke hovedrollerne i vores projekter, vi vender den om: det der er den væsentligste resurse er erhvervspersonen. De er resursen, giver det videre. Virksomheder og erhvervspersoner er i fokus for os. De nydanske kommer i anden række. Ledige nydanskere er der masser af, men virksomhederne er der ikke så mange af, de skal nurses. Så vi lytter først til dem, så til nydanskerne.

R: Fordi det er dem der har magten?

N: Ja, det er der mange der glemmer.

R: Hvordan ser den gode forandring ud hos jer?

N: God dialog med virksomheden om hvilken forventing de har om vores fælles proces, tidsramme, økonomisk ramme, og så videre. Når der en sammenhæng mellem forventninger - det er ikke altid vi når resultatet. Jeg har lært at virkeligheden ikke er ligetil at håndtere. Mange projekter når ikke i mål, ringe til ministeriet og sige "tak for pengene, men vi når ikke i mål". Hvis man er ærlig om processen og inddrager brugeren - vi er aldrig blevet kritiseret for ikke at være ærlige, eller ikke at gøre det godt nok. Ikke blevet bedt om at betale penge tilbage.

R: Et eksempel på en forkert/for ambitiøs løsning?

N: En gammel én i en kommune: vi tog fat i 50 ældre tyrkiske mænd, som vi gerne ville rebounde tilbage til arbejdsmarkedet, ikke for at få dem i fast arbejde, men for at få en arbejdsidentitet som kunne gives videre til familie, især drengene. Selvom vi havde en god konsulent, så ligemeget hvad vi gjorde med denne gruppe af arabiske mænd, så virkede det ikke. Forandringen kom ikke. Vi turde ikke

sælge dem til virksomheder, kunne ikke skabe motivation hos dem. Det er mange år siden. Vi sagde til ministeriet: "Vi har gjort hvad vi kunne". De fattede ikke.. Da vi var halvvejs troede vi ikke på at vi kunne komme i mål.

R: Hvad med hos en virksomhed?

N: Det kan jeg ikke - en slags tavshedspligt. Jeg kan sige at inde i et stort ministerie, havde de fået en opgave om at have 4,3 % nydanske ansatte, men de ansatte kun cand.scient.pol.er, men så skulle de ansætte alle de nydanske cand.polit.er for at nå målet. Jeg forsøgte at give dem andre løsningsmodeller, men de havde besluttet sig for at deres vej til ikke at foretage sig noget var at konstatere at modellen var umulig. De var kun interesserede i mangfoldighed fordi de havde fået et ledelsespålæg, der ikke blev fulgt op på. Det var ikke forankret. De fandt en god undskyldning.

R: Der skal være en bred enighed i virksomheden?

N: Jeg har et krav om at ledelsen skal deltage, ellers bliver det ikke anset som vigtigt. Der skal være klart ledelsescommitment. Ellers er kravene for delikate. Ledelsesengagement er et must.

R: Lad os slutte med den danske kontekst? Hvad kendetegner Danmark?

N: Godt spørgsmål, jeg synes ellers jeg kan svare på alt. Tre ting der falder mig ind: Janteloven: påvirker på godt og ondt. Virksomhedsstørrelsen: små virksomheder kan være svære at overtale, men når de er der, er de meget agile. Tre: Meget specielt: Forankret i en arbejdsmarkedskontekst. Ledelsesforankret, tillidsmanden, en tur forbi medarbejderne, en struktur i de danske virksomheder hvor de arbejder relativt ens - det betyder det kan være bøvlet, men også at tingene hænger fast.

R: Kan du uddybe det om Janteloven?

N: Vi har så mange forskellige ordsprog i Danmark: "Stik en finger i jorden", "skik følge eller land fly", og så videre, dybest set er det: Vi har bygget en verbal kontekst der hedder "hvis du ikke gør som os er der ballade."

R: Det er en udfordring at sådan gør vi her, på arbejdspladserne?

N: Ikke bare på arbejdspladserne - i Danmark er der en meget stærk kultur for homogeniteten, et helt ordsprog og etik om at vi er dem vi er, og det vil være gerne fortsætte med. Masser af sange, ordsprog om det. Janteloven er bygget op om det. Så når man kommer og spiser noget andet, ser anderledes ud og har en anden religion, så skal man arbejde målrettet mod clashes.

R: I rykker ved kulturen?

N: Det kan man ikke. Underbevidstheden er Janteloven, vi må prøve efter bedste evne at arbejde med bevidstheden, og kortslutte Janteloven. En af de største udfordringer. Men det er konsekvent en udfordring at arbejde med mangfoldighedsledelse. De folk jeg har, som sagt, er de allerbedste, ildsjæle. De går ikke bare på arbejde. Knivskarpe.

Jeg glæder mig til at se hvad du får ud af det. Ikke for at kontrollere. Men jeg vil gerne se det. Jeg behøver ikke at være anonym. Hvert et ord du har fra mig har du lov til at bruge. Kom endelig ud og fortæl om det en fredag.

Britt

B: jeg synes ikke der er så meget forskning om organisationer i Danmark. Inden vi begynder, så fortæl mig hvad du vil vide, for jeg har været 100 år i branchen, og jeg har rigtig meget at fortælle. Jeg ved ikke hvor meget du har fundet om mig på nettet, men der ligger noget af min faglige historie på hjemmeside [R: ja, jeg har godt set..], jamen jeg har mange hjemmesider, jeg har fem-seks hjemmesider, mine koncepter og historien bag koncepterne. Jeg har også taget nogle af mine bøger med. Hvis vi skal helt tilbage til ruder konge: jeg er mag.art. i Kultursociologi fra gamle dage, jeg er blevet dyppet i sociale konstruktioner: ting er noget i kraft af hvordan vi betegner dem og så videre, det er den tradition jeg kommer fra, tilbage fra 1972. Kultursociolog: det vil sige jeg har lært om

forskelle og historie i kulturer. Det er det ene. Det andet er, at jeg er gammel rødstrømpe, fra 1972. Jeg har været med til at skrive [titel på dansk feministisk bog om kroppen]. Jeg var 19 år, gik ind i selvhjælpsgrupperne. Vi undersøgte os selv, vi ville ikke have at det kun var lægerne der vidste noget om os. Det dér er kommet ind i mit liv på samme tid - rødstrømpe og kultursociologi. Alt det jeg laver i mine 7 års studier har ikke meget at gøre med organisationer. Bagefter bliver jeg ansat på [navn på dansk universitet], der bliver jeg kvindeforsker. Forsker i kvinder og mænd på arbejdsmarked og i fagforeninger, der er jeg i 6 år. Underviser, skriver pjecer, skriver bøger. Med mit ene ben var jeg aktivist, med det andet arbejdede jeg. Jeg var aktiv i min fagforening - jeg var en af lederne af projektet. Vi kunne dokumentere at det bedst kunne betale sig at få børn under uddannelse som kvinde. Jeg var med i et af de første ligestillingsudvalg i en fagforening. Vi laver en bevægelse "Akademikerkvinder på tværs", vi koordinerer, så det bliver stærkt, inden overenskomstforhandlinger. For eksempel en barselsfond - det var 30 år om at blive gennemført. Så kan jeg ikke være på [universitetet] mere, men først er jeg med til et projekt: underligt, at på det her nye universitet, er det 90% mænd, 10% kvinder i det videnskabelige personale. Den er jeg med til at rejse. [Navn] er rektor, hun er svensker og har en helt anden feminismetradition. Vi laver en undersøgelse sammen. Vi forsøger at få den blide kønskvotering igennem, men bliver stemt ned. Vi laver alt muligt, blandt andet en fantastisk konference om kvinder i akademia, vi samler 100 kvinder fra hele Danmark - hvad skal vi kæmpe for, og så videre. Ja, der kan du se: aktivisme og lønarbejde, ikke. Jeg har mange veninder der arbejder professionelt med mangfoldighed og ligestilling, de driller mig, "jaja, du har aldrig taget et job indenfor det, men du arbejder hele tiden for det, og lader os andre tage slæbet". Jeg har været aktivisten bag kulissen. Nå, der blev jeg ikke populær blandt mændende. Fik tilbudt deltidsstillinger, sagde nej. I 1985 biver jeg ansat i [navn på stor, dansk transportvirksomhed], som organisatons- og ledelseskonsulent. Der var jeg i 9 år. Der begynder jeg at lave aktivistarbejde inden i en virksomhed - men igen, bag kulisserne. Jeg er med til at lave en del forandringsarbejde - planlægning, strategi - men vi var nogle der sagde vi mangler lige den 11. gruppe - den hedder ligestilling, og "ja, jo, det kan vi da godt", var reaktionen. Så lavede vi en strategi for et mere lige arbejdsmarked indenfor [navn på virksomheden], og en ligestillingskonsulent, og flere kvinder ind i mandejob, og mænd ind i kvindejob. Da jeg første gang arbejdede inden i en organisation, på [navn på universitetet], gik det rigtig, rigtig dårligt. Jeg fik så mange bank. Og på siden af hovedet. Da jeg kom ud derfra var jeg mentalt set helt forslået. Det var så rocker-hårdt, vi blev angrebet fra alle sider. Jeg lærte det på den hårde måde: jeg kunne ikke forstå at nogle kvinder var imod vores arbejde, men bagefter kunne jeg forstå at nogle kvinder ikke vil forbindes med nogen der arbejder for noget lighed hvor kvinder gøres til et problem, hvis du er en kvinde skal der gøres noget særligt for dig. [ophold på grund af tespild]

B: Vi var kommet til det der med at det var hårdt, at være inde i en organisation og arbejde imod uligestilling, og for mere ligestilling. Jeg fattede, på det tidspunkt, ikke hvorfor de var imod os, de ville ikke forbindes med det. Sidenhen - så snart jeg kom ud fra [universitetet] kunne jeg se hvad det var. Du har forhåbentlig styr på Betina Rennison og hendes syv paradigmer for køn. Det er noget med diskurser. Den siger, at når man går ind på kønsdiskursen, taler de forbi hinanden, for de taler ud fra forskellige paradigmer, og man kan stå i et paradigme der hedder kvinder og mænd er ligemeget værd, og derfor har vi ret til de samme ting, og derfor skal vi ind og påvirke. Men der kan også være et andet paradigme, der siger: at kvinder og mænd er ens, der er kun en biologisk forskel man ikke skal råbe for højt op om, og der kan være et paradigme der siger at køn er uvigtigt, og så videre - jeg er ikke selv enig med hendes konklusion, for hun konkluderer sådan noget med queer og man skal selv forhandle sit køn, og det holder ikke en meter ude i organisationerne, det holder ikke en meter, ja, du er ikke selv en individualist ude i organisationerne, du bliver inddraget i en hel masse, der er nogle ting du bliver inddraget i, hvor du overhovedet ikke har styr over dit køn. Så du må bare - Dorte Marie Søndergaard, "Tegnet på kroppen" - gå ind på den scene der er, og så vide at du bliver aflæst på alle mulige måder, og det bestemmer du bare ikke selv. At komme og sige, "jeg forhandler selv mit køn", ja, det kan være

meget godt, men hvis alt hvad der hedder hunkøn bliver set på en bestemt måde, så hjælper det ikke at man forhandler sit køn. Nå. Derfor, da jeg var på [universitetet], lærer jeg noget på den hårde måde. Det kan jeg så heldigvis bruge lige efter, nemlig i [virksomheden], fordi der vidste jeg så, ok, vi skal lige have nogle forskellige argumenter her, vi skal ikke have kvinder fordi de er kvinder, der er tre forskellige grunde til at vi skal have kvinder ind i mandestillinger i [virksomheden]: det demokratiske, det kvalitative - hvis vi ikke rekrutterer fra den ene halvdel af menneskeheden går vi glip af nogle kompetencer, det tredje er at kvinder og mænd kan jo være forskellige, så hvis man vælger kvinder, som har nogle andre livsvilkår, man kan få noget andet. De tre argumenter er meget vigtige at adskille. Ved at reflektere, kunne jeg se at vi skulle have mange argumenter på bordet. Hvis vi kun har ét, så fletter de det hele sammen - og siger, "hov, hun er ligesom mændene og har ikke nogen børn", det vil sige på [universitetet], hvis det skulle være en rigtig interessant kvinde der skulle ansættes i en videnskabelig stilling, så skulle hun både være kvinde, og mor - måske enlig mor ville være fedt, ikke - og skulle forske i kvinder og ligestilling på en helt genial måde, og det kan ingen jo leve op til. Derfor får man malet sig op i et hjørne, i stedet for at sige, at det er udemokratisk ikke at gøre det - eller - det giver bedre undervisning - og så videre.

