

JEFF HEARN

Men, (Pro-)Feminism, Organizing and Organizations¹

ABSTRACT

To avoid the question(s) of feminism when considering 'gender, organization and society' would be like talking about capitalism without mentioning exploitation or the wage relationship. The general relationship of feminism, gender, and business economics is, however, not the primary issue addressed in this article. The primary concern here is more specifically the relation of men and feminism, and hence pro-feminism, and their implications for organizing, organizations and management. This necessitates attention to such questions as: How do men relate to feminist demands in the public world? How are men to support feminist demands in the public world? How is this to be done? These and other questions become significant if one rethinks 'business economics' in terms of the gendered political economy of organizations. Different kinds of public political and practical arenas in which men may act in relation to feminism are considered. This article provides an introduction to these questions and a framework for discussion and debate. Three ways in which men organize within public worlds are considered: men's mainstream organizing in mainstream, especially business, organizations; men's explicit responses to feminism, often outside of business; and men's responses to feminism in mainstream, especially business, organizations. Finally, some further questions for the analysis and practice of men's organizing in the future are noted.

1 An earlier version of some parts of this article was presented in the 'Gendering Men' stream at the 7th International Interdisciplinary Congress on Women, GenDerations, University of Tromsø, June 20–26, 1999. I am also grateful to Anne Kovalainen and the journal reviewers for their comments and suggestions.

JEFF HEARN, Research Professor, University of Manchester, UK; and Academy of Finland Senior Fellow and Visiting Professor at the Swedish School of Economics and Business Administration, Department of Management and Organization, Helsinki, Finland

• E-mail: jeff.hearn@shh.fi

What has feminism, or for that matter pro-feminism, to do with business economics? The answer to this question depends partly on how one understands business economics, and how broadly or narrowly one draws its boundaries. Nowadays any credible answer must be placed in the context of the growing realisations that what is conventionally called 'the economic' is strongly structured by and through social and cultural relations, including gender relations. There is no doubt that gendered interpretations are increasingly present in analyses of 'international economic trends' (Fernández Kelly, 1994), 'third world politics' (Waylen, 1996), 'international relations' (Grant and Newland, 1991), as well as the very notions of economics (Waring, 1988), finance (Lehman, 1996), and labour itself (O'Brien, 1981, 1986; Mies, 1986, 1998; Hearn, 1987). Two recent, excellent and very different feminist texts which discuss such issues are Peterson and Runyan's (1999) more modernist and more structuralist, *Global Gender Issues*, and Gibson-Graham's (1996) more postmodernist and more poststructuralist, *The End of Capitalism (as we knew it)*.

More specifically, the answer to the question of what is meant by business economics depends centrally on the growing contribution of *feminist economics* (not least through the academic journal of that name), and the attempt to connect economic analyses to politics and society – something sought in some classic versions of 'political economy'. Indeed if one ever thought that business economics was just a matter of economics (as generally defined in dominant constructions of the discipline of Economics), then one need look no further than the development of the World Trade Organization. Another broader political-social-cultural-economic story is told here in the embedded intertwinings of multinational companies and national governments, the form of financial pressures and alliances, and the large scale 'civil disobedience' on November 30th 1999 around the WTO meeting in Seattle attempting to disrupt these political-social-cultural-economic processes.

The primary reason that there is a special issue of a journal of business economics on 'Gender, Organization and Society' at all is not just some general interest in gender but rather the impacts of feminism. What I mean by this is not that a general interest is not important but rather that the growth of a general interest in gender questions and gender relations follows from the historical impact of various forms of feminism and feminist struggles. I say this though I am aware the F-word, 'feminism', often seems to evoke all kinds of strange reactions within and well beyond the worlds of business and business economics, economics and the academy. Indeed what is particularly interesting and infuriating for me, as non-Finn living and working in Finland – a country where many measures show relatively less gender inequality than many other places (UNDP, 1999, 2000) – is how the F-word seems to be if anything even more disreputable in Finland than in, say, the UK. Sometimes you would think that the person using it had made a rude noise; more often the word remains unsaid.

The reasons for this discrepancy in a society with at least a *relatively* high level of gender equality are complex. The women's movement did not develop on any large scale in an autonomous way from the state. There has been a complicated and uneven process of placing feminist demands within a state-led ideology and agenda of 'gender equality'. Indeed in Finland and other Nordic countries there often appears to be a slippage from an ideology of relative 'gender equality' to an ideology of gender-neutrality and gender-neutral citizens (see Hammer and Hearn, 1999). Also within this context, in Finland questions of sexuality and violence have been rather neglected within the development of gender equality policy and politics until quite recently. The main focus of gender politics, debate and intervention has been on the analysis and policy development of the gender equality agenda at the intersections of state, welfare, education, family, community, civil society, and to some extent broad employment policy. It has been rather less focused on the world of business and business organizations. Indeed the gender structuring of the private sector has remained quite distinct to that of the public sector. For example, in 1995 the ratio of women to men was 39:61 in the private sector, in contrast to a ration of 67:33 in the public sector (Statistics Finland). There have been relatively few feminist (or indeed pro-feminist) analyses of business and 'the economy' (see Kovalainen, 1994, 1995, 1999) relative to, say, feminist analyses of cultural practices or cultural artifacts.

To avoid the question(s) of feminism when considering gender, organization and society would be like talking about capitalism without mentioning exploitation or the wage relationship. The question of this general relationship of feminism, gender, and economics is, however, not the primary issue addressed in this article. My primary concern here is more specifically a set of questions around the relation of men and feminism, and their implications for organizations. I frame this in terms of men's relation to feminism for I remain convinced that, while men can be pro-feminist, we cannot be feminists. How are men to or how do men relate to feminism? How are we to understand men's relations to feminism? Is it possible for men to fully answer the questions asked by feminisms? Or is there a sense that all such answers by men are always provisional and incomplete (Hearn, 1992b)? And how are men to respond to feminism, and how do men respond to feminism? And more specifically, in this context, what are the implications of feminism for men in terms of organizing, organizations and management? How do men relate to feminist demands in the public world? How are men to support feminist demands in the public world? How is this to be done? All these questions become significant if one rethinks 'business economics' in terms of the gendered political economy of organizations (cf. Benson, 1977).

To put this more concretely, the global political economy is such that many women continue to face a lack of formal recognition and rights, and exclusion from positions of formal

power in the public worlds of organizations, including politics, law, business and other workplaces. Some men are working on these issues in supporting demands for women's basic rights and the extension of women's power throughout institutions. This involves questions of property ownership, legal action, sexual citizenship, discrimination at work, serving in the military, sexual harassment, and so on. It involves confronting men's continued domination of most organizations, especially internationally and globally. These demands and responses can be thus considered in their local, national and international contexts, as global change presents new possibilities for both increases in men's power and challenges to that power. Such action may highlight the relationship between men acting to support feminist-led demands and men acting in men's own reconstruction and change.

A further word of introduction is necessary on the use of the category 'men'. There has been extensive critical scholarship on men and masculinities in recent years (for example, Carrigan et al., 1985; Connell, 1987, 1995; Hearn, 1987, 1992a). With the growing interest in gendered power, subjectivity and agency, critical studies on men have highlighted not only men's power but also material and symbolic differences through which that power is reproduced. Thus '(w)hile both men and masculinities are dominantly categories power and social value, they are by no means homogeneous, unified or fixed categories, but diverse, differentiated and shifting ...' (Collinson and Hearn, 2000, p. 267). Of particular importance in these debates has been analysis of interrelations of unities and differences between men and between masculinities (Hearn and Collinson, 1993), and their implications for organizing, organizations and management (for example, Collinson and Hearn, 1994, 1996, 2000). Throughout this article I use the category of 'men' as a social category and not to suggest a universal notion of men. I specifically recognize and make explicit that 'men' is a social category that is frequently and characteristically taken-for-granted. For example, so when we consider how men organize within the mainstream, we are in fact usually talking predominantly about adult, able-bodied, 'working age' men in particular social arenas, not all men. Or when men's pro-feminist organizing against the mainstream is focused on, men are usually addressed in a different way. The category 'men' typically stands for particular groups men distinguished by class and other divisions and differences: 'men' is a strictly socially constructed category.

