



Women-in-Leadership Research and Feminist Futures: New agendas for feminist research and impact on gender equality

Journal:	<i>Gender in Management: an International Journal</i>
Manuscript ID	GM-01-2023-0025
Manuscript Type:	Editorial

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

EDITORIAL: Special Issue for Gender in Management: An International Journal

Women-in-Leadership Research and Feminist Futures: New agendas for feminist research and impact on gender equality

Introduction

This is the *first* Special Issue of Gender in Management: An International Journal dedicated to positioning *women leaders as part of feminist futures and theorising*, and considering *their impact on gender equity*. Our aims in curating this Special Issue are to: contribute to feminist theorising and develop research agendas for women-in-leadership research; consider the current position of women leaders in neoliberal postfeminism and post-feminist research and practice, including the backlash towards women leaders as diluting the feminist cause; and, consider the impact women leaders can have on gender equality and feminist theory.

Women in leadership continue to be a source of fascination, confusion and controversy for researchers and organizational practitioners alike. Even after a wealth of scholarship in this area, many questions remain unanswered about how far we have really come and why (Boatman, 2007). It is impossible to deny the influence of neoliberalism and postfeminism for women holding leadership roles, while they also continue to face inequalities, and confront ongoing dilemmas and contradictions within a discourse of hegemonic masculinity (Elliott and Stead, 2018; Mavin and Grandy, 2019; Stead and Elliott, 2019). Women leaders are subject to postfeminism which decries that feminism is no longer needed. Instead, relying on their individual efforts women can now achieve in leadership roles, and in doing so are seen to brush inequalities aside and deny feminism (e.g., Rottenberg, 2014; Eisenstein, 2010). A resulting backlash towards women leaders positions them as diluting the feminist cause which in turn impacts researchers of women-in-leadership. However, the realities of women leaders globally are that they retain a minoritised and marginalised status compared to men. Further, white

1
2
3 women leaders are the majority of women who hold leadership roles, and racialised dynamics
4
5 also impact women's leadership representation.
6
7

8 Against this backdrop there is complexity at the heart of the postfeminist thesis and
9
10 multi-layered feminist challenges become evident when understanding the praxis of women
11
12 leaders, and advancing women-in-leadership research. Feminist critique can position women
13
14 leaders as turning their back on solidarity and collective feminist action (e.g., Negra, 2009) by
15
16 focusing on personal career progression in the corporate world (Rottenberg, 2014). Such
17
18 complexity and criticism of women-in-leadership research can paralyse women-in-leadership
19
20 researchers and women leaders in their efforts to articulate inclusive agendas for change and
21
22 intellectual advancement, as well as close the door to women leaders and researchers engaging
23
24 in feminism and feminist research.
25
26
27

28 To develop new agendas for feminist research we begin by outlining our understandings
29
30 of postfeminism, moderate feminism, feminist critique of women leaders, and challenges for
31
32 women-in-leadership research. We then discuss the themes of this Special Issue and offer a
33
34 further avenue for women-in-leadership research.
35
36
37
38
39

40 **Postfeminism and Moderate Feminism**

41
42 Postfeminism is a critical concept understood in terms of a discursive formation, with no single,
43
44 definitive interpretation of postfeminism, and with a range of conceptualizations signalling its
45
46 malleability (Lewis et al., 2019). Postfeminism 'simultaneously rejects feminist activism in
47
48 favor of feminine consumption and celebrates the success of feminism while declaring its
49
50 irrelevance' (Butler, 2013: 44). Gill (2007) conceptualised postfeminism as a 'sensitivity',
51
52 composed of an 'entanglement of both feminist and anti-feminist themes' (Ronen, 2018: 149).
53
54 Butler (2013) influenced by Gill (2007:44) views postfeminism as a sensibility, and identifies
55
56 six characteristics which often denote postfeminism, including:
57
58
59
60

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4 1. Implies that gender equality has been achieved and feminist activism is thus no
- 5 longer necessary;
- 6 2. Denies femininity as a bodily property and revives notions of natural
- 7 sexual difference;
- 8 3. Marks a shift from sexual objectification to sexual subjectification;
- 9 4. Encourages self-surveillance, self-discipline, and a makeover paradigm;
- 10 5. Emphasizes individualism, choice, and empowerment as the primary
- 11 routes to women's independence and freedom; and
- 12 6. Promotes consumerism and the commodification of difference.
- 13
- 14

15 Postfeminism is tightly entangled with neoliberalism and neoliberal capitalism's
16 reclamation of ideas about femininity and womanhood. In line with the ability of capitalism to
17 reinvent itself, these ideas make use of discourses of generational difference to re(present)
18 feminism as obsolete and feminist ideas as restrictive and disempowering (see Whelehan,
19 1995). In addition, they reinforce the individualised, entrepreneurial agency of highly
20 privileged, mainly white, middle-class women, guiding them away from solidarity and
21 common goals and promoting the reclamation of the self (see Negra, 2009) through the focus
22 on their personal initiative to improve their career prospects in the corporate world (Rottenberg,
23 2014). Such individualism, including the lack of challenge to structural inequalities, versus the
24 collectivism of feminism challenging inequalities for all, is a platform for critiques of women
25 leaders. For example, Ozkazanç-Pan (2019) suggests that collective agency grounded in
26 context is more likely to evoke radical change than individual agency or struggle.