R: Så man kan sige at en kvinde ikke behøver at opfylde alle krav.

B: Ja, ellers bliver man kørt rundt i manegen. Ellers siger de, "jojo, vi vil gerne have kvinder ansat, men der er jo heller ingen ansat fra arbejderklassen?" Og så bliver minoriteterne slået oven i hovedet med hinanden, ikke. Så får vi den der amerikanske ufede med at man både skal være sort, og arbejderklasse, og enlig mor og småkriminel, så kan man komme ind på et universitet. Så lægger man minoritetskategorierne sammen.

R: Så I fokuserede på kvindekønnet?

B: Dengang gjorde vi, for der var nogle kønsuligheder der var problematiske for forretningen, og vi syntes det var problematisk for kvinder hvis det her skulle være en fed arbejdsplads. Så vi havde alle argumenterne. I ens-kønnede arbejdspladser og grupper kan der udvikle sig nogle ufede sociale dynamikker. I [virksomheden] havde 3/4 af alle ansatte, de havde ikke kolleger af et andet køn. Det var godt for forretningen, godt for image - vi havde en chef der gik op i image, godt for arbejdsmiljøet, en anden slags ledelse. At kunne kende forskel på strategier, ikke lade dem blive spillet ud mod hinanden.

R: Så da I planlagde, vidste I at I ville bliver angrebet?

B: Det kom lige... Det kommer når man starter. Kommer fra alle mulige steder. Mænd der føler sig truet - "så bliver der færre lederstillinger til mig" - og det er jo rigtigt: Hvis et køn, eller en gruppe, eller en hudfarve har siddet på det hele, så er det da rigtigt, at så bliver der dårligere vilkår, men der plejer jeg at sige, at hvis der er stor uligestilling et sted, så er det fordi der er en gruppe - race, køn eller alder, eller - der uden at mærke det, har haft medvind på deres cykelsti. De er blevet udsat for positiv diskrimination, de har bare ikke vidst det, for de har været normen - apropos det med normbryderne - og når man laver noget andet fremstår det som et fremmedlegeme, det fremstår som normbrydende. Men der blev ikke stillet spørgsmålstegn ved normen, så det skulle vi gøre. Så er der det med at køn er uvedkommende, "vi er jo voksne mennesker, jeg gør da ikke forskel på nogen". Eller overdrevne hensyn: Man tror at man tager hensyn - der er enormt meget ubevidst. Det tager jo bevægelsesfriheden fra cheferne at nogen kommer og lægger en bestemt strategi ned over deres måde at rekruttere og sende folk på kursus på. Nogle synes ikke det har noget med sagen at gøre, "hvad siger kunderne ikke", nogen føler sig antastede og puffede ud - for al forandring bliver jo også modtaget af dem der er i systemet, det bliver opfattet som en kritik, hvilket det jo på en måde er, men ikke en personlig kritik. Men al forandring bliver mødt med noget vemod og vokseværk fordi de ikke kan finde ud af det. Men jeg vil helst ikke kalde det modstand. Heller ikke når jeg taler om tiltag. Jeg vil kalde det spændinger. Spændinger findes på mange fronter, og skal tages alvorligt, som en gave, som et læringspunkt. "Ej, hvor interessant, så kan du blive bedre til at argumentere". "Nå ja, det havde jeg

ikke tænkt på". Noget der hedder tensions, der er et hot issue. At se tensions som et læringspunkt. Jeg blev også uddannet gestaltterapeut, personlige modstande, neuroser. Man skal danse med folks modstande, man skal ikke bare få dem til at græde og bryde sammen og få dem til at indse alt muligt på en hård måde, man skal få dem til at identificere hvor de er rigide, og så danse videre. Det har givet mig indsigt.

R: Man skal ikke være for hård og konfronterende?

B: Enhver ting til sin tid. Nogengange skal man, hvis det er det sprog der er. Jeg har lært meget af mine modstandere, en chef kom engang og sagde til mig: "Jeg kan mærke at når du taler om at vi skal kæmpe og så videre, så bliver jeg provokeret, for I får jo en kamp når I beder om en kamp." Det lærte jeg af, jeg tænkte "det har han ret i". Hvis man går tilbage til hvad er strategien, hvis man siger det her er godt for forretningen, så skal man jo netop få alle med, så alle synes det er godt for forretningen, så skal de ikke se det som en kamp - dem mod os.

R: Hvordan får man folk med?

B: For eksempel ved at de ser hvad de selv kan få ud af det, men også hvis man er ærlig, at hvis man tager nogle privilegier fra dem, så må man sige "ja, det er nye tider, nu er det nogle andres tur til at have medvind".

R: Så du forsøger at forklare, for eksempel med cykelstismetaforen, det med privilegier og normer?

B: Ja, ja, men det er enormt svært, ved du, for når man er en del af den herskende, majoriteten, normen, så kan man ikke mærke det. Man kan ikke fatte og se det. Derfor er der måder, øvelser at få folk til at mærke hvordan det er at være udenfor normen - det gør jeg ikke - sådan en hel diversity-tradition fra USA og UK.

R: Diversity management og så videre - er det noget du er inspireret af, eller er det en modsætning til det du laver?

B: Efter [arbejdet i transportvirksomheden], i '95, blev jeg selvstændig, og i slutningen af 90'erne blev jeg lokket til at lave noget for kvindelige chefer i det offentlige, og jeg havde ellers tænkt, "nej, nu gider jeg ikke køn mere", jeg begyndte at kunne se at der også var ulemper ved at arbejde med én forskel ad gangen, for man kan også blive en del af problemet. Og i [transportvirksomheden] havde jeg arbejdet med andre forskelle: faglige, personlige, og da jeg bliver selvstændig blev jeg lokket til det projekt, men jeg udnyttede det til at sige: "vi kan godt arbejde med kvindelige chefer, men de skal ikke kun arbejde med køn", at de kun identificerer sig med deres køn. Vi skal arbejde med forskellige fagligheder, nationalitet og så videre, men dét strittede jeg også imod. Jeg var leder og hyrede folk ind der gav workshops. Blandt andet nogle der arbejdede med nationale forskelle. Noget der siger hvordan nationaliteter er forskellige ud fra fem forskellige dikotomier - men jeg tænkte, der er noget der skurrer. For jeg gjorde op med kun at se én forskel ad gangen. For så siger jeg, at man bliver en del af problemet, ikke af løsningen, fordi man graver grøfter. Det er nyttigt at opdage at der er en forskel, men hvis man bliver ved, bliver det et problem. Jeg blev også uddannet i forskellige persontypeprofiler - jungiansk, introvert versus ekstrovert, og så videre. Så jeg fik flere og flere brikker til at kende forskelle på folk. Jeg holdt fast i den der diversity tankegang. Og introducerede den på holdet med de kvindelige chefer. Men i år 2000 røg jeg ud af programmet, og havde tid og råd til at skrive den første bog om mangfoldighed i Danmark, sammen med to andre. Vi forsøgte at slå et slag for diversity - som kom fra Canada, USA, UK - men det jeg var kritisk over for var at det var minoritetsdiversity: Det var udelukkende køn, etnicitet, race, handicap, og så videre, seksualitet. I den bog slog vi et slag for at tale diversity i Danmark med *alle* slags forskelle: også med uddannelse, personlige forskelle, organisationsforskelle. Den kom i 2001. Det har jeg plæderet for lige siden. I den bog tabte vi definitionskampen. For lige efter bulrede det frem med den etniske dagsorden. I mange år efter der var diversitet - eller, man kaldte det mangfoldighed - det var lig med etnisk mangfoldighed. Der skete lige præcis det jeg ikke ville have skete. Det var kun minoritetsforskelle, ikke andre forskelle. I 2004 skrev jeg en artikel - jeg gik fra mangfoldighedsfeltet, lukkede døren dertil, ved at

skrive denne artikel. Jeg var røvtræt af at der blev blandet sammen på begreberne. At der blev italesat fra ét paradigme, men brugt begreber fra et andet. Senere blev den genoptrykt [B tegner et koordinatsystem]: nulpunkt, hernede har vi ligestilling, og øverst har vi mangfoldighed som en resurse. Ligestilling det er alt det der med minoritetetsforskelle, forskelle som et problem, "vi skal op på niveau med", "det er for dårligt", "der mangler nogen"; "vi bliver undertrykte på grund af normen" - kan du høre det? Det er mangelsprog. Problemer, barrierer, og så videre. Vi skal op på et nulpunkt: Det mindste vi kan forlange er at vi ikke bliver diskrimineret. Imod diskrimination. Nulpunkt: Nu er vi lige, ingen bliver diskrimineret. Hvis vi taler om forskelle som resurse, så er det noget helt andet vi snakker om. Med minoritetsforskelle ser vi folk som grupper. Den gruppe, den gruppe, og så videre. Når du taler om mangfoldighed som en resurse, eller diversitet, så taler vi om at vi alle sammen er forskellige: ja, vi har et køn, seksualitet, men vi har også en faglighed, en organisatorisk tilknytning, og en alder, og en baggrund og en uddannelse, og så videre. Så vi har alle disse baggrunde, og de kan bruges som resurse. Men mange tror at hvis man automatisk arbejder med ligestilling så kommer man automatisk derop [til mangfoldighed] - men det gør man ikke. Det er to forskellige ting. Hvis du kommer ind i en virksomhed hvor de har arbejdet med ligestilling, så er det meget svært for dem at dekonsturere den måde at tænke på, fordi de hvide mænd, og nogle gange de hvide kvinder, de vil sige at det handler om de andre. Altså, ligestilling handler om nogle andre der skal blive ligesom mig. Men her, i mangfoldigheden, der er det os allesammen der er forskellige. Så det er faktisk nemmere at arbejde i en virksomhed med mangfoldighed som resurse hvis de ikke har været inde i ligestilling. Så de tænker ikke i problemer, og så videre. Når folk blev trætte af den der etniske ligestilling, så sagde de - "nej, nu handler det om noget heeelt andet, om fordele, om forretningen, nu skal vi have nytte". De *talte* heroppe [mangfoldighed]: men metoderne kom hernede fra, det var stadig kvinderne der skulle på kursus for at blive ledere. Og nogle der skulle have mentorprogrammer. De blandede rundt i dem.