In this article I focus on men's relations to feminism and feminist demands in the public world. I therefore consider the different kinds of public political and practical arenas in which men may act in relation to feminism; and discuss the continuing importance of men's actions both within mainstream organizations, including business organizations, and in organizing for change more generally. This article provides an introduction to these questions and a framework for discussion and debate. Three ways in which men organize within public worlds are

considered: men's mainstream organizing in mainstream, especially business, organizations; men's explicit responses to feminism, often outside of business; and men's responses to feminism in mainstream, especially business, organizations. Finally, some further questions for the analysis and practice of men's organizing in the future are noted.

MEN IN THE MAINSTREAM ORGANIZATIONS IN THE PUBLIC WORLD(S)

First I focus on how men organize in the mainstream organizations of the public worlds. So what are the main ways in which men, that is, particularly adult, able-bodied, 'working age', employed or employing men, organize within the mainstream (or malestream)? Such men organize routinely through organizing and organizations, managing and management, as, for example, in most business organizations. Often, indeed very often and usually, such men's organizing is not defined as gendered; it is defined simply as business or politics or management or trade unionism, not men's organizing. This is a crucial way in which mainstream organizing and managing is dominantly seen as non-gendered. This non-gendering is itself a form of gendering.

Many conceptualisations easily reproduce the taken-for-grantedness and *apparent non-gendering* of the public world; this is one of the characteristic features of malestream theory, politics and practice (see O'Brien, 1981, 1986; Hearn, 1987, 1992a, 1994b). In contrast, the notion of the 'public world(s)' is itself better understood as *intensely gendered* and differentially culturally constructed (Moore, 1987). The notion of the public world should thus never be considered as fixed or unproblematic. In focussing on the public worlds, it is necessary to continually foreground the ideological and material issues and indeed difficulties around the gendering of public worlds and indeed the the public/private division. In particular, there is the persistent and gendered dominance and valuing of the public worlds over the private worlds of the home, families, households and immediate personal relations. This is often in effect a double historical dominance – of the public over the private, and of (certain) men within the public. The public worlds have thus historically been one of the arenas or sets of arenas of (certain) men's power. Furthermore, business economics, at least as dominantly and conventionally, defined depends on the underpaid or unpaid labour, predominantly of women, in private, domestic and family spheres. This kind of labour and value is usually left out of accounting, both national and business. These complications are also both reproduced and contradicted in experience. Joan Kelly (1979), for example, has argued that the public/private division is false in the sense that women's experience, personal and social, is shaped by the simultaneous operation of the relations of work and sex.

Mainstream organizations are the main political economic arenas by which some men maintain particular power in the public worlds, and the main means of accumulation of many men's resources in the public worlds. This applies in all the major parts of the public worlds,² but it applies especially to men's accumulation of resources in business. Different groups of men, such as owners, managers, supervisors, workers, professionals and entrepreneurs are set in different gendered as well as occupational and class relations to women and each other. Mainstream business organizations are typically intensely gendered, by management, formal and informal hierarchies, divisions of labour, sexual structuring and the structuring of sexuality, relation to the 'private' and 'domestic' worlds, and constructions of relations of centre and margins (by membership, employment, physical space, and symbolic meanings). More generally, organizations may also be structured in other ways, such as the gendered use and control of violence and abuse, and especially so if business is placed in its global context with the production of violently exploitative and gendered labour processes in poorer regions of the world, where labour counts for less. As has been discussed by Mies (1998) and Peterson and Runyan (1999), Third World women have become the new proletariat of global manufacturing and some service business.

Such dominant and diverse genderings of business organizations have been subject s to extensive research and analysis. Feminist and critical, feminist-influenced studies have spelt out the explicit and implicit genderings of business organizations and management (for example, Hearn and Parkin, 1983, 1995; Ferguson, 1984; Powell, 1988; Acker, 1990; Mills and Tancred, 1992). Men continue to dominate business management. This is especially so at the very top and more highly paid levels of the business sector. Davidson and Burke (2000, p. 2) report that '... in the European Union countries fewer than 5 per cent of women are in senior management roles and this percentage has barely changed since the early 1990s.' According to the official Labour Force Statistics, the relative percentage of women and men in senior staff and upper management in Finland was also constant from 1990 (21:79) to 1995 (22:78) (Veikkola et al., 1997, p. 83). The 1998 UK Institute of Management survey found that 3.6 percent

2 Habermas (1984, 1987) analysed 'the system and the life world' by distinguishing the private (capitalist) sector, the public administration, private intimacy and the family, and public opinion formation. Fraser (1989) describes the following 'societal zones': the official economy, the state, the family, and public political discourse. In both cases, mainstream organizations are the main means of men's power and resource accumulation in each of the public arenas. These kinds of differentiations are themselves intensely gendered. They have close parallels with Walby's (1986, 1990) analysis of patriarchy in terms of the following sites, arenas and social structures: capitalist work, the state, the family, and culture, along with two further arenas and structures: violence and sexuality. Rather similarly I have specified the following patriarchal social relations and social processes within patriarchy: the reproduction of labour power (within patriarchal capitalism), regeneration/degeneration (through patriarchal professions), procreation (with patriarchal fatherhood), (patriarchal) ideology, violence (within and through the patriarchal state), and sexuality (through hierarchic heterosexuality) (Hearn, 1987). This last approach is further complicated with the overlap and interrelation between these different patriarchal social relations (Hearn, 1992a).

of directors were women (Institute of Management / Remuneration Economics, 1998; also see Collinson and Hearn, 1996a). This compares with figure of 17 percent of directors who were women on the 114 Finnish stock exchange-listed companies in 1995 (Veikkola et al., 1997, p. 83–84). Two of these companies had women CEO's. There is evidence of some increases in women's representation in middle management and in small business ownership, and thus in management in total (see Davidson and Burke, 2000; Vinnicombe, 2000). However, at director and the highest executive levels the numbers may actually be reducing, static or increasing very slowly indeed (Calás and Smircich, 1993; Institute of Management, 1995; Veikkola et al., 1997; Institute of Management / Remuneration Economics, 1998).

Men managers are more likely than women managers to be better paid, to be in more secure employment, to be on higher grades, to be less stressed, to be older at each responsibility level, and to have not experienced prejudice and sexual discrimination (Davidson and Cooper, 1984; Davidson, 1989; Institute of Management, 1995; Institute of Management / Remuneration Economics, 1998). For these and other reasons, management and effective management, especially what is often understood as effective business management, have often been assumed to be consistent with characteristics traditionally valued in men (see Schein, 1973; Alimo-Metcalfe, 1993; Hearn 1994a). Many organizations and managements have grown as institutions characterized by definite gendered patterns of hierarchy, occupational segregation, dominant (hetero)sexuality and differential family responsibilities, themselves defined by and reproducing other social relations of age, class, disability, and ethnicity.