R: Så der var meget varm luft?

B: Ja, og bruge det som en fordel, synergi, og så videre.

R: Men der var stadig fokus på minoriteterne?

B: Ja, og de forstod ikke forskellen.

R: Kan du tale mere om mentorprogrammerne, som en løsning?

B: Det har været oppe i mange år. Men man skal passe på - I et program jeg evaluerede, var der en fyr der sagde: "Jeg har aldrig følt mig så etnisk som da jeg kom ind i det her program - min etnicitet bliver set hele tiden". Man bliver aflæst udefra, bliver sat i boks.

R: Du smækkede døren...

B: Jeg lukkede døren - jeg gad ikke mere.

R: Du følte at mangfoldighedskonceptet var blevet hijacket af et ensidigt fokus på etnicitet?

B: Nej, men det var det der kom fra USA og England og det var egentlig ærligt nok. Det maste gennem Danmark som en damptromle. Nogen sagde "ihhh, vi arbejder også med mangfoldighed som du gør" - ja, tak, så arbejdede de både med etnicitet, og køn og handicap og synes det var vældig mangfoldigt. Det var det ikke - stadig at klipse "synd for jer" grupper sammen. Det er ikke at bruge diverstitet som resurse. Det er det jeg gør i dag. Jeg bruger ikke ordet mangfoldighed i dag, det gør jeg ikke. Jeg bruger forskelle. I mellemtiden har jeg skrevet endnu en bog. Så introducerede jeg begrebet om kulturel intelligens her i Danmark. Det var allerede et begreb derude i USA og Singapore, men der hijackede jeg det begreb: jeg brugte den tredeling, og sagde det er et skidegodt begreb fordi det sætter nyt lys på at arbejde med forskelle - man kan ikke blive ved med at tale om interkulturelle kompetencer. Man skal bruge et nyt begreb, nye ord, for at få et nyt fokus. Så jeg snuppede det begreb, puttede nyt indhold i det. Tredelingen bevarede jeg: det kognitive, emotionelle og det handlingsrettede, men jeg sagde: nu er det det moderne kulturbegreb, som ikke kan måles, for kultur er en social konstruktion. Kulturel intelligens handler om alle slags forskelle. Derfor handler bogen om

fusioner, projektledelse, nationale forskelle - og så videre. Det var i 2007, kom på engelsk i '08. Det var spændende. Arbejde i forskellige organisationer, på at opbygge kulturel intelligens, med forskellige anledninger: Forandringsledelse, projektledelse, internationalisering, og så videre. Så fik jeg en masse erfaringer, og skrev i 2013 en bog: Der var jeg træt af kulturbegrebet, for man bliver lukket inde i sine begreber. Når man bruger et begreb som andre aflæser på en anden måde er det ret træls. Det vil sige jeg gik fra mangfoldighedsområdet, fordi jeg ikke kunne være ved den måde det blev aflæst, ind i kulturbegrebet, det er de samme pointer jeg har hele tiden: De mange forskelle på én gang, vi har mange forskellige sider, og når man arbejder med én forskel gør man tingene værre. Man skal altid arbejde med flere. Man skal dekonsturere de grøfter der er gravet, de stereotyper der er lavet. Så opdagede jeg, åh, kultur, det bliver altid aflæst som nationalitet, så jeg skulle altid forklare. Det går ikke. Så næste bog handlede om forskelle. Nu arbejder jeg med forskelle. Det er nemmere. Nu har jeg jo også været mange år i feltet, de ved hvem jeg er. Det er godt ikke at blive forbundet med noget som nogle andre aflæser som noget andet. Fordi jeg var i modstrøm. Mange har sagt jeg var før min tid. Det er muligt. Det har jeg også gjort. Hvis du ser på Arla, med flere, så har diversity bevæget sig i den retning vi beskrev [i bogen] i 2001, så det er kommet. Jeg har nok været så tidligt ude at der ikke var brug for det. Jeg synes jeg kunne se det, jeg var kritisk overfor mainstream, men virksomhederne var ikke der hvor de skulle bruge det. I dag er det nogle, men ikke alle, der kan se det. Nå, nu skal vi lave status.

R: Hvilke opgaver bliver du hyret ind til nu, hvilke forandringsprocesser, i forhold til mangfoldighed med mere?

B: Det bliver aldrig sat ind i en mangfoldhedstankegang. Aldrig. Jeg starter et andet sted. Virksomheden tænker det ikke der. Jeg bruger al min tid på en model: Team culture modellen. Der er to grundpiller. Den ene: Ligemeget om man sammensætter en team med mange forskellige mennesker der supplerer hinanden, er der ingen garanti for at det bliver et godt team. Det der afgør om de får succes er, hvilken kultur får de skabt på tværs af deres forskelle. Den anden pille er så hvad skal den kultur være præget af før de får succes? At de ser og bruger deres forskelle. Forskelle og fællesskab skal det være præget af. I den model kan et team identificere hvilken kultur de har, og hvilken retning de skal i for at kunne løse vores opgaver endnu bedre og få det endnu sjovere sammen. Så kan du høre, jeg går ind og siger: "Jeres team, spider I jeres tid"? Så jeg kalder det ikke forskelle - jeg går ind et andet sted, jeg går ind i forretningen, og siger: "Får I nok ud af jeres resurser? Spilder I jeres tid, eller får I det bedste ud af hinanden? Er I tilfredse med teamarbejdet, og med lederteamet?" Får I det bedste frem i hinanden - det bruger jeg meget, for at bruge nogle simple udtryk. Det rammer et blødt punkt. For folk ved godt: det gør i ikke: De lægger låg på, eller glatter ud, eller bekriger hinanden. Det er jo det der er selve - en af de vigtigste ingredienser i en virksomhed, det er der hvor man arbejder sammen. Det er det jeg tager fat i. Men jeg har alt det jeg har lavet de sidste 30-40 år med, om forskelle og kultur, og så videre, jeg har bare sat det ind i en anden sammenhæng. Og jeg bruger frisk fra fad, for eksempel en anden model jeg er meget stolt af. Der demonstrerer jeg at forskelle er noget man gør. Figurer med forskelligt udtryk - man beder dem lede efter noget bestemt, for eksempel alle dem der har hvidt tøj på og så videre. Det er perception - der bruger jeg min terapeutviden. Det er jo det samme vi ser på - men hvis vi kun taler om nationalitet, så ser vi kun de kolonner. Eller hvis vi kun taler om køn. Det er en kraftfuld måde, som jeg har haft med helt langt tilbage fra min fortid, og har opfundet, hvor de opdager "guuud ja, det er da også rigtigt, det er sådan vi gør", og så videre.

R: Er der nogle ord du prøver at undgå?

B: Ja, jeg bruger aldrig mangfoldighed. Aldrig. Jeg kan godt sige diversitet, for det er mere neutralt.

R: Men det betyder jo det samme?

B: Det er fuldstændig ligemeget, pointen er hvordan det bliver aflæst. Der går også lidt tid inden jeg taler om kultur. Hvis jeg taler om den kultur de skaber sammen, så tænker de ikke på nationalitet. Så tænker de på organisationskultur. Så folder jeg min model ud. Jeg tænker *meget* på hvilken bane jeg

ikke går ud i. For hver gang du siger noget, så ryger der alt muligt med op, som nogen andre har bestemt, det vil du ikke have med, men det kommer med, ikke.

R: Hvad undgår du ellers?

B: Det ved jeg ikke, har været i feltet for længe.

R: Kunne du finde på at tale om racisme, diskrimination, sexisme?

B: Der går langt hen - hvis jeg taler om diskrimination, så sørger jeg for at åbne et andet vindue hvor vi kan komme hen til diskrimination. Jeg siger for eksempel man bliver set forskelligt, aflæst forskelligt - bruger eksempler: "I kan tro det er irriterende at blive aflæst som noget man ikke vil". Bruger mig selv, da jeg kom ind i [transportvirksomheden], og nogen siger "hvad synes kvinden om det her", og jeg tænker "Gud jeg er den eneste kvinde" - og det kan de godt forstå: "Neeej, du sidder der som professionel og pludselig bliver du aflæst som kvinde". Spørgsmålet er om jeg også bliver aflæst som professionel lige der, ikke. Eller jeg kan fortælle andre historier. Så kan de tale om det med at blive aflæst, puttet i bås, ikke blive taget alvorligt. Jeg bruger også noget jeg har helt tilbage fra 70'erne. Det med Berit Ås herskerteknikker - så kalder jeg det ikke det, men jeg bruger det.

R: Hvad kalder du det?

B: Det kan jeg ikke huske. Jeg siger bare at der er fem måder at magt udspiller sig på i en gruppe, eller et eller andet. I nogle sammenhænge kan jeg godt slippe afsted med at sige "ja, det kaldte vi herskerteknikker i 70'erne". For nu er jeg så gammel, at de ved godt jeg har været på banen længe. Så jeg bruger uhæmmet af hvad jeg har lært og fået med.

R: Så det handler om at aflæse situationen, og bruge humor?

B: Ja, det gør jeg altid. Jeg prøver at gøre det - det her er et vanvittigt vanskeligt felt. Det er det vanskeligste forandringsfelt du overhovedet kan arbejde på, for der er så mange følelser og private holdninger i det. Alt det vi kalder mangfoldighed - altså, ikke den måde jeg arbejder på - det bliver ikke set som et professionelt felt, det bliver set som noget alle har en holdning til.

R: Bliver du mødt med den?

B: Nej, ikke sådan som jeg arbejder nu. Jeg møder den ikke fordi jeg har så meget erfaring at spille på. Jeg siger man skal passe på, fordi vi har så mange private holdninger. I mange andre felter i organisationen, der siger man måske "nårh, det ved jeg ikke så meget om", men dér hvor det er en del af ens hverdag og hjemmeliv, der tænker man "nårh, det ved jeg ligeså godt som dem". Eksempel: Anders Fogh holdt en tale om ligestilling. Ministeriet havde virkelig forberedt sig, med masser af facts, creme de la creme af viden i Danmark indenfor feltet. På vej derhen havde han talt med sin kone, og sin kvindelige sekretær. Så brugte han halvdelen af sin taletid på at sige hvad de syntes. Og så tog han talepapiret frem, og nåede lidt af det. Og det syntes han var legitimt. Det kunne være ligeså godt som det de der forskere havde fundet ud af [griner].

R: Så for eksempel når folk siger "jeg har et køn, jeg ved godt...." Den er du forberedt på?

B: Jeg arbejder slet ikke med køn. Jeg går ikke ind på det der mangfoldighedsnoget. Det gør jeg simpelthen ikke. Jeg går ind på samarbejde: hvad får vi frem i hinanden. Hvad er effektivt og sjovt samarbejde.

R: Der bliver det ikke nødvendigt at tale om køn, selv hvis der sidder 9 ud af 10 og er mænd?

B: Langt hen ad vejen kan jeg lave fis med det. Så kan jeg sige at der er en elefant i rummet. Jeg kan spørge ind til hvilke forskelle der er i rummet, jeg kan godt gå ind på de der baner - men det er efter et stykke tid. Når jeg har sat den ramme som jeg synes er professionel lige der - fordi det er så kontroversielt. Du går ind på en kampbane. Der er så mange misforståelser, du bliver tillagt alle mulige dagsordener og motiver, og så videre. Så dem skal du først sige: "Det mener jeg heller ikke, det mener jeg heller ikke."

R: Så du skaber først en ramme...

B: ...Som er vedkommende for dem som sidder i rummet der. Så kan man lave afstikkere derfra til alt muligt, kan gøre meget vedkommende. Men det er ikke der jeg starter. For så har jeg allerede lavet en motorvej ind et sted hvor jeg ikke kender deres erfaringer eller ved hvad de synes om det.

R: Det kræver du har tid?

B: Nogle gange har du to timer, andre gange mere. Tit bliver jeg bare hidkaldt til to timer. Så bruger jeg det med team culture modellen. Så trækker jeg på alt det andet, alt efter problemstillingen. Jeg bruger al min viden, kogt ned i den Maggi-terning der hedder team culture modellen. Derfra kan jeg pakke alle mulige problemstillinger ud alt efter relevans. Der hvor jeg møder folk er: "får I nok ud af hinanden?" Går fra det individuelle til det kollektive niveau, det er hele pointen. Hvilke relationer laver vi sammen.

R: Handler det om at få dem til at se normer generelt i samfundet?

B: Hvis diskussionen går den vej, kan jeg gå den vej med dem. Det kommer an på... Det kan sagtens være. For eksempel, to unge kvinder der kom ind i et ingeniørvirksomhed, og blev hele tiden aflæst som unge, eller som kvinder, eller som eksotiske af uddannelse. De syntes det var enormt irriterende. Men så gik der nogle måneder, så fik de muffet sig ind på det.

[interviewet afbrydes. Vi taler også om at hendes arbejde ikke er politisk.]

Liv

[Jeg forklarer om projektet, hvor mange jeg har interviewet. Min interesse i motivationer, udfordringer, om jobbets indhold, tanker om forskellige ord.]

R: Start med din baggrund, og hvordan du kom ind i arbejdet.

L: [navn på Livs organisation] er en nonprofit organisation, og startedes af [navn på kommune], høgskola, og et par virksomheder, som så at mangfoldighedsspørgsmålene behøvede at konkretiseres og løftes. Vi har haft forskellige fokusområder og metoder, men frem for alt har det været mentorordninger for udenlandsfødte. Jeg er kønsekspert [genusvetare] og strategisk kommunikatør med retning mod forandringsarbejde, og har arbejdet i en integrationsvirksomhed for flygtinge og indvandrere, som projektleder med fokus på ligestillingsintegrering, jeg har arbejdet som projektleder i et projekt om psykosocial sygdom. En tid med ligestilling i Landsstyrelsen. Bredt, men inden for samme område, og arbejdet indirekte med de her ting. Jeg har fulgt [navn på Livs organisation] på sidelinien, og har været inde over et par projekter i fortiden. I sommer skete der store forandringer, flere holdt op, og jeg blev kontaktet. Jeg arbejder som projektleder for de projekter som [navn på Livs organisation] styrer, for eksempel med fundraising, men også koblet på mentorordningen, uddannelse, og så videre i virksomhederne.

R: Hvor mange ansatte er I?

L: Vi er tre, med en bestyrelse på 10 - fra blandt andet SEB, Ikona Bank, IKEA, [navn på kommune]. Vi er en medlemsorganisation med 38 medlemmer fra både offentlig og privat sektor.

R: Hvad betyder et medlemskab?

L: At man tager del i [navn på Livs organisation]s tjenester, vi arbejder meget konsultativt, med internt forandringsarbejde: Policies, handlingsplaner, vi har afsluttet et stort projekt i Skåne med en virtuel værktøjskasse, koblet på deres intranet, som en støtte for deres chefer så de internt kan arbejde med ligestillings- og mangfoldighedsspørgsmål. Uddannelsesindsatser. Større rekrutteringsplaner, mangfoldighedsrekruttering. Meget handler om at igansætte arbejdet. Man behøver ikke være medlem for at benytte vores tjenester. Meget handler om at man enten har en specific problematik i virksomheden eller at man helt enkelt ikke ved hvordan man skal starte. Så meget fokus på uddannelsen og på hvordan man kan komme i gang.

R: Så motivationen for dem er, at de ikke ved hvad de skal gøre?

L: Motivationen er frem for alt at man vil løfte mangfoldighedsspørgsmålet, at spørgsmålet er vigtigt, noget man vil prioritere i sin organisation. Så det er anledning til at man bliver medlem.

R: Kræves det af staten eller fra offentlig side at man arbejder aktivt med manfoldighed?

L: Nej, men vi kan gå ind og hjælpe til, det kræves bare at man har motivationen.

R: Hvilke udfordringer har de?

L: Det er svært at det er alles ansvar - normalt ligger det på to-tre nøglepersoner. Så det at implementere en mangfoldighedstankegang, det perspektiv. Hvordan gør man rent praktisk? Hvordan arbejder man med forandringsarbejde, ikke kun på teoretisk niveau. Og der kan også ind gang imellem være intern modstand - det er følsomme sager. Det kan være at der er nogle ting der er sket, og man ikke vil og tør tage fat på i en organisation, så der kan opstå modstand. Det er svært hvis det kun er interne kræfter der tager fat, og det er lettere at vi kommer udefra og styrer stedet lidt.

R: Så når I kommer udefra, er det lettere, fordi I ikke er investerede i organisationen?

L: Ja præcis. Det er lettere for visse personer der yder modstand, at tage det til sig når der kommer en udefra. Jeg kender det fra mig selv - hvis der kommer nogen udefra og siger at man skal tage fat i fællesskab, så er det lettere.

R: Hvorfor?

L: Så får spørgsmålene plads og tid. Arbejdsgiverne prioriterer det, og gør lederne det ikke, så sker det ikke. Og så er det jo følsomt at tage fat i disse emner - at diskutere diskriminering, normer på arbejdspladsen, kan være svært i visse tilfælde, og at tale med sine kolleger, og rent faktisk at udfordre normerne. Det er lettere for os der kommer udefra.

R: I kan være hårdere?

L: Ja.... Men sætte spørgsmålstegn på en bredere måde. Og vi får en del baggrundsinfo fra den der inviterer os: Hvorfor har I brug for os, hvad er følsomt, hvad skal vi belyse, er det diskrimineringslovgivningen, er det et fokus på køn, eller etnicitet, og så videre, ud fra hvad de rent faktisk synes er svært, internt. Vi skal føle os frem til hvor vi skal lægge os - hvor følsomme er de her spørgsmål. Jeg holdt for eksempel en workshop i en organisation, hvor de havde store problemer med sexchikane, så ved vi at det er hovedfokus, og så ved vi også at det er et følsomt emne. Så ved vi hvordan vi skal gå ind og italesætte det, så vi ved hvor meget vi kan udfordre dem.

R: Hvordan gør man så det?

L: Vi taler meget om dillemmaer. Cases. Og taler frit om situationerne, indledningsvis. For at få samtalen i gang. Om normer og så videre på arbejdspladsen. Og hvad er det der former vores arbejdsmiljø ud fra normer vi faktisk har. Ganske frie diskussioner. De taler ud fra sin egen virkelighed, fra sin egen arbejdsplads. Det plejer vi at arbejde videre med, hvordan kan vi gøre det konkret, ud fra handlingsplaner. Vi ser en fordel i at medlemmerne i en organisation får lov til at sætte ord på det først.

R: Hvordan sætte ord på?

L: At løfte det normkritiske ind: At få dem til at tale om normen, i stedet for det der afviger fra normen. Det plejer at sætte nye perspektiver på.

R: Er der modstand mod at tale om normer, eller er det sådan "aha", så forstår de?

L: Jaha, det er vældig forskelligt, men ofte når vi vender perspektivet, og fokuserer på normen, så plejer der er at være mange aha-oplevelser: "Det er ikke bare mig..." Det kommer an på organisationen, og hvad de har gjort i forvejen. Nogen har jo aldrig... Det er nemmere i organisationer hvor de faktisk ser normer som begrænsende, hvor andre ikke er bekvemme om at tale om det.

R: Hvem laver I workshops for - alle ansatte eller ledelsen?

L: Det er også meget forskelligt. Det er ofte for HR-afdelingen, fordi de ofte er ansvarlige for at drive arbejdet; ledelsesgrupper, mange begynder med lederne og HR, og så implementerer det nedad til, hvilket vi også plejer at anbefale - det er vigtigt at man forankrer det i ledergrupperne først, inden vi arbejder videre.

R: I starter der, men vil gerne blive i virksomheden og lave workshops - eller er det deres eget ansvar?

L: Visse steder har vi arbejdet med hele organisationen, men i forskellige trin. Andre steder nøjes med en eller to dage med deres ledere, og så stopper det dér. Det kommer an på deres ambitioner.

R: Så det er jeres job at tilpasse jer til deres ambitioner? Være fleksible?

L: Ja, vi er ret fleksible i forhold til andre. Vi får meget info fra dem om rammerne: Hvor meget tid har de, hvad vil de have ud af det, vil de have forelæsninger eller diskussioner. Gentag spørgsmålet?

R: Er I nødt til at være fleksible i forhold til resurser?

L: Ja, vi har brug for rammer at forholde os til, men vi vil også vide hvordan de langsigtet planlægger at arbejde med de her ting. For så bliver det lettere for os at lægge forskellige ting op for dem, mens andre vil have en punktvis indsats, og så vil arbejde videre selv. Med vores medlemmer ved vi tit hvordan de arbejder, men ikke altid hvis de ikke er medlemmer.

R: Så med medlemmerne er det lettere at følge deres arbejde over tid?

L: Ja, for så har de en medlemsrepræsentant. Som vi møder ofte gennem medlemsnetværk og Cultural Intelligence netværk, hvor man deler erfaringer om mangfoldighedsarbejdet. For vi vil gerne værne om at vi er et stort netværk, med mangfoldighedssmarte virksomheder, der kan lære af andre. På træffene kan vi følge med i hvad der sker. Men det kan vi ikke med ikke-medlemmer.

R: Hordan er opfattelsen af mangfoldighed, ligestilling - bliver det opfattet positivt eller negativt?

L: Vores indsatser?

R: Hvis I laver en workshop, er der så nogle koncepter som er mere lette at bruge, og nogle hvor der er blokeringer?

L: Forelæsninger er sværest. De får ikke mulighed for at sætte egne ord på hvad der er problematisk, og hvorfor de ikke er den inkluderende arbejdsplads som de gerne vil være. En metode som jeg synes er let, er vores mentorskabsprogram, hvor vi matcher mentorer fra erhvervslivet med udenlandske arbejdssøgende. Inden mødet mellem parterne - som gør meget for begge parter, det er for den målgruppe vi findes for, som vi vil åbne arbejdsmarkedet for [de udenlandske] - konceptet er at man mødes med sin mentor i 10 måneder, og der indgår både uddannelse for mentoren og for menteen. For mentorerne indgår uddannelse indenfor CSR, diversity management, det praktiske mentorskab, og så videre. Gennem at skabe denne relation med en person som man ellers ikke ville træffe, parallelt med at man udvikler kompetencer for hvordan organisationen kan arbejde med mangfoldighed, så skaber det store effekter for mange gange er der flere mentorer fra samme virksomhed, og så er de spredt ud i virksomheden, hvilket gør at metoderne får mere tyngde på forskellige virksomheder. Så det koncept vi kører med der, har bedre gennemslagskraft, og vi kommer til at køre flere programmer.