Another well-established mode of gendering is gender segregation in organizations and management. This persists strongly in Finland (Veikkola and Palmu, 1995), as elsewhere. While this has generally been understood in relation to occupational and organizational divisions, gender segregation reproduces and is reproduced through patterns of homosociality. This provides a different way of viewing gender segregation. Indeed it is interesting how these two topics are not usually considered as part of the same set of gendered processes. Much of men's activity at work is strongly homosocial, in terms of men's homosocial preference for men. Indeed why do so many (apparently heterosexual) men seem to prefer men, and their cosy company? Why do many heterosexual men show themselves as such by preferring men's company? Is it simply a complicit acceptance of dominant systems of social power and status, that then accrue reciprocally to the all the men involved by dint of association, or is it a much more socio-emotional or even socio-sexual process (Roper, 1996)?

Mainstream and many business organizations have rather rarely been the place where men have responded explicitly and positively to feminist demands. They institutionalize a 'mobilization of gendered bias' (cf. Schattschneider, 1960), so that various forms of complicit masculinity (Carrigan et al., 1985) can reproduce men's taken-for-granted power and authority.

This hegemony is itself maintained by a variety of forms of dominant men's practices, as, for example, in men's routine hierarchical organizing practices, and in masculinist managerialism (Collinson and Hearn, 1994, 1996). Cockburn (1990, 1991) has specifically analysed the variety of ways through which men may resist equal opportunity policies, and women's advancement within organizations. These include principally: asserting 'the main aim'; the pursuit of autonomous labour market policy; the evasiveness of power; leaving domestic ties to women; defining certain forms of difference as illegitimate; organization sexuality; and the shaping of construction of women's consciousness. Mainstream (malestream) business organizations can thus be understood as places of men's organizing; they are often in effect 'men's organizations' that are themselves full of unnoticed and unnamed 'men's groups'. Men routinely organize in these groups and organizations, without usually naming them as such. And it is here that feminist demands may often be directed, and where men often respond (predominantly in a negative way) without explicitly calling or thinking of those responses as 'men's responses', let alone 'men's relations to feminist demands'. Men in the business mainstream/malestream are thus easily left ungendered.

MEN'S PUBLIC RELATIONS TO FEMINISM

These mainstream forms of men's organizing appear somewhat distinct from men's more explicit relations to feminism. So what have these more explicit relations and responses looked like? While men in mainstream organizations have usually sat tight, appearing to hope that feminism would go away, meanwhile, some men have also organized, mainly outside business and other mainstream organizations, in more explicit and different relations to feminism. The notions of 'men' and what it is to be a 'man' have rather different cultural meanings to those discussed in the previous section. These men have often sought to organize in rather different and distinctive ways to those in mainstream organizations. This has often involved reconstructing organizing in a more consciously gendered way and on a less formal and sometimes less hierarchical basis, through the small group, network and large group meeting. They often entail political identification 'as men', though this is itself a process that can have its own dangers in re-providing a gendered power base for men (Stoltenberg, 1990). Sometimes these responses have been performed from an anti-sexist and pro-feminist stance; often not; sometimes from an ambiguous politics; and sometimes from an anti-feminist position. There are now an increasing array of political positions adopted by men's organizing, often defined within the coordinates of the recognition of institutionalized privileges, the recognition of differences/inequalities among men, and the recognition of the 'costs of masculinity' (see Messner, 1997).

The diversity of relations and responses by men is seen when we consider the various meanings of the term, 'the men's movement' (see Hearn, 1993). The term is itself obviously constructed as a parallel to the term 'the women's movement'. In the 1970s (when I first became involved in 'men's politics', as it was sometimes referred to then) and early 1980s, the term 'men's movement' was used to refer to the 'anti-sexist men's movement', and in the UK and elsewhere there were considerable attempts to define the movement as 'pro-feminist' and 'gay-affirmative' and so on (see Morrison, 1980). Much of these relatively early responses were focussed on activity away from the mainstream definition of the public sphere. They were usually in the expanded 'private sphere', in the sense that they were founded around the group – the men's group, consciousness-raising, therapy, or 'support group' – rather than in publicly visible organizations in the public sphere. However, having said that, they were 'public' in several respects: they were a form of politics; they represented an explicit activity that went beyond individuals in isolation; and they were often, though not always, formed in a (positive) relation to feminism and gay liberation. Additionally, many of the men involved in these more private forms of politics had moved towards this form of 'politics' following experience and sometimes disillusionment with mainstream politics – especially on the left, in trade unions, in the political parties, and elsewhere. In Helsinki there is a small pro-feminist network, 'profeministimiehet', which organizes demonstrations and other campaigns against patriarchy, structural gender inequality and men's violence.

By the mid-1980s the term, 'men's movement', had been taken over by a different and much larger 'movement' – the mythopoetic movement that developed, principally in the US but also in Australia, New Zealand and some other countries. This drew heavily on the work of Robert Bly (1990) and in particular his book, *Iron John*. The book was a best seller in the US and also sold well elsewhere. It has been republished in Finnish, as *Rauta Hannu*, and in many other languages. It held out a particular appeal to many men who had previously not shown much interest in 'gender' or 'feminism'. Some followed Bly's version of masculinity closely; others went off in all sorts of different directions, drumming, story-telling and 'finding themselves', sometimes with no connection to feminism at all. The mythopoetic gatherings were often on a much larger scale than the anti-sexist/pro-feminist meetings. They also often attracted men who had not earlier been involved in sexual politics, and more importantly many men who did not have a strong relation to feminism. They were drawn to (re)find their 'voice', their 'pain', their 'wound', their 'deep masculinity', and so on. They were not necessarily antagonistic to feminism, though no doubt some were/are, but their primary motivation appeared to be for themselves, not their relation to women and feminism. Since then the relation between the pro-feminist and the mythopoetic 'men's movements' has been a source of great debate, argument, and perhaps limited reconciliation (in the US at least) (see Kimmel, 1995).

In the 1990s the term, 'men's movement', has been shifted again – this time towards the self-definitions of yet larger 'movements'. In the US the two clear examples are the Promise Keepers and the predominantly African-American Million Man March (see Messner, 1997). The former is a Christian men's organization reaching out to 'ordinary' Christian men to state their Christian 'duties' and 'responsibilities' to provide Christian leadership to 'their' families and communities. In its early stages, it was a white organization; more recently it has attempted to include Christian men of colour. The latter developed as an organization of Afro-American men and was founded very much on the basis of pride in being Black; it has also been closely linked to the activities of the Nation of Islam. This kind of political development contains some contradictory elements. It proposes forms of anti-racism and Black pride alongside a non-feminist or anti-feminist religious position on men and gender relations with women. Both of these organizations reassert a traditional power and honour of being men, as fathers, husbands, brothers, and so on, usually within a framework of religious order. They also reassert heterosexual family values, with limited tolerance and sometimes antagonism to gay men. They are linked to other movements, including the responsible fatherhood movement, fathers' rights movements, and men's rights movements. The last of these present as anti-feminist. The crucial point here is that to speak of men's organizing in relation to feminism is no guarantee of a positive relation to feminism or pro-feminist politics, as, for example, the 'Valtakunnalliset miespäivät' beginning in Tampere in 1997. For this reason, amongst others, (while pro-feminist men's groups can be a useful activity) moves to create men-only public organizations, conferences and events that exclude women should be viewed with great suspicion or worse. Furthermore, while most, though not all, of these various groups, networks and 'movements' are small, they do influence the framing and structuring of understandings, aspirations and debate.