R: Så det er en succes, både fordi de får en personlig relation, og fordi mentoren bliver en change agent i sin egen organisation?

L: Ja, præcis, og mange har fået arbejde på mentorens arbejdsplads, men de får også mulighed for overhovedet at have en kontakt på en svensk arbejdsplads hvilket er svært at få, så det er virkelig win-win.

R: Så I mærker stor interesse fra virksomhederne? Hvorfor?

L: Vi tager betalt for at man bliver mentor, for man får et diplom, så man kan fortsætte sit mentorskab. Vi har udviklet det som en tjeneste, og der går arbejdsgiveren ind og betaler for mentorens tid i programmet, som en del i personens kompetenceudvikling, for alle medarbejdere har jo en potte til kompetenceudvikling, og der kan mentorskabet være en del af det. Så det er også arbejdsgiveren der siger det her er vigtigt.

R: Du nævner diversity management - hvordan arbejder I med det?

L: Visse af mentorerne arbejder allerede med de her ting, og får mere inspiration til at arbejde videre, mens for andre er det helt nyt - CSR, diversity management, normkritik, de bidder - og det vi får at vide er at der sker mere når man tør starte diskussioner på arbejdspladserne, at turde udfordre arbejdsmiljøet og de sociale koder og normer på en anden måde, end når man arbejder strategisk. Det

afhænger af ens rolle i organisationen. Mange kommer tilbage og siger at man kan opnå forandring der. Hvordan man taler om folk i frokostrummet, hvordan man formulerer sig sprogligt, om regler. Mange begynder at tænke i de baner. Vi har også mentees som har fået job på mentorerne arbejdsplads, og som kommer tilbage som mentorer, og giver tilbage gennem det, så det skaber en spiral med tydelige effekter.

R: Så det handler meget om at skabe et godt arbejdsmiljø for mentorerne?

L: Ja, at skabe et godt arbejdsmiljø gennem at åbne op for udlændinge, mens mentorerne får andre kundskaber, og så sidder de på forskellige positioner og kan påvirke på forskellig måde. Men mange er på lederniveau, og kan begynde at løfte de her spørgsmål internt.

R: I bruger økonomiske argumenter?

L: Forretningsmæssige fordele, ja, specielt mentorerne som er på lederniveau som ser det som en øget rekrutteringsbase, man kan forøge kundegrupper, og at det bliver et bedre arbejdsmiljø af at have en blandet og mere mangfoldig arbejdsstyrke, så der er mange der ser fordele ud fra et forretningsmæssig vinkel.

R: I blander flere argumenter? Finansielle og arbejdsmiljømæssige?

L: Der arbejder vi meget med det forretningsmæssige. Både det sociale, men også det økonomiske. Det afhænger af hvilken organisation vi er ude i - de private ser det forretningsmæssige, og så arbejder vi med dét, og de offentlige forvaltninger ser mere på de sociale, og hvilken arbejdsplads vi gerne vil have. Så det veksler meget, og vi arbejder med begge. Det går hånd i hånd, synes vi.

R: Hvis I har en privat virksomhed, som lægger vægt på det forretningsmæssige, så forsøger I at få det sociale aspekt med?

L: Ja, præcis, man kan sige at alle medlemsforeninger kan jo skrive under på at de arbejder med de her spørgsmål fordi de ønsker en inkluderende arbejdsplads, og så vil man have det af forskellige årsager, men ja.

R: Du siger de skriver under, har I en kontrakt?

L: Nej, det er noget vi diskuterer, om man skal skrive under på en kontrakt, eller have et medlemsbevis, som man kan hænge på væggen, så det er faktisk en diskussion vi har. På en måde siger man at man tager stilling fordi de her spørgsmål er vigtige.

R: Så image er vigtigt?

L: For visse er det, ja, at man kan sprede ordet om at man arbejder aktivt med mangfoldighed.

R: Men ikke alle?

L: Nej, ikke alle, visse ser det kun som noget de vinder på internt, fordi de vil have en velfungerende arbejdsplads, og det behøver vi ikke skilte med, mens andre ser det som en måde at profilere sig på - meget forskelligt.

R: Har der været en forandring, som du kan se, i Sverige, i de sidste par år - er mangfoldighed blevet mere populært at arbejde med?

L: Ja, det synes jeg at man kan se, samtaleklimaet har forandret sig. Det udtrykker vores medlemmer også, at det er blevet vigtigere at arbejde med de her spørgsmål, og at sætte spørgsmålstegn ved de strukturer som ikke er inkluderende. Der er mange som vælger at arbejde med dem ud fra dét. Ligesom at man før talte meget om miljøcertificering, for 10-20 år siden, så føles det som om at mangfoldighedcertificeringen, at profilere sig på at arbejde med mangfoldighed, er større i dag end for 10 år siden. Absolut.

R: Der er en enighed i virksomheder om at det er vigtige ting?

L: Ja, ja, absolut, at man er mere klar om at man bør prioritere dem.

R: Er der nogen ting det er lettere at tale om - inklusion - og nogle sværere at tale om - racisme, og så videre.

L: Gennem dem som vi arbejder med, er der mange som udtrykker at arbejdspladsen bliver mere åben, og arbejder mere kompetenceorienteret, så det viser at attituderne ændrer sig, også internt. Men det er

svært at måle arbejdet, og vi må gå ud fra hvad vi hører. Men nogle siger også at miljøet er blevet hårdere, og at det er en motivation til hvorfor man vil arbejde med det - for eksempel en arbejdsplads hvor racisme kommer til udtryk, og at der findes racistiske ting, og at man går ind og tager stilling til at man ikke vil have det. Så mange ser det negative, og bestemmer sig ud fra det til at skabe forandring og arbejde med det aktivt.

R: Så de kommer og siger direkte til jer, "hey, vi har problemer med sexisme, racisme, og så videre".

L: Ja, ekstern støtte til hvordan de skal arbejde med det.

R: Hvis I så starter en workshop med at tale om racisme, diskrimination, kan I det?

L: Ja, for eksempel i en organisation med sexisme, der sagde ledergruppen at det var grunden til at jeg var der, at man havde lavet en undersøgelse i firmaet, som viste at mange havde oplevet chikane. Så der ville lederne gerne have at deltagerne vidste at dét var anledningen til at vi skulle arbejde aktivt med det, så der bad de os om at trykke på det der var sket. Vi går ikke i detaljer, men vi siger at vi ved at de har de her problemer.

R: Er det en god strategi?

L: En gang imellem. I det her tilfælde var det. For alle der var med, var jo så enige om at de skulle arbejde med det, fordi det var sket. Mens andre vi har mødt kan opleve det som et angreb, "nej, det kender vi ikke noget til, nu kommer I udefra og siger at vi har racisme og sexisme". Men så plejer lederne heller ikke at sige at vi skal tage det op. Det er jo dem der kender deres organisation bedst. Og det skal vi stole på. For vi kommer jo udefra, og har kompetence og viden om de her spørgsmål, men vi kender jo ikke organisationen og deres klima. Så der må vi stole på dem der bestiller vores tjenester.

R: Så tit virker det bedre at bruge positive ord, for eksempel mangfoldighed og inklusion?

L: Ja, for at bevise at der findes en forankring i virksomheden, og at det er derfor vi er der. Men en gang imellem opstår der også modstand.

R: Hvilken modstand?

L: Ja, man går ind - vi taler meget i cases hvor normer kommer til udtryk som ekskluderende, og der taler vi om vigtigheden af at reflektere over når man er normen, og ikke kun når man afviger - der kan opstå en del modstand. Og de almindelige jagoner: "man må jo kunne tage lidt gas", typiske som man læser om i teorien - modstanden findes praktisk taget altid.

R: Hvordan håndterer man det?

L: Mange gange, hvilket er heftigt, når vi er ude, så vil de resterende i diskussionen gå ind inden os og sige det som vi påtaler: "Man ved ikke hvilke erfaringer personen har, man kan ikke antage at alle er hetero, man ved ikke hvad de har med, om man får spørgsmålet om hvor de er fra 10 gange om dagen." Mange gange så kommer det inden vi selv går ind og italesætter det. Og det er heftigt at se det ske, for der sker det jo på arbejdspladsen, og det at nogen tør gå ind og stille spørgsmålstegn, det er jo også det vi vil opnå. Mange gange behøver vi ikke gøre så meget.

R: I skaber en arena?

L: Ja, og får dem til at skabe et godt diskussionsklima, så sker der ret meget.

R: Kan du give eksempler på en succesfuld workshop eller projekt?

L: Det største resultat er jo mentees der kommer tilbage som mentorer, det er fantastisk. At man vil fortsætte med at give andre en chance, ud fra det man selv har prøvet, den åbning man har fået gennem et møde mellem målgrupper. Det er vores flagskib, at vi får så fantastiske resultater gennem den metode. Men ellers at når vi holder en workshop, og at organisationen så kommer tilbage og vil arbejde mere langsigtet, og vil arbejde et års tid på at implementere et langsigtet forandringsarbejde i organisationen, og at man går fra at se det som et punkt på en dagsorden til at se det som et kontinuerligt arbejde.

R: Som også kan integreres i organisationens arbejde?

L: Ja, præcis.

R: Føler du at det er noget organisationerne prioriterer - som de vil ofre tid og penge på?

L: Absolut. Ikke alle, men mange gør det. Definitivt. Sætter tid og økonomiske resurser af til det, at deres medarbejdere skal have kompetenceudvikling, og at de her spørgsmål skal have tid til at ændre strukturer på arbejdspladsen, og at man går fra bare at have en handlingsplan liggende til at man faktisk forankrer den ude i virksomheden. Men det veksler selvfølgelig.

R: Man vurderer hvad der skal være fokus på - sexisme, etnicitet - er der noget der er mere populært end andet?

L: De fleste vi kommer ud til vil have os til at arbejde ud fra diskrimineringsloven. Og arbejde helstøbt med alle diskrimineringsgrundene. Men de diskrimineringsgrunde som er lidt sværere at arbejde med, er funktionsnedsættelser - tilgængelighed på arbejdspladsen - og racisme, og diskriminering ud fra køn. I større grad. Men ellers arbejder vi ud fra dem alle, og bruger cases fra dem alle, men nogle vil have at vi vælger ud.

R: Men I foretrækker at arbejde helstøbt?

L: Ja, det handler jo om diskrimineringens strukturer ud fra normer. Og så kommer vi mere ind på racisme og etnicitet fordi vi er den organisation som vi er, og at vi arbejder for den målgruppe udtalt, og der er nogle som hyrer os fordi vi har erfaring med at arbejde med at få udlændinge ind på arbejdsmarkedet. Men i det store hele har arbejdsgiveren også et ansvar for at arbejde ud fra diskrimineringsgrundene, loven.

R: Så der er en lov om at arbejdspladser skal arbejde med anti-diskriminering?

L: Ja, vores lov er ganske... Egentlig træder den ikke i kraft før en diskriminering ér sket, men derimod findes der pro-aktive indslag i lovgivningen, men det gælder kun køn, etnicitet, og religion. Så de tre diskrimineringsgrunde skal arbejdsgiverne arbejde forebyggende omkring. Men minimumskravet er jo bare at ingen skal blive diskrimineret, og at de resterende diskrimineringsgrunde træder ikke i kraft før der er sket noget. Arbejdsgiverne ved jo godt at de har et ansvar for at forebygge diskriminering, men at arbejde forebyggende med de her grunde betyder jo ikke at man får en inkluderende arbejdsplads. Det er ofte dét perspektiv som arbejdsgiverne ser, at selvom vi følger diskrimineringsloven, så betyder det ikke at vi får en inkluderende arbejdsplads.

R: Så de er ikke så motiverede af loven, de siger at de vil meget mere end minimum.

L: Ja, lige præcis, men det interessante ved den svenske lovgivning er at den kun er forebyggende inden for disse tre grunde. Alder, som er en svær diskrimineringsgrund, som det er svært at synliggøre, dels fordi den er svær, men også fordi man ikke behøver at arbejde forebyggende med den.

R: Er der andre grunde du tænker...?

L: Ja, alle grunde som der ikke er forebyggelseskrav om, får ikke samme legitimitet. Man kan ikke opdage diskriminering ud fra disse grunde, fordi vi ikke behøver at arbejde med dem.

R: Hvad er din motivation for at arbejde med det her, gennem dit liv og din karriere? Stort spørgsmål.

L: Det der motiverer mig mest, ud fra de arbejdspladser jeg har været på, er at jeg ser en gevinst i at have mangfoldige arbejdspladser, og at det er de arbejdspladser jeg selv trivedes bedst på, og jeg har ikke trivedes særlig godt på homogene arbejdspladser. Og så at jeg ved at der findes strukturelle begræsninger for visse grupper, blandt andet udlændinge, som har har utrolige kompetencer, og vi har gode resurser i vores samfund, som vi ikke passer på, og som vi ville kunne tjene på og anvende, både ud fra det forretningsmæssige, men også ud fra hvilke arbejdspladser vi ville kunne få. Mere åbne arbejdspladser, hvor man faktisk respekterer hinanden, og kommer væk fra toleranceperspektivet, som lidt er et modeord indenfor svensk politik: At man skal tolerere hinanden. Men toleranceperspektivet i sig selv skaber jo også et magtforhold - hvad giver mig retten til at tolerere dig? Gennem mangfoldige arbejdspladser kan man faktisk skabe respekt, vi respekterer hinanden, uanset hvem vi er - der er meget der motiverer, men det er vigtige spørgsmål, og jeg kan ikke rigtig forstå at vi ikke er kommet længere.

R: Motiverer det dig at møde folk på arbejdspladserne, og se forandringen ske?

L: Absolut. Det er en motivering i sig selv, virkelig. Privat, også. Jeg er gift med en mand fra Kosovo, som har haft det virkelig hårdt på arbejdsmarkedet, og som har mødt mærkelige... En udenlandsk født mand som arbejder inden for pleje, og indenfor pleje møder han meget fordi han er mand - så min interesse er også vokset frem fra det private. Så både privat og professionelt.

R: Er det også en politisk motivation som kobler det private og politiske?

L: Ja, klart, det politiske klima som det har set ud i de sidste 8 år, og det der er sket, og de fremgange vi ser - racistiske partier, det gør at man vil arbejde for at forandre.

R: Tænker du at [navn på Livs organisation]s arbejde er politisk?

L: Ja, det er et politisk forandringsarbejde, selvom vi ikke er parti-politiske [griner]. Men vi tager jo politisk stilling, absolut. Det er klart at det er et politisk arbejde.

R: Ser jeres medlemmer det også som et radikalt forandringsarbejde?

L: Jeg tror at mange er meget forsigtige om at udtale det som radikalt og politisk, men vender det mere som et arbejdsmiljøarbejde. Måske de er bange for at tage stilling. Men indirekte ser man det, men man udtaler det ikke.

R: Er der noget du vil tilføje?

L: Nej.

Annie

[We agree to do the interview in English]

R: Explain about your motivations, how you got to do what you do, and your background.

A: I actually am a student, I do not work with diversity in my career path, [name of Bs organization] was started on the side, because of my interest in LGBT equality, I have experience in the corporate world, workplace issues would be the best translation for myself. That's how it came about, even though I have not studied it. It grew organically out of - I know a lot about corporate life, and LGBT.

R: You worked in the corporate world?

A: Operations - supply chain management - working for profit businesses.

R: How did the interest to combine the two interests arise?

A: It's a long story, I don't know how relevant it is, I will keep it short.

R: It's part of my interest.

A: When I was still in the U.S., i was a youth mentor for LGBT kids in high school and I loved it, I really liked working with the community and feeling like I gave back. And then when I moved to Denmark, I thought I would do the same thing, and volunteer for LGBT Danmark. But our interests did not mesh well, I wanted to move a lot faster, they wanted to be more political.

R: How, political? How, faster? Which clash?

A: I wanted to; or, I want to; make change - I wanted a tangible way to give back, and a lot of the stuff we did in the international group was to write letters to ministers but not get meetings. I would like to do something more tangible. They are doing great work. But anyway. My partner at the time and I went to Europride in Poland, there was a business conference right before - well, I'm interested in business. When we attended, it hit me: "wow, you can do this? You can combine LGBT and business?" Two things I have interest in. Then I was poking around, and we did not have that in Denmark - this was in 2010 - then we decided to start [name of B's organization] immediately, we wrote the business plan on the flight home.

R: What was your approach - what could you contribute with in your organization?

A: The idea was that we would be consultants, talk to businesses, help them, talk about what it means to be LGBT, what inclusion is, things like that. The first act we did was to make a survey in 2011, which we did again in 2014.

R: Can you explain about the survey?

A: Yes, we wanted to see what the climate was, which issues were there - because if there were no issues, then there is no reason for us to invest in the organisation. So: were there issues, and what were they, so we can help people where they need it, and not just guess. That way we could do something useful. From that we made a few events to raise awareness about LGBT inclusion in the workplace. Because one thing we found was that it's just not that discussed. Not at that time, it has become a lot better. They still say, "well, you should not talk about sex at work", and we say: "we just want to talk about being included, when you sit down at the lunch table and everyone talks about their family."

R: So you wanted to find clients?

A: That was the original idea. We haven't really done that. What you come up against is that there is no problem: "we are a very tolerant country, this is not an issue, we don't need to look at it". So in that way we tried to come at it from another angle, to do events and publications. Right now, this year, we are working with FIU Ligestilling, equality for the three unions. They wanna have all these talks about LGBT inclusion. Us, Sabaah, LGBT Denmark are all doing talks for them. This is our outreach now. Bringing awareness where we can, and where people will listen.

R: Which other strategies do you have to create awareness?

A: Events was pretty much the only thing we tried. Small, for eksempel for idaho, or bigger: a conference in Stockholm, or a workshop in Copenhagen at SEA: we got together people who were thinking, or should be thinking, about these issues, diversity managers, etcetera, from the Nordic countries.

R: You try to reach out to the HR departments?

A: Yes. It's rare in the Nordic countries that you have a diversity head; normally it's just HR that you talk to. Or maybe someone on the CEO level who is interested in workplace inclusion.

R: That sounds random. Is there a pattern in who is interested, and who is not?

A: Yeah, international companies tend to be more interested, they also see that another branch in another country is doing this, has diversity groups, employee networks. You don't find employee networks in Danish companies so much.

R: Explain what a network is?

A: If you have LGBT people who want to be part of a network, they get together after work hours, talk about what they wanna do: for eksempel change the wording in the HR policy if they feel it is not inclusive, or how to partake in Pride, or arrange things to raise awareness and create inclusion at the workplace, or an event for their straight co-workers.

R: This is not popular in Denmark?

A: Not as much as in the U.S., where it is huge, in Denmark it varies how big they are, there are a few. We do have the Danish LGBT business network, with different talks of interest for LGBT people at work, we are different people coming together to talk, because even the big companies here tend to be small, even a big international company like Google only has like 15 people in Denmark. They don't need a LGBT network for the one gay employee. So it's important to have this network , where we can all come together and talk about issues - the only gay in the village. We meet once every quarter, always in copenhagen, unfortunately. Free to attend, for anyone, always sponsored by a company HQ - we've been at IBM, HP, Nykredit. Coffee, snacks, two hours of talk.

R: What keeps coming up at these meetings?

A: It is quite structured, with speakers, so the talk will be about what the speaker was talking about. The American ambassador, for eksempel, at the next meeting we will present our survey results. That group is always increasing and decreasing with interest. Because after a while in the LGBT business world, you get really frustrated. People keep telling you it's not a problem, and then you wanna stop, but then you are like "wait - maybe it's not a problem, maybe I'm just being a huge jerk for pushing this issue" [laughs].

R: Is that a thing you hear from a lot of people, that they are exhausted?

A: That is the feeling I get, because I see - DSB, for example, they had an employee network, it was big, they were in Pride, now the employee network does not exist anymore, I think. So it goes that quickly, because people get excited, but then after a while they don't really know what to do, no-one is really supporting this initiative, so you lose the fire.

R: Where should the support come from? How to sustain momentum?

A: I think you need the excitement from the employees, definitely, to make sure there are people who are willing to support the project; you need the support from management, somehow, either HR or CEO level, you need support, so you have some sort of alignment of goals. Because as soon as the network starts to feel like... "we've done this, but management did not recognize, has this helped" - there has to be an alignment of goals. Also a huge need to talk to other companies. I get a lot more fire again when I go to LGBT events. People are talking, new ideas, and then "oh yeah, this is why I got into it in the first place". I look forward to that again [laughs].

R: So which strategies seem to be working in the companies for creating change, implementing. Events, workshops, policy?

A: To be honest, nothing seems to be working that well here [in Denmark], it's a combination of a lot of issues. There are so many things to say. It's a cultural thing, this thing about jantelov. Someone once told me that in Denmark you are free to be exactly like your neighbor. So everyone is free to be equal, as long as you look like everybody else. Not that anybody is gonna discriminate against you; it's more like don't call a reason for someone to, you know. So if you have this difference, then don't raise your hand and be like "I wanna be the gay in the company", you know. So I think this creates some sort of hesitance for people to start these sorts of initiatives. Because then all of a sudden you are calling a lot of attention to something which could potentially lead to discrimination.

R: So nobody wants to be the gay one?

A: Yeah, when we ask people why they are not out at work, in the survey, the most frequent answer is that they keep their private life private, or "I don't wanna be known as the gay", you know. Which I don't think you necessarily need to be, or I don't know.. I guess I've always been so loud and outspoken about being the gay at work, that I don't have a problem.

R: I've heard Rikke Voergård talk about her thesis, she was saying that her respondents - some said they had to come out, while others were assumed to be the gay one.

A: Yeah, I cannot hide it either. As soon as you know I'm female it's like, come on [laughs].

R: Is that not the issue specifically with LGBT - it's invisible, unlike race or disability, and you can't ask about it either at a job interview?

A: But you kind of... Danes do.

R: They do?

A: I was very surprised at my first - well, only - job interview here in Denmark, 'Hi, my name is bla bla, I have two kids, my wife is', and I am like 'oh my, that is a lot of information about you.. and I'm single, and a lesbian', and you know [laugh].

R: So the job culture, you have to be open?

A: A lot of people don't realize that when they say they keep their life private, they might do that if they were straight, but they would not feel ashamed of coming out as straight. People come out as straight all the time. People talk about it all the time, but don't realize, because it's the majority. So there is still shame about being gay or LGBT, and that's why you don't talk about, or some people feel like they can't talk about it at work. A problem is the older, who have worked at the same place, they have to come out as lyer and gay. Worse to come out as a lyer.

R: I interrupted you; you started with the Danish culture, you are not the first one to mention janteloven as an issue.