What is also of continuing interest has been the way in which most of men's organizing in these kinds of ways, despite their variable substantive relation to feminism, has been, initially at least, conducted outside the usual discourse of 'economics' and 'the economy'. This has applied to both the politics of individual men's personal economic relations and more general societal questions of economic value, distributions and rewards. Questions of class, work, wages, jobs, promotion, employment and unemployment have not been high on the agendas of men's relations and responses to feminism. The economic has often been something to keep clear of in these discussions, perhaps because men know only too well (without learning it in school) the global patterns of inequality in wealth, and the continuation of the gender wage gap – whether this is Finland, the Nordic region or elsewhere. This leads us onto the third broad area – the implications of these organizing for men's relations to feminism within mainstream organizations, including business organizations. This in many respects brings the concerns of the previous two sections together.

MEN'S RELATIONS TO FEMINISM WITHIN MAINSTREAM ORGANIZATIONS

So third, how has men's organizing in relation to feminism taken shape within (or around) mainstream and business organizations, most of which continue to remain centres of men's power? There are four main forms of relations and responses that I shall examine here. First, there are a variety of broadly pro-feminist forms of organizing that have developed in recent years in mainstream activities. Second, there are a range of less conscious developments arising from social change in the organization of work, time and family. Third, I introduce some of the ways in which both these more conscious and less conscious developments can be and are being negotiated in mainstream organizations, with a specific focus on business management. Fourth, I note some implications at the level of global organization.

More conscious responses. So first, I turn to the development of broadly pro-feminist action and practice in professionalized, institutionalized, state and related contexts. At the general level of politics, men's responses have included support for women's demands for better working conditions, equal pay, funded daycare, family-friendly policies, freedom from violence, reproductive and sexuality rights, and so on. State responses to these demands have varied greatly between European countries. More focused initiatives by men have often been in and around the state, the professions, the third sector, and now public-private partnership organizations. They can be understood as taking the more conscious forms of responses, described in the previous section, into mainstream organizations.

Other conscious responses have occurred within educational work and youthwork; initiatives around violence (Hearn, 1998, 1999a), such as men's programmes against violence, men's work in prisons, campaigns against violence, rape and sexual assault, the White Ribbon Campaign (begun in Canada but now established in several countries) (see Luxton, 1993); academic and research networks, such as IASOM – the International Association for Studies on Men, a number of Nordic Men's Studies networks; and the EU 4th Framework-funded European Profeminist Men's Network. In some of these, such as the EU 5th Framework-funded European Research Network on Men in Europe, both women and men are working and organizing together. Several Nordic countries have instigated focused state-funded broad development activity around men, that may not be defined as specifically pro-feminist but is at least seen as part of what is sometimes called 'state feminism'. The Nordic Council of Ministers have funded from 1999 a 'Men's Studies Coordinator', as part of NIKK, the Nordic Institute for Women's Studies and Gender Research, Oslo.³

3 It has since been sometimes referred to in English as 'Coordinator for Critical Studies on Men'.

In Finland the governmental Council for Equality between Women and Men founded 'Mies-jaosto', the Sub-committee on Men, in 1988, and this has made a number of initiatives, especially around fathering. More recent events include the *Isän jäljillä* (1999) conference on fathers, sponsored by the Nordic Council of Ministers, held in Hannasaari in 1998. Indeed one social change that is now in place is that men and masculinities can at least be talked about – in the press, on television, in the media more generally – as problematic. One example of this is the Council for Equality between Women and Men's recently published collection of men's reflections on what it is to be a man in Finland today (Linnavuori and Tiihonen, 1998). Whether the situation is a business meeting or an informal discussion, it is now at least possible to ask such questions as: What is a man? How do men maintain power? Is there a crisis of masculinity? Or is there a crisis of men in a more fundamental way? What does the future of men look like or should be? What policy and practice implications might follow both in relation to or for men and boys? These kinds of questions can now at least be asked; they do not appear as 'strange' as they did even ten years ago.

Less conscious responses. Second, there are major challenges for men within mainstream organizations even where there is no explicit reference to men, women or gender. This imperative applies in all organizations – those that make products, organize finance, sell, market, provide state services, and so on and so on. Thus it is necessary to outline some of the recent major and gendered changes in men's work and time-use, as these constitute very significant elements in men's relations to forms of organizing and organization. The central importance of 'work', still usually meaning specifically paid work, for many men has been well established (for example, Cockburn, 1983, 1991; Collinson and Hearn, 1996c). Work has often been and often still is a source of power and resources, a central life interest, and a medium of identity. When men are unemployed or are inappropriately employed, additional problems may follow for them, such as for men's health, and indeed for women too. In many European countries recent transformations of work, through major structural change in employment and unemployment, has been extremely significant for many men. In the UK during the period from 1973 to 1993, the number of men in employment shrank from 13.1 million to 10.7 million. The shift in the sectoral makeup was dramatic: with changes from 39.7% to 27.9% in manufacturing; from 12.4% to 17.9% in retail, wholesale, consumption, catering and leisure; and from 5.4% to 11.9% in finance, insurance, estate agency and business services. So-called 'traditional' working class-based masculinities, most obviously around heavy manufacturing, lumbering and mining, can no longer be so easily sustained unchallenged (Dicks et al., 1998, Waddington et al., 1998). And for many men, especially young, less qualified men in deprived localities of Europe, there is the prospect of unemployment, or at least little prospect of official employment.

Patterns of women's employment are also changing. In many countries significant increases in women's employment, sometimes in part-time employment, have occurred in the financial and service sectors and in community, social and personal services. In the Finnish case, these sectoral shifts have intersected with the long established tradition of women's high level of participation in the employed labour market. Such work changes for women necessarily impact on men's changing relations to organizing, organizations and management.

These combinations of structural changes mean that many men have experienced considerable personal change in their working lives in recent years. Lifelong security of employment is no longer guaranteed, and of course for many men it never was; but now this even applies to the relatively successful and well qualified. In many countries such insecurity has become a real possibility, even for managers and qualified professionals as, for example, during the recession of the early 1990s in Finland. Meanwhile corporate reorganization is commonplace; post-Fordist flexibility demands flexibility of men. However, all this does not necessarily mean a decline in the significance of paid work for men or women. Indeed some commentators, some in largely non-gendered way (for example, Sennett, 1998), some through gendered analyses (Hochschild, 1997), have pointed to the growing power of work, particularly in the lives of the corporate employed. But this itself is not such a new theme, and especially so for some men, as described by Whyte (1956) in *The Organization Man* in the early 1950s. Some people, some men and some women, may be living for and spending more time on 'their work', even if it appears that work is a much more individualist matter or even that it is not so clear what work is and how it exactly relates to the organization of working life. There is thus the contradiction of the greater insecurity of employed work, and yet the greater appeal – intellectually, in terms of identity, even aesthetically – of work. This used to be called exploitation.

These changes in the form and content of work and organization are intimately connected to questions of time and time-use. There is growing interest in both policy and academic analyses in men's time-use inside and outside families. Men's time-use is becoming of increasing policy interest within European, especially EU, debates, as expressed in the November 1993 European Directives on Working Time, calling for minimum daily rest periods, a maximum working week of 48 hours, a maximum average working day of 11 hours, minimum periods of annual leave, and some restrictions on night working and shift working. Despite and perhaps because of these transformations in men's work, men's, often fathers', time spent *within* families remains vitally important, not least because, in the UK at least, some of the longest working hours outside the home are often worked by fathers with children under sixteen (Fagan, 1996). While men with wives in full-time employment may in some cases take on more housework, this may more like involve shifting tasks than devoting more total time to housework (Anderson et al., 1994). In Finland, the birth of a baby in a family does not generally change

the way that men participate in housework (Niemi, 1994, p. 168). These are not only matters of who does what kinds of work in families, but also the type and quality of contact between men and others in families. The amount of time young people spend with their families can be a key influence on how well they do at school and work, rather than whether they grow up in a family with both biological parents (*The Relationship ...*, 1996). How time issues are dealt with is a vitally important component in men's individual and collective (and often less conscious) responses to feminism and gendered socio-economic change.