A: It's not an issue, I like janteloven. I just think people misinterpret janteloven. They need to remember that differences can strengthen your organisation. And in order to combine those differences, you have to know what they are. Innovation comes from diversity. That's the bottom line. At Microsoft they told a story about how an Arabic worker spotted a problem right away, so just having that other perspective - it's an obvious story, which is why I tell it. But people don't remember to point out their differences here. A classic story - i've been to so many LGBT conferences, you hear so many stories - this guy from Lenovo always says: a guy says he doesn't wanna come out as gay, and he says, 'oh, well when we hired you, you were telling us how you were like everybody else' - you need to embrace those differences to create innovation and move the company forward.

R: Is that hard for Danish companies to realize?

A: Yes, but it's a scary prospect, because someone could end up discriminating against someone else, because they are aware of the diversity, so they have to figure out how to deal with that from an HR perspective.

R: That is holding people off?

A: I think they don't even think that far ahead. They think: 'everyone is so tolerant, we don't even need to talk about this issue.' And because of this, coupled with janteloven and that you shouldn't be talking about your differences anyway, this is a non-issue we don't have to talk about. In FIU ligestilling, as soon as I start talking, the first hand is always 'why do we have to talk about this, we are all so tolerant' - then when you go further, they go, 'oh, I remember this one time when my colleague took ten years to come out...' yeah [laughs].

R: So if you keep talking about it?

A: Then people start finding these small examples, 'oh, maybe this one time, but that's probably just an exception to the rule.' And it is - we do find that according to the survey, 55% of people are marginally open at work. A lot are still closeted, so we gotta find out where we are meeting them, or why this still feels like they can't come out.

R: Where does the responsibility of this lie, in your talks?

A: They wanna put it on the individual. The individual needs to come out. Which is partly true - you don't need to come out, if you don't want to, there just shouldn't be a barrier for it. What I try to explain in my talks, is when I was growing up, I had no gay role models. When you are feeling different your whole life, it is really hard to think 'oh, now everybody is accepting, and will be fine with it,' when you've been fighting it so long, sometimes you need a nudge from the straight or cis colleague, to say 'I am accepting of whomever i work with. I don't wanna assume you are gay, but i wanna let you know that I am open.' Some places have little badges up, and again this is very anti-Denmark, you need to have a little symbol: I'm open about race, gender, LGBT. To passer-bys, without having to maybe pull somebody out of the closet.

R: So if people were signing [A: we recommend that], it would feel like going against janteloven?

A: No, not on the business side, just for the colleague side. I am pushing too many barriers about minority groups. But from the business perspective you should always do that. For recruitment etcetera, because normally they will make a list of who should apply, we do not discriminate against [list]. Some have it on their email signature - 'I'm open', that way, in correspondance, people can feel comfortable.

R: Do these statements make a difference?

A: They do to me, personally, I have not read any research that supports it. This is purely story based. I think it's a tiny and simple thing to say 'hey I'm open and you can be out to me.'

R: What would the reaction be against that idea?

A: It depends on the person, but... after the Nordic LGBT inclusion workshop, we did this design thinking, it's a way to structure brainstorming to come up with good, tangible ideas you can use. This was one of them. Someone did go back and do these things, and someone went back and checked that

their HR policy was including sexual orientation and gender identity. So people are open to it when it is these small things that they can do to flag that they are open and inclusive. You will get more loyalty out of your employees - they are less likely to leave.

R: In this network, where these meetings happen, is that where the brainstorm happens?

A: No, that was an event we held at SEB 2 years ago. I wrote a report after, with the outcome. It has some small ideas.

R: Who participated?

A: People from many different companies [mentions two people we both know, we talk a bit about that], so, students etcetera, but also HR managers, so business-business people and students and NGOs, because we just wanted as many minds together and think about these problems. Again, diversity within diversity to come up with the best ideas [laughs].

R: What was the general feeling there - positive or negative?

A: At the event, immediately after, it's always like 'Yay, diversity!' And then we try to keep it going, and it dies.

R: Why is that?

A: There's not enough people... People are happy to participate when things keep being organized and they can come, but there has to be more of that locomotive. People that wanna drive the train. Sometimes it's just really tiring. I've been doing it for nearly 5 years, and I'm still hearing the same thing I was hearing 5 years ago - 'this is not a problem, stop talking about it.'

R: Is this specific for LGBT issues, or also for the rest of the stuff under the diversity umbrella - do these categories even come up in your work?

A: Mmm no. We don't really talk about the other categories. Gender can come in, because gender identity is under our umbrella, and then gender is not a far cry - well, binary gender, the majority of cis people think that. But if you ask any Danish person - 'of course we have full equality, we just celebrated 100 years of the woman's vote, come on' - but at the same time we also talk about quotas for women in management, so clearly there's a disconnect between the everyday experiences of people - 'I don't have an issue with this' to how it is actually playing out in the workplace. Like there's some sort of glass ceiling, whether it's for women or LGBT people.

R: So people think their personal opinions automatically changes into a policy, or?

A: Yeah, if you ask an individual everyone's gonna say they are tolerant, nobody will say: 'of course I'm racist!' A friend said that his coworker had said: 'no, I'm not homophobic, I would not beat up a guy if i found out he was gay' - and I'm like, that is not the definition of homophobia - so, a lot of people have a skewed idea... 'because I would not beat you up, I am tolerant' - you might wanna try to take the next step: be open, make friends etc.

R: So, at a workshop etcetera, which words are positive and which are negative? How do you navigate?

A: I normally will always try and stay with the positive words. Because that's what people will respond to. Even when I'm trying to take it from a positive perspective, talk about diversity and inclusion, I'm still met with this: 'I can't believe you don't think I'm inclusive,' kind of. People get offended. This is also why people say: 'we don't have a problem. You are offending me that you would say that I have a problem with this.' Um, so, I definitely would never... I don't try to bring up negative words, and when I do, I always say, 'I don't think that Danes discriminate,' I really try to say... 'Denmark is an amazing place to live, I love it here, there is no problem. If you jumped over to Russia, you would have problems. There's no problems in Denmark, I'm not saying there's a problem; it's just that we have to move from tolerance to inclusion, and that's a different kind of step, than it is moving from going to prison, to not going to prison.'

R: Does it help, talking about stages, or levels?

A: It seems to open them up a little bit. That initial reaction of we are not discriminatory, we are free, and an open land, if you can squash that argument by saying: 'I realize that. We are on the same page, I totally agree with you, Denmark is an amazing place to live, and even much better than the US in terms of freedoms and not being discriminated against.' Um. But, yeah, so, we just try to change the conversations around it. To say, we have to move from tolerance to inclusion, and that means we have to change the way we talk about... I talk a lot about heteronormativity in my speeches.

R: Is that something people respond to, that word?

A: People do not know that heteronormativity exists. That's why it persists, you know. So a lot of the times when I hit them with this slide, 'this is what heteronormativity means,' people are like 'wow what is that, this crazy word.' I also try to explain that heteronormativity is not homophobia, and not sexism, and it's not outright discriminatory, it's more like an ignorance to how you're presenting yourself or asking a question can make other people feel marginalized. But you're not doing it on purpose. I'm not gonna feel offended if you asked me if I had a husband, which would be crazy to me, because they live in this heteronormative world, yeah, people with even CPR numbers marries people with uneven CPR numbers [laughs].

R: Can people see this?

A: At a talk recently, a woman said, 'you gotta slow down, but this is a lot of new information, I understand what you mean, but I never realized that i did that.' You know? She's like: 'but if I say, I assume your gender, use a pronoun, I'm not trying to be offensive,' and I'm like: 'no I know that, but I'm saying you have to change the conversation, the way you approach people, and the questions you ask, so you don't assume they have the same background as you.' Heteronormativity isn't even about LGBT, it's also about feminism. To say that women are not alway secretaries, and men are the bosses, that type of thing.

R: So you can talk about feminism?

A: Oh yeah, I always bring it in as well. Because people can relate much more to feminism, they've talked about it for a long time, learned about it in school, right, you don't have LGBT history in school, not when I was a kid. But you had woman's suffrage, the right to vote, own land - it's a more relatable subject. Someone will say: 'yeah, I'm the union representative, I'm female, i represent some masculine cis men' - yeah, so you are breaking out of the heteronormative gender world, so you can understand what this gender role thing is.

R: So you can can appeal by saying that they are already breaking with the norm, that they already know it?

A: Yeah, making it more relatable, how they are experiencing the world. And even though I don't agree with all this gender role stereotype things, but they still persist, an idea that men are more aggressive and powerful.

R: So you have to talk into that? Start there?

A: Yeah, verbalize and address it, even though we shouldn't be talking about that any more in 2015 - there are differences between cismen and cis women, whatever, even though there really aren't. There are expectations placed by a society, that's what the difference is.

R: Can you talk about the expectations?

A: Yeah, I do talk a lot about that. Me, I identify as lesbian, but I identify as genderqueer - lesbian throws back on your gender.

R: Gender and sexuality are interlinked....

A: ... Yeah, but they're not, and I try to bring it up in talks, and that is a tough one. We mapped together LGBT, but T has nothing to do with LGB [laughs]. People don't understand that either, but, yeah.

R: Is there a limit to what they can understand - where is the limit? When does it become too accusatory, abstract, theoretical - is there a wall where it ends?

A: Yeah... um, I think gender is where people start to get really touchy. Because people are normally really protective of their gender. For some reason, I don't know why. This is something they've been told their whole life, how to classify someone - when you walk to someone, the first thing that goes through their minds is what gender do they have, what skin color, very basic things, where they dump you in a box right away. Talking about cis, versus trans, versus not being on either side of the binary, is when it starts to break down with communication with the hetero-cis society, normally, they don't get it, so I normally stay with sexuality when I talk. That's where they are still ready to listen, that's where we can make progress, gender identity has to be a step beyond - a next, yeah.

R: So where do you think, what do you try to appeal to when you are talking to anyone in the workplace - do you try to appeal to them individually - you need to change. Or do they need to make a policy, mission statement, or organizational structure change [we joke about all gays in the board] where can change happen?

A: As with anything, is has to happen in the middle. You need the HR policy there, but you need people to voice their support of it, and be personal representatives of it. If you have a policy hidden away that nobody knows about, that was one of the big takeaways from the first survey, a lot of people did not know if sexual discrimination was part of the wording in their HR policy. And that to me, is, you know bad upstart training. You're not aware of your HR or maternity policy. That also affects LGBT people a lot. It's not a good answer, but you have to do both: the company has to believe in it, but you also need people who are vocally supportive - 'yay, remember we have gay people here.'

R: Could that be anybody?

A: Oh yeah, it could be anybody - if you have a strong hetero-cis colleague high up, that is gonna be a stronger statement than if you have an out LGBT person.

R: Why?

A: Because they can also talk to the other hetero-cis people on their level - otherwise it will be: 'you're just saying that because you're gay.' But if you talk to another person who looks like you, and sounds like you, then they start listening to you as well, because you - 'oh, you're not gay, you have no agenda.'

R: So, as gay, you are assumed to have a personal agenda, that's a risk?

A: It's a risk, not necessarily assumed, but a risk.

R: For example, if you go to these network meetings, how many people are there, and is it only LGBT people or anyone interested in inclusion?

A: Yeah. At the Danish LGBT business meetings, it's mostly LGBT people, there are some hetero-cis people coming, especially when they are gonna give a talk [smiles].