Negotiated responses in management. Third, the *intersection* of men's organizing, especially pro-feminist organizing, in relation to feminism and men's dominant practices in mainstream organizations makes for some further complex, negotiated forms of organizing and raises some novel organizational questions. To illustrate this, let us look at the question of business management in more detail. Focusing on management in this kind of way also raises questions around both the description of managerial practices and the normative prescription of such practices.

In most contemporary business organizations the managerial prerogative over key decisions remains the taken-for-granted norm, generally unquestioned and unchallenged. This applies, though perhaps more subtly, in teamwork, collaborative organizing, project organization, and the various forms of organizational and management restructuring and delayering (see, for example, Collinson and Collinson, 1997). While management is often, indeed usually, presented as if it is a gender-neutral activity, in reality it remains strongly dominated by men in most organizations (Collinson and Hearn, 1996b). Assumptions of gender-neutrality in and of management have been strongly challenged by feminist and feminist-influenced studies, showing how management often excludes women, and especially black women, women of colour, and ethnic minority women (Davidson, 1997). Changing organizations so that excluded voices are heard is an essential part of bringing together feminism, pro-feminism and organizational change and development.

Changing men's relations to management also involves the support of women and women's initiatives in management. If the current gendered form of management is to change, and if there are to be more women in management, it needs to be accepted that there will be fewer men there. Getting the question of fewer men in management onto business policy agendas, or at least onto the table for discussion, seems to be rather difficult. Targets, both nationally and individually, can be set for changes of this sort. This can include discussion of what constitutes a minimum acceptable mass of women in management, and a maximum acceptable mass of men in management.

Regendering management also involves developing the range of flexible working, family-friendly and dependant-leave policies. Clearly the baseline daycare and similar support that

exists through the state still varies greatly between European countries. Some companies are now providing considerable direct support to women and men managers for what are usually domestic labour, not only for childcare but also for cooking, cleaning, washing and so on. This is a way of transferring domestic labour from the personal responsibility in the family to (usually) other women not in the family – a modernized and clearly gendered form of corporate domestic service. While the broad provision of ‘family-friendly’ and related policies on caring for dependants is to be welcomed, there are potential problems in managers and employers taking too active a stance in the organization and management of the ‘family’ lives of *individual* staff and managers. Without sympathetic implementation this can indeed become an extension of managerial, and often patriarchal, surveillance into the private, domestic and sexual lives of those in the organization.

This links with the question of time-use noted in the previous section. While overall employed working time has decreased since the end of the last century (Julkunen and Nätti, 1999), in some managerial jobs and sectors, the (gendered) phenomenon of presentism is a serious problem, and difficult to resist for men whose jobs remain insecure. Rutherford (1999) has reported high levels of working time spent by managers, especially senior managers, in her studies of the UK financial and airline sectors (9.9 hours per day plus most taking work home, with 11.4 hours in one division of the finance sector case study organization). A recent UK survey found that 1:5 managers had increased their working time by 15 hours in the previous two years (New Ways to Work, 1995). And a recent Swedish survey (Haas and Hwang, n.d.) found that some companies were unhappy about men reducing their hours because of fears of seeming unprofessional or uninterested in their business clients. The interaction of time-use and organizational position is a vital area of ambivalence for at least some men business managers. There are urgent needs for business and governmental employers to facilitate ways and means for men to reconcile work and domestic/family/personal life in a much more positive way. This includes attention to more job-sharing, voluntary reduced work time, flexible working hours, term time working, working from home, and other approaches promoted by New Ways to Work (1993, 1995) and similar initiatives (see Julkunen and Nätti, 1999). Men can indeed be ‘reluctant managers’ (Goffee and Scase, 1989).

Working along somewhat similar lines, Cooper and Lewis (1998; also Cooper, 2000) have outlined key steps for their broad ‘agenda of change’, as follows: ‘integrating work-family issues into core thinking and strategic planning in organizations’; ‘more diversity in decision-making’; ‘a rethinking of notions of time’; ‘developing flexibility and autonomy’; ‘redefining careers’; ‘new approaches to management’; ‘redefining success’; and ‘public support and partnership with industry’. While these steps are by no means unproblematic, they do point to the growing understanding of the complex intersections of forms of home life, employment, or-

ganizational structure and process, management and gender relations. These interconnections have complex and equally important implications for men as for women. Recent Norwegian research suggests that men's paternity leave is significantly lower for senior managers, men in private sector organizations, and men with high overtime use (Brandth and Kvande, 2000, pp. 6–7). Greater participation in such leave and childcare may lead some men to take more leave in the future (Brandth and Kvande, 1999), and may be part of more egalitarian relationships with partners. Haas and Hwang (1995) have found evidence in their Swedish research that parental leave encourages more 'androgenous' behaviour and blurring of what have been thought of as 'gender roles'.

In some business organizations there is some degree of regular change in management positions. In others, managerial positions are more permanent, and it may be very unlikely that many men will wish to move from management. If that is so, it can be considered how they might move 'temporarily', for example, by exchanges with women, shifts to specialized or lower positions on the same pay, external secondments, sabbaticals, and so on, as ways of opening up management positions for women. Furthermore, changes that are already happening in business organizations, such as budgetary, legal, geographical and restructuring changes, can be seen as opportunities for challenging and changing men there in management and elsewhere.

Men in business organizations and management also need to be understood in gendered terms. Similarly, organizational power, structure and decision-making can all be re-interpreted in this context (Collinson and Hearn, 2000). Where appropriate men can be challenged in terms of dominant forms of masculinity. Men managers, and indeed workers, need to look critically at themselves not only as workers or managers, but also through gendered eyes. This raises the question of how for many men in such positions, different forms of management and different ways of being men can be simultaneously reproduced – authoritarian, paternalist, careerist, personalist, entrepreneurial, and so on (Collinson and Hearn, 1994). Indeed in some business organizations some conventional managerial masculinity is simply unreasonable behaviour. There is also the specific question of whether it is possible to develop pro-feminist management (Hearn, 1994a, 1999b). More specifically, men cannot be absolved from the responsibility for equal opportunities policies and the development and promotion of women staff (Cockburn, 1991). Different men's (by age, class, disability, ethnicity, race, sexuality) relationship to equal opportunities policies need to be more explicit. This involves examining the interaction of gender and other social divisions; of considering the different situation of different 'types' of men (for example, black men, men with disabilities); and making explicit the category of white heterosexual able-bodied men (WHAMs) (Hearn and Collinson, 1993).

Similarly, men's cultures in business organizations need to be open to explicit examination, discussion, critique and change. The dominance of certain men's cultures that produce a climate of sentiment that is both antagonistic to women and harmful to men (Cockburn, 1991; Hearn, 1989, 1992a; Maddock and Parkin, 1994). Men's competitive behaviour, especially in mixed groups, needs to be the subject of critique and change (Case, 1994). Common pitfalls for men in such situations include: 'hogging the show'; being the continual problem solver; speaking in 'capital letters'; defensiveness; put-downs and one-upmanship; negativism; transfer of the focus of discussion; intransigence and dogmatism; listening only to oneself; avoiding feelings; condescension and paternalism; using sexuality to manipulate women; seeking attention and support from women while competing with men; storing key group information for one's own use; speaking for others. Instead attempts have been made to specify what responsible action might look like: limiting our talking time to our fair share; not interrupting people who are speaking; becoming a good listener; getting and giving support; not giving answers and solutions; relaxing; not speaking on every subject; not putting others down; nurturing the democratic group process; interrupting others' oppressive behaviour (Moyer and Tuttle, 1983). Such possible changes have clear implications for women.

Explicit attention needs to be given to such issues in in-house gender training in business organizations. In the case of men, training might address such issues as: male identity; how men's prejudices were encouraged; the good and bad things about being a man; how men's attitudes and behaviours can change; how the organization reproduces dominant male values; and ways of changing the organization in these respects. Women in organizations should have at least as much time and resources as do men for training and related activities. Training budgets could be distributed to women/men in *inverse* proportion to the number of women/men in management or elsewhere in the organization concerned.

Organizational and managerial policies and practices need to be developed not just around 'gender in general' but around sexuality, sexual harassment, heterosexism, and indeed violence and violation. Many business organizational cultures remain dominated by heterosexuality and conventional forms of heterosexuality, with the consequent devaluing or worse of lesbian, gay, bisexual and queer sexualities. This can occur in both the everyday organizational cultures and processes, and in the more formal policies. On the other hand, there are, and probably increasingly, in many parts of the world major developments of the 'pink economy', with the greater realisation of the power of the 'pink pound' or perhaps the '*vaaleanpunainen talous*' – as another example of the clear intersection of economics and politics, and in this case sexuality.

More generally, men in business can be asked to clarify where they stand in terms of, for example, anti-racism, anti-sexism, pro-feminism, gay affirmation. This may involve acknowl-

edging ambivalence and dilemmas rather than pretending that there is some 'pure' position. It also necessitates avoiding the idea of some men being 'more advanced' or 'further on' than other men. Men can be asked what they are doing and how long-term any commitment is. In such a perspective, it is important to see nothing as 'too trivial', whilst, at the same time, recognizing the possibility of changing the whole 'set' of the organization, whether mainstream or not. The particular and the global often go hand in hand.

Global responses. Fourthly, I turn briefly to the position of men in relation to globalization and global organizations (Connell, 1993, 1995, 1998; Hearn, 1996) as one of the most important challenges for the future. This includes attention to 'transnational business masculinity' (Connell, 1998), and the analytical and political usefulness of a concept of 'men of the world' (Hearn, 1996). A fundamental feature of global processes is the growth of transnational or multinational managements and large organizations within and beyond nations. This is made all the more graphic when we consider that the GNP of some nation-states is exceeded by the assets of many supranational corporations (Bauman, 1995, p.152). The operation and impacts of the Western-dominated, yet transnational, finance and development organizations, like the IMF, WTO and the World Bank, upon the activities of supposedly autonomous nations through the management of debt and the implementation of structural adjustment programmes is profound. These challenges are especially acute in those many parts of the world that are in the midst or the wake of men's militarism and military violence. In the worst cases, organizational and managerial silencing and exclusion involves violence and death – the destruction of the 'missing', 'the invisible ones', that are no longer even present, alive, in organizations to practice, to respond to, to theorize on. In the worst organizations, the process and practice of organization is explicitly and purposefully directed to the mass destruction of people. The full tendency to violation and violent destructiveness, actual and potential, of many organizations is rarely faced (see Hearn, 1994c).

Meanwhile international resistances develop in the form of anti-militarism, organizing against trafficking in women and children and other sexual violences, trade boycotts, international trade unionism, organization of homeworkers, fair trade movements, green campaigns, and ethical consumerism, from Shell to McLibel to the Body Shop to Clean Clothes campaigns to Women Working Worldwide (for example, Shaw, 1997). As noted, the recent and growing global organization against the alliance between nations and multinationals represented by the World Trade Organization shows the contingent and contested nature of business economics. Men's pro-feminist organizing in and around business and other mainstream organizations would be better developed in relation to the profound and growing challenges of globalization, rather than as a way of men re-finding their 'lost' 'deep masculinity'.

FURTHER QUESTIONS FOR MEN'S ORGANIZING IN THE FUTURE

There are many further questions and challenges, both analytical and practical, that are likely to become of growing importance in the future. They include:

- The relationship of men's organizing in public to men's activity in private and the organization of the private worlds more generally;
- The cultural variability of the forms of men's organizing in different parts of the world and within different cultural contexts;
- The problematic nature of men's *dominant* ways of organizing as a basis for pro-feminist organizing by men;
- The importance of clarifying the ethics of men's organizing, both between men and in collaboration with women. Just as there are now growing debates on ethical capitalism and ethical investment, so there is the need for more consideration of ethical organizing. This points to the inappropriateness of certain established forms of organizing, often men's political organizing, that have prioritized ends over means;
- The development of pro-feminist ways of organizing, being in organizations, and indeed managing in mainstream organizations. This involves recognizing the dangers of men-only organizing, even when done with apparent 'good intentions', and the case for men's organizing to be done in collaboration with women, and especially so in supporting feminist demands;
- The development of international and transnational organizing by men in positive relation to feminism;
- And finally, the urgency of pro-feminist organizing on global issues, such as militarism, transnationalism organizations, international finance and debt, and the global environment. ■

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ACKER, JOAN** (1990). 'Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: a theory of gendered organizations', *Gender & Society* 4, 139–158.
- ALIMO-METCALFE, BEVERLY** (1993) 'Women in management: organizational socialization and assessment practices that prevent career advancement', *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 1, 68–83.
- ANDERSON, MICHAEL, BECHHOFFER, FRANK and GERSHUNY, JONATHAN** (1995) *The Social and Political Economy of the Household*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- BAUMAN, ZYGMUNT** (1995) 'Searching for a centre that holds' in Mike Featherstone, Scott Lash and Roland Robertson (eds.) *Global Modernities*, London: Sage, 140–154.
- BENSON, J.K.** (1977) 'Organizations: a dialectical view' *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 22, 1–21.
- BLY, ROBERT** (1990) *Iron John: a Book about Men*, Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley. Published in Finnish as *Rauta Hannu*.