R: And tell you how great they are.

A: How great their inclusion is, yeah, their inclusion is the best in Denmark [laughs]. Um. But when we hold events in Copenhagen and Stockholm, we make it a point to market it to hetero-cis people, to try to get them to attend, because allies - 50% allies, because they can be the people who can fight for you, when you can't fight your own battle, really important.

R: You say Stockholm, do you think there's a difference between Denmark and Sweden?

A: Um, I mean, I feel like you are met with a lot of the same things in Sweden: 'this is a really inclusive place, no need to talk.' But at the same time, Sweden is also more willing to take up some of these issues - the third gender thing, hen, the gender neutral bathrooms in the swimming hall, they seem a little more ahead, and more out and proud about their LGBT support than Denmark.

R: Why?

A: No idea

R: Do you think legislation has something to do with it - there does not seem to be much policy in Denmark on workplace inclusivity - do you know anything about this, and what do you think? How are they reflected in the workplace policies?

A: There are actually some laws in Denmark, I'm sure you are aware, [R: no]it's also one of my slides, I have all these laws, but there is a clause that you are not allowed to discriminate in the workplace, there shouldn't be "forskelsbehandling" - you can't treat people differently based on lalalala - they list of a lot of things, and one of them is sexual orientation. They do not explicitly mention gender identity. Because we always talk about LGBT, and people just lump it into the LGBT umbrella, T has nothing to do with LGB, regardless of your gender identity you are also gonna have a sexuality - might even be a hetero identity.

R: Do you think there's enough legislation, do companies know about it?

A: The difference between the US and Denmark is that there's a sort of laziness in Denmark, because there is this - 'it already says it in the law; we don't need to have a specific discrimination policy at our workplace, we're gonna use the one from the government.' And so then, in that way, people are not necessarily aware of these discrimination policies. Because it's not standing - if someone read their HR bylaws, if an employee read them, there would not necessarily be non-discrimination policy, because it's standing in the law, so then people. I think there's some sort of bad circle happening. The employee cannot see, and the company is assuming that the employee knows that of course you can't discriminate, because that would be illegal.

R: Because it says it in the law.

A: Exactly. But the employee can't necessarily see that, so they're missing that voice, which is where I think we need to meet people halfway to come out, and the hetero-cis colleague needs to come out and say 'we support you.'

R: So the explicit voice of the company.

A: Right, it's missing. As well as a lot of people are missing, especially in their paternal, maternal and bereavement leave, they forget to include "your partner". Before they might say "mand" or "kone", instead of just saying partner, now we have gay marriage, so now it's ok to use that terminology a bit, but before it was just registered partnership. So it needs to be "your registered partner" or "married partner".

R: So people need to make those changes, but they don't necessarily?

A: Right. They say 'oh but people know that! Were so open here! Of course they're gonna get that leave.' I'm like: 'yeah, but you're not telling them that. It's not standing explicitly; they are feeling excluded. They are not seeing themselves represented in this policy. So, even if you think you're the most open person in the world, if you haven't said it, nobody is gonna know it.' How can they just guess?

R: So it's a vicious circle with vague legislation, and the companies are not required to show they have a good policy. They don't have to have that?

A: Not that I'm aware of, no.

R: Because it seems like they have to do that in Sweden.

A: Oh that's good. Then every company has to think about it as well? Write it down?

R: Yeah, every company has to have a policy on how to prevent discrimination based on gender, ethnicity, religion - you can't discriminate on other categories, but you don't have to prevent that from happening.

A: Ah, ok.

R: To your knowledge, there is no requirement to prevent something from happening?

A: Eh, no, I don't think so. I know that the discrimination law in Denmark, both parties are responsible to prove discrimination.

R: which is what LGBT Denmark is also upset about, proving discrimination.

A: Right, exactly, that can be hard to prove. And it can be hard to take a case up and start gathering that evidence, for an employer that you would still wanna work for. Maybe. Cause that can make things really uncomfortable.

R: Is that something that comes up, how to deal with discrimination?

A: We mostly direct people to their union representatives, because they are also the ones who will take the case, we certainly want them to come to us and say they felt this, and we tell them to go to LGBT Denmark, or the union, someone who can take political or legal action. We are working with companies as consultants, so we are more business oriented. But we still wanna help employees as much as we can.

R: So when you work with business which arguments do you use to actually convince them?

A: The strongest argument is definitely how many people are not out. People like to see concrete numbers and hard statistics, that speaks something to them. You might think there's no issue, but 1 out of 5 of your employees are not out.

R: Yeah, but what if they don't think that's a problem - like, 'we don't care?'

A: Yeah, they can also do that, it's just the best argument we have, is that there is still an issue, basically.

R: Your argument is that if they are out, they will be happier, you will have a better work environment?

A: Right, that's the natural progression of the argument. Happier employees, who are more loyal, more productive, adds to your bottom line, and when you start to have a visibly inclusive workplace, they are going to attract more diversity which means further innovation which means your business will prosper. It means something positive for your bottom line, basically. And retention is a huge thing for companies, to replace an employee costs 1 and a half time their salary, so it costs money if they are constantly flipping people. You don't wanna do that. We found in the previous survey that people who are closeted lose productivity, so that translates to how much money are they making, were losing 8 hours a week on this person, how much are we basically paying for nothing, because they are not being productive, because someone just asked how their weekend was, and they didn't know how to respond, and they sat an hour by their desk feeling bad because they're closeted - you know [laughs].

R: So you use the productivity argument, these people are not productive?

A: Hm, yeah, but you gotta be careful with that because I don't wanna say that closeted people are less productive, they might be.

R: You don't wanna put the responsibility on the individual.

A: Exactly.

R: But they wanna do that.

A: Possibly, exactly. You can be fully productive, were talking generalities, statistics, generally the happier people are, the better it's gonna be for your workplace. It can also affect people around you: 'everytime I go say hi to Bob he's acting weird, doesn't he like me,' but maybe it's just because he's closeted. That weird tension at work can be affecting that project group, or whatever.

R: Is this something companies wanna spend time and money on, improving the work environment, because it's gonna make people feel better and help the bottomline?

A: Well, unfortunately we started [name of A's organization] in 2010, right after the financial crisis. and people are not focused on HR at the moment, it's just starting to come back, instead of just staying afloat, people are now trying to see how to improve things, instead of just not going bankrupt. HR has always been a fluffy point on the budget - you can make a solid bottom line argument, but people wont see it translate directly, as in sales - ok, sales means this much to the company. An employees productivity is getting squishy, it's true and does add to the bottom line, but maybe you won't see this big effect, but at the end of the year, you will see you got more work done.

R: Is this specific to Denmark, not prioritizing on HR now?

A: I think it's general after the financial crisis, people are more focused on sales. I think HR should be the most important thing to focus on in Denmark. Because Denmark can't compete on the global economy with china or india in terms of labor wages - what are you gonna sell? innovation, your good

ideas, and then someone else is gonna make it for you. So, in order to come up with those good ideas, you need a good employer base, and diversity.

A: Does the argument work with people?

A: [laughs] I it think it's a great argument!

R: It is! I just wonder if it works.

A: People agree. But then... There's always a but: 'it's so true, what you're saying is exactly right. Buuut, right now we're just trying to focus on staying alive,' whatever. 'But when we feel more comfortable, we'll come back and revisit that.' Or, if they are gonna start focusing in HR now, then they are *only* talking about gender. 'We'll get to LGBT - give us ten years'. There's a priority list, when it comes to diversity. LGBT is at the bottom, down with disability.

R: So it's gender, and then..?

A: Ethnicity. Yeah. And then age, probably, and then you talk LGBT and disability, that's how I experience it.

R: Do you think that's a Danish..?

A: I think that's general. Because I also heard a story from IBM, many of them tell it, they went to an employment fair in china or something and they had their little LGBT things sitting up, and all these women kept coming up: 'can I get a job?' And they thought - 'is everybody a lesbian??' No, but if you accept LGBT people, you're gonna accept women. So as soon as you've gotten down to LGBT, you're accepting everybody else [laughs] because that is like the lowest form of diversity.

R: So IBM has figured out, if they do LGBT they don't even have to do the work for the top ones?

A: No I don't know if that was the strategy. That was one of the stories they tell.

R: I was at this LGBT conference at Nykredit with MIX Copenhagen, one of the reasons for this thesis - two things stuck out: 30% more productive - which sounded cold to me. And then the minister for equality said that he did not want more legislation - do you think that would help if there was more legislation? You have to show us... I know there are these charters.

A: Yeah, the Copenhagen diversity charter. I think it would help. Not to say you should do it in this way, but like you said - they have to make their own policy, because every company know what's best for their environment. It has to be individualized, personalized. You can't just say - you have to have 30% LGBT people on the board, it's not gonna work. So to make people think about the issues, we forgot this wording, to make them review it, is really important - you have to think about it and write it down, that is a good start.

R: How does it work - you come as an outsider, how does it work vs being someone working in the company? How does it feel to go into places where you don't work?

A: It's not the best approach to go in and say "you're doing it wrong". In order to make companies listen, I always go for the excited employee. Doesn't matter where in the company, but someone who will support an LGBT initiative. And start working and talking with them - 'what is it like, what do you need, what would the company be willing to do, how do we work together' - you have to have a connection inside the company that's willing to do something. From my experience, if you just go in and try to convince them, they're not gonna listen to you: "Out of our 100 employees nobody is gay, everybody is open [laughs]".

R: I've heard that. So, when you come from the outside, what can you contribute with that an insider would not be able to do?

A: Just because we have a lot of experience talking and going to many different places, knowing what language usually works, you know, what people are doing other places, giving ideas and suggestions, because the more of that you have, the better. Of course people can do it, themselves, from the inside, a lot of it is just feeling like you have a support system - like the LGBT business network - you need someone driving the locomotive with you, you don't wanna feel so alone. Cause it can be really hard.

R: The diversity champion on the inside, needs to not feel alone?

A: Yeah, a buddy, so if you feel stuck, you can ask for some advice, like: I've heard this argument before, what do I do? Or going to the diversity conferences, all those stories, 'make that argument, make *that* argument,' see what works.

R: So you feel like your task is to be a supporter?

A: Yeah, like an interactive knowledge base. Not just Googling, it gets tedious and if you don't know what to search for... If you can just ask: 'this is my problem, be my interactive Google, and tell me what you've come up with before.'

R: So, to finish, that sounds motivational, but what else keeps you going and interested?

A: Yeah... [laughs]. It is hard to keep motivated. I think, um, I don't know. For me, in general, I wanna do something to help people, and when I hear a story - whether it's a personal friend or acquaintances, who have these horror stories, even though that's a negative way to be motivated, for me it's a big motivation: there's work to be done, and I wanna make sure I can help you, wanna help create the work environment that's gonna be inclusive of you, and people arent gonna be homophobic or transphobic or whatever.

R: Does this relate to you being one of the people you wanna create help - I've talked to people who work with ethnic inclusion, but they are white, so not personally affected, they just think it's important. How do you think that's different?

A: Yeah. Yeah, there is definitely a personal agenda, and every time somebody tells me some sort of negative story, I feel personally offended as well. So yeah, I guess there is some sort of... Yeah, it's like my family [laughs].

R: Cool.

[off the record we talk about how being a volunteer is also motivational, no way to charge for this kind of work in Denmark these days, getting paid a bit by FUI ligestilling.]