- BRANDTH, BERIT and KVANDE, ELIN** (1999) 'State feminism and flexible fathers', Paper at the Nordic-UK Collaborative Seminar on Employment Policies and Gender Relations, Stockholm, June.
- BRANDTH, BERIT and KVANDE, ELIN** (2000) 'Reflexive fathers', Paper at Researching Masculinities Doctoral Course, Trondheim, March.
- CALÁS, MARTA and SMIRCICH, LINDA** (1993) 'Dangerous liaisons: the feminine-in-management meets globalization', *Business Horizons*, March–April, 71–81.
- CARRIGAN, TIM, CONNELL, R. W. and LEE, JOHN** (1985) 'Towards a new sociology of masculinity', *Theory and Society*, 14(5), 551–604.
- CASE, SUSAN SCHICK** (1994) 'Gender differences in communication and behaviour in organizations' in Marilyn J. Davidson and Ron J. Burke (eds.) *Women in Management: Current Research Issues*, London: Paul Chapman, 144–167.
- COCKBURN, CYNTHIA** (1983) *Brothers*, London: Pluto.
- COCKBURN, CYNTHIA** (1990) 'Men's power in organizations: "equal opportunities intervenes"', in Jeff Hearn and David Morgan (eds.) *Men, Masculinities and Social Theory*, London: Unwin Hyman/Routledge, 72–89.
- COCKBURN, CYNTHIA** (1991) *In the Way of Women: Men's Resistance to Sex Equality in Organizations*, London: Macmillan.
- COLLINSON, DAVID L. and COLLINSON, MARGARET** (1997) 'Delaying management: time-space surveillance and its gendered effects' *Organization*, 4(3), 375–407.
- COLLINSON, DAVID L. and HEARN, JEFF** (1994) 'Naming men as men: implications for work, organizations and management', *Gender, Work and Organization*, 1(1), 2–22.
- COLLINSON, DAVID L. and HEARN, JEFF** (eds.) (1996a) *Men as Managers, Managers as Men. Critical Perspectives on Men, Masculinities and Managements*, London: Sage.
- COLLINSON, DAVID L. and HEARN, JEFF** (1996b) 'Men' at 'work': multiple masculinities in multiple workplaces', in Mairtin. Mac an Ghaill (ed.) *Understanding Masculinities: Social Relations and Cultural Arenas*, Open University Press, Milton Keynes, 61–76.
- COLLINSON, DAVID L. and HEARN, JEFF** (2000) 'Critical studies on men, masculinities and managements' in Marilyn J. Davidson and Ronald J. Burke (eds.) *Women in Management: Current Research Issues II*, London: Sage, 263–278.
- CONNELL, R.W.** (1987) *Gender and Power*, Cambridge: Polity.
- CONNELL, R.W.** (1993) 'The big picture: Masculinities in recent world history', *Theory and Society*, 22(5), 597–623.
- CONNELL, R.W.** (1996) *Masculinities*, Cambridge: Polity.
- CONNELL, R.W.** (1998) 'Men in the world: masculinities and globalisation', *Men and Masculinities*, 1(1), 3–23.
- COOPER, CARY L.** (2000) 'Towards short-term contract cultures: the future impact on women in management' in Marilyn J. Davidson and Ronald J. Burke (eds.) *Women in Management: Current Research Issues II*, London: Sage, pp. 294–302.
- COOPER, CARY L. and LEWIS, S.** (1998) *balancing you Career, Family and Life*, London: Kogan Page.
- DAVIDSON, MARILYN J.** (1989) 'Women managers and stress: profiles of vulnerable individuals', *Clinical Psychology Forum*, 22, 32–34.
- DAVIDSON, MARILYN J.** (1997) *The Black and Ethnic Minority Woman Manager: Cracking the Concrete Ceiling*, London: Paul Chapman/Sage.
- DAVIDSON, MARILYN J. and BURKE, RONALD J.** (2000) 'Women in Management: Current Research Issues II' in Marilyn J. Davidson and Ronald J. Burke (eds.) *Women in Management: Current Research Issues II*, London: Sage, pp. 1–7.
- DAVIDSON, MARILYN J. and COOPER, CARY L.** (1984) 'Occupational stress in female managers: a comparative study', *Journal of Management Studies*, 21, 185–205.
- DICKS, BELLA, WADDINGTON, DAVID and CRITCHER, CHAS** (1998) 'Redundant men and overburdened women: local service providers and the construction of gender in ex-mining communities' in Jennie Popay, Jeff Hearn and Jeanette Edwards (eds.) *Men, Gender Divisions and Welfare*, London: Routledge, 287–311.
- FAGAN, COLETTE** (1996) 'Gendered time schedules: paid work in Great Britain', *Social Politics*, 3(1), 72–106.

- FERGUSON, KATHY** (1984) *The Feminist Critique of Bureaucracy*, Philadelphia, Pa.: Temple University Press.
- FERNÁNDEZ KELLY, M.P.** (1994) 'Making sense of gender in the world economy: focus on Latin America', *Organization*, 1(2), 249–275.
- FRASER, NANCY** (1989) *Unruly Practices: Power, Discourse and Gender in Contemporary Social Theory*, Cambridge: Polity.
- GIBSON-GRAHAM, J. K.** (1996) *The End of Capitalism (as we knew it)*, Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell.
- GOFFEE, ROBERT and SCASE, RICHARD** (1989) *Reluctant Managers*, London: Allen & Unwin.
- GRANT, REBECCA and NEWLAND, KATHLEEN** (eds.) (1991) *Gender and International Relations*, Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- HAAS, L. and HWANG, P.** (1995) 'Company culture and men's usage of family leaves in Sweden', *Family Relations*, 44, 28–36. Cited in Cooper (2000).
- HAAS, L. and HWANG, P.** (n.d.) 'Fatherhood and corporate culture in Sweden', unpub. paper, cited in New Ways to Work (1995), cited in New Ways to Work (1995).
- HABERMAS, JÜRGEN** (1984) *The Theory of Communicative Action, Volume 1, Reason and the Rationalization of Society*, trans. T. McCarthy, Boston: Beacon.
- HABERMAS, JÜRGEN** (1987) *The Theory of Communicative Action, Volume 2, Lifeworld and System: A Critique of Functionalist Reason*, trans. T. McCarthy, Boston: Beacon.
- HANMER, JALNA and HEARN, JEFF** (1999) 'Gender and welfare research' in Fiona Williams, Jennie Popay and Ann Oakley (eds.) *Welfare Research: a Critical Review*, London: UCL Press, pp. 106–130.
- HEARN, JEFF** (1987) *The Gender of Oppression*, Brighton: Wheatsheaf; New York: St. Martin's.
- HEARN, JEFF** (ed.) (1989) *Men, Masculinities and Leadership. Changing Patterns and New Initiatives* Special Issue *Equal Opportunities International*, 8(1).
- HEARN, JEFF** (1992a) *Men in the Public Eye*, London: Routledge.
- HEARN, JEFF** (1992b) 'The personal, the political, the theoretical: the case of men's sexualities and sexual violences' in David Porter (ed.) *Between Men and Feminism*, Routledge, London/New York, 1992, 161–181.
- HEARN, JEFF** (1993) 'The politics of essentialism and the analysis of the men's movement(s)', *Feminism & Psychology*, Vol.3(3), 405–409.
- HEARN, JEFF** (1994a) 'Changing men and changing managements: social change, social research and social action', in Marilyn J. Davidson and Ron J. Burke (eds.) *Women in Management: Current Research Issues*, London: Paul Chapman, 192–209.
- HEARN, JEFF** (1994b) 'Men in the public domains' in Stephen Edgell, Sandra Walklate and Gareth Williams (eds.) *Debating the Future of the Public Sphere: Transforming the Public and the Private Domains in Free Market Societies*, Aldershot: Avebury, 199–220.
- HEARN, JEFF** (1994c) 'The organization(s) of violence: men, gender relations, organizations and violences', *Human Relations*, 47(6), 731–754.
- HEARN, JEFF** (1996) 'Deconstructing the dominant: making the one(s) the other(s)', *Organization*, 3(4), 611–626.
- HEARN, JEFF** (1998) *The Violences of Men*, London: Sage.
- HEARN, JEFF** (1999a) 'Educating men about violence against women', *Women's Studies Quarterly*, 27, 140–152.
- HEARN, JEFF** (1999b) 'Men, managers and management: the case of higher education', in Stephen Whitehead and Roy Moodley (eds.) *Transforming Managers: Engendering Change in the Public Sector*, London: Taylor and Francis, 123–144.
- HEARN, JEFF and COLLINSON, DAVID L.** (1993) 'Theorizing unities and differences between men and between masculinities', in *Theorizing Masculinities*. Harry Brod and Michael Kaufman (eds.) Newbury Park, Ca.: Sage, 148–162.
- HEARN, JEFF and WENDY PARKIN** (1983) 'Gender and organisations: a selective review and a critique of a neglected area', *Organisation Studies*, 4, 219–242.
- HEARN, JEFF and WENDY PARKIN** (1995) *'Sex' at 'Work': the Power and Paradox of Organisation Sexuality*. Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall/Harvester Wheatsheaf. Rev. ed., 1st ed. 1987.
- HOCHSCHILD, ARLIE R.** (1997) *The Time Bind*, New York: Metropolitan Books.

- INSTITUTE OF MANAGEMENT** (1995) *National Management Salary Survey*, Kingston-on-Thames: Institute of Management.
- INSTITUTE OF MANAGEMENT / REMUNERATION ECONOMICS** (1998) *UK National Management Survey*, London: Institute of Management. Cited in Davidson and Burke (2000).
- ISÄN JÄLJILLÄ: KONFERENSSIRAPORTI** (1999) Copenhagen: TemaNord 1999: 559.
- JULKUNEN, RAIJA and NÄTTI, JOUKO** (1999) *The Modernization of Working Times: Flexibility and Work Sharing in Finland*, Jyväskylä: SoPhi, University of Jyväskylä.
- KELLY, JOAN** (1987) 'The doubled vision of feminist theory: a postscript to the "Women and Power" Conference', *Feminist Studies*, 5(1), 216–227.
- KIMMEL, MICHAEL** (ed.) (1995) *The Politics of Manhood: Profeminist Men Respond to the Mythopoetic Men's Movement (and the Mythopoetic Leaders Answer)*, Philadelphia, Pa.: Temple University Press.
- KIVIMÄKI, RIIKKA** (1998) 'How work is structured by the family? The impacts of parenthood on the work community', Paper at Gender, Work and Organization Conference, Manchester, January.
- KOVALAINEN, ANNE** (1994) *The Invisibility of Gender in Economics*, Turku: Publications of Turku School of Economics and Business Administration, Series A: 2.
- KOVALAINEN, ANNE** (1995) *At the Margins of the Economy: Women's Self-Employment in Finland 1960–1990*, Aldershot: Avebury.
- KOVALAINEN, ANNE** (1999) 'The welfare state, gender system, and public sector employment in Finland' in Jens Christiansen, Pertti Koistinen and Anne Kovalainen (eds.) *Working Europe: Reshaping European Employment Systems*, Aldershot: Ashgate, 137–154.
- LEHMANN, CHERYL** (1996) 'Quiet whispers ... men accounting for women, west to east' in David L. Collinson and Jeff Hearn (eds.) *Men as Managers, Managers as Men*, London: Sage, 150–166.
- LINNAVUORI, MATTI and TIHONEN, ARTO** (eds.) (1998) *Istetään Puhevat Miehet*, Helsinki: Council for Equality between Women and Men, 5/98.
- LUXTON, MEG** (1993) 'Dreams and dilemmas: feminist musings on 'the man question' in Tony Haddad (ed.) *Men and Masculinities: A Critical Anthology*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.
- MADDOCK, SU and PARKIN, DI** (1994) 'Gender cultues: how they affect men and women at work' in Marilyn J. Davidson and Ron J. Burke (eds.) *Women in Management: Current Research Issues*, London: Paul Chapman, 29–40.
- MESSNER, MICHAEL** (1997) *Politics of Masculinities: Men in Movements*, Thousand Oaks, Ca.: Sage.
- MIES, MARIA** (1986) *Patriarchy and Accumulation on World Scale*, London: Zed.
- MIES, MARIA** (1998) 'Globalization of the economy and woman's work in a sustainable society', *Gender, Technology and Development*, 2(1), 3–37.
- MILLS, ALBERT and TANCREDE, PETA** (eds.) 1992. *Gendering Organizational Analysis*. London: Sage.
- MORRISON, PAUL** (1980) 'Our common ground ...', *Anti-Sexist Men's Newsletter*, 10.
- MOYER, B. AND TUTTLE, A.** (1983) 'Overcoming masculine oppression in mixed groups', in *Off their backs ... and on our own two feet*, Philadelphia: New Society Publishers, 24–29.
- NEW WAYS TO WORK** (1993) *Change at the Top: Working Flexibly at Senior and Managerial Levels in Organisations*, London: NWTW.
- NEW WAYS TO WORK** (1995) *Balanced Lives: Changing Work Patterns for Men*, London: NWTW.
- O'BRIEN, MARY** (1981) *The Politics of Reproduction*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- O'BRIEN, MARY** (1986) *Reproducing the World: Essays in Feminist Theory*, Boulder, Co.: Westview.
- NIEMI, IIRIS** (1994) *Perheiden ajankäyttö. Suomalainen perhe*, Helsinki: Tilastokeskus, Väestö 1994:5. Cited in Kivimäki (1998).
- PETERSON, V. SPIKE and RUNYAN, ANNE SISSON** (1999) *Gender Global Issues*, Boulder, Col: Westview.
- POWELL, GARY** (1988) *Women and Men in Management*, Newbury Park, Ca.: Sage.
- THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FAMILY LIFE AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S LIFESTYLES** (1996) Findings, Social Policy Research 95, York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- ROPER, MICHAEL** (1996) 'Seduction and succession': circuits of homosocial desire in management' in David L. Collinson and Jeff Hearn (eds.) *Men as Managers, Managers as Men*, London: Sage, 210–227.

- RUTHERFORD, SARAH** (1999) 'Organisational culture, patriarchal closure and women managers', Ph D thesis, Bristol: University of Bristol.
- SCHEIN, VIRGINIA** (1973) 'The relationship between sex-role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics', *Journal of Applied Psychology* 57, 95–100.
- SCHATTSCHEIDER, E. E.** (1960) *The Semi-Sovereign People: a Realist View of Democracy in America*, New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- SENNETT, RICHARD** (1998) *The Corrosion of Character: the Personal Consequences of Work in the New Capitalism*, New York: W.W: Norton.
- SHAW, LINDA** (1997) 'The labor behind the label: clean clothes campaigns in Europe' in Andrew Ross (ed.) *No Sweat: Fashion, Free Trade and the Rights of Garment Workers*, New York: Verso, 215–220.
- STOLTENBERG, JOHN** (1990) *Refusing to be a Man*, London: Fontana.
- UN HUMAN DEVELOPMENT REPORT** (1999) New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press for the United Nations Development Programme.
- UN HUMAN DEVELOPMENT REPORT** (2000) New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press for the United Nations Development Programme. Available at: <http://www.undp.org/hdro/>
- VEIKKOLA, EEVA-SISKO and PALMU, TARJA** (eds.) (1995) *Women and Men in Finland*, Helsinki: Statistics Finland. Living Conditions 1995:1.
- VEIKKOLA, EEVA-SISKO, HÄNNINEN-SALMELIN and SINKKONEN, SIRKKA** (1997) 'Is the forecast for wind or calm?' in Eeva-Sisko Veikkola (ed.) *Women and Men at the Top: A Study of Women and Men at the Top*, Gender Statistics 1997:1. Helsinki: Statistics Finland.
- VINNICOMBE, SUSAN** (2000) 'The position of women in Europe' in Marilyn J. Davidson and Ronald J. Burke (eds.) *Women in Management: Current Research Issues II*, London: Sage, pp. 9–25.
- WADDINGTON, DAVID, CRITCHER, CHAS and DICKS, BELLA** (1998) 'All jumbled up': employed women and unemployed husbands' in Jennie Popay, Jeff Hearn and Jeanette Edwards (eds) *Men, Gender Divisions and Welfare*, London: Routledge, 231–256.
- WALBY, SYLVIA** (1986) *Patriarchy at Work*, Cambridge: Polity.
- WALBY, SYLVIA** (1990) *Theorizing Patriarchy*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- WARING, MARILYN** (1988) *Counting for Nothing*, Wellington: Allen and Unwin.
- WAYLEN, GEORGINA** (1996) *Gender in Third World Politics*, Buckingham: Open University Press.
- WHYTE, WILLIAM H.** (1956) *The Organization Man*, New York: Simon and Schuster.