27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42 More recently, challenges to the stranglehold of postfeminism have been theorised as
43 moderate feminism, which reflects more moderate 'acceptable' forms of feminism operating
44 in the public domain through a 'double movement', where feminism is affirmed while distance
45 from radicalism is secured (Dean, 2010: 397). For example, Mavin et al.'s (2019) study of
46 women political leaders in the media contributes a new modality of feminist politics, offering
47 a space where feminism can be affirmed, encouraged and progressed, where the gendering of
48 women leaders provokes feminism as well as denying inequalities. Tzanakou and Pear (2019),
49 explore the UK gender equality tool and accreditation, Athena SWAN, arguing that a pragmatic
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 approach to this moderate tool can be used to pursue more radical change. Lewis et al. (2019)
4
5 ask whether mainstream acceptance of a restrained feminism, with its focus on the psyche of
6
7 individual women, stymies radical versions of feminism or whether the take-up of moderate
8
9 forms of feminism provides a visible space to call for structural and cultural reform to address
10
11 the persistence of gender inequalities. While Mavin and Grandy (2019) argue that women
12
13 leaders and women-in-leadership researchers can impact gender equality via moderate
14
15 feminism, 'located in the ambiguous and imperfect place between postfeminism and
16
17 feminism', which 'offers opportunities for progressive change' (p.1558).
18
19
20

21
22 Postfeminism and moderate feminism place women leaders and those doing women-
23
24 in-leadership research - front and centre of feminist futures. Women leaders and researchers
25
26 are enmeshed in these debates, vulnerable to critique and hyper-visible as highly privileged,
27
28 mainly white, heterosexual women. Sometimes they are feminists, sometimes in their role as
29
30 leaders and knowledge-producers they are located as the problem.
31
32
33

34 **Feminist Critique of Women Leaders**

35
36 In the West, women leaders are in the minority and face inequalities, while at the same time
37
38 they are predominantly white, middle-class women and privileged. They have progressed in
39
40 organisations and in doing so they challenge the status quo by destabilising patriarchy and the
41
42 masculine order. However, this progress is seen to be at the price of privilege and working for
43
44 capital rather than being subject to capital. Women leaders are critiqued as 'corporate
45
46 feminists' (Scott, 2006:13) and 'are largely unrecognized for their efforts on behalf of
47
48 feminism. Rather they are criticized for their privilege and not being politically active on behalf
49
50 of 'ordinary' women'' (Mavin and Grandy, 2019: 1549).
51
52
53

54
55 Women leaders are critiqued by Calás et al. (2018) for advancing corporate interests,
56
57 becoming members of a system of masculinist capitalism, denying gender inequalities, and
58
59 becoming 'company women because there is nothing left to be (Gordon, 1983: 5)' (Calás et
60

1
2
3 al., 2018: 207). Women leaders who are seen to be performing ‘corporate feminism’ are
4
5 criticised, for example, for remoulding feminism and delivering ‘self-declared manifestos ...
6
7 symptomatic of a larger cultural phenomenon in which neoliberalism is fast displacing liberal
8
9 feminism’ (Rottenberg, 2014: 419). As such, feminism is seen to be corporately seduced to
10
11 produce a certain kind of hegemonic feminism (Eisenstein, 2010), embodied in women such
12
13 as Marissa Mayer and Sheryl Sandberg. Paradoxically, the success of such women in achieving
14
15 these leader positions means other women can see what they want to be; they can identify with
16
17 women leaders and recognise that women can make it to the top of organisational hierarchies.
18
19 Sealy and Singh (2008) argue that the increasing number of women who manage to break the
20
21 glass ceiling not only enhances other women’s ambitions and alleviates the danger of tokenism,
22
23 but it can also create more gender-inclusive work environments (also see Vinnicombe and
24
25 Mavin, in this Special Issue).

26
27
28
29
30
31 Women leaders are critiqued for ‘submitting’ to postfeminism. They are seen to deny
32
33 inequalities, deny the need for feminism, and to enculturate neoliberal norms of the ideal
34
35 worker. Women leaders are viewed as undermining the feminist cause in that ‘displaying
36
37 sexual and economic agency within the public sphere, means they must withhold critique of
38
39 hegemonic masculinity and disidentify as feminist’ (McRobbie, 2009: 85). Ronen (2018: 517)
40
41 argues through ‘immersion in discourses of having it all (Pomerantz et al., 2013), women
42
43 workers find that naming sexism is challenging — if not dangerous’ and ‘relegate experiences
44
45 of sexism to the past or other places and accept discrimination as part of the status quo (Gill et
46
47 al., 2017, p. 232)’.

48
49
50
51
52 There is complexity at the heart of the postfeminist thesis. A key paradox in the feminist
53
54 debate regarding women leaders is that many women want to progress to, and continue in what
55
56 can be precarious senior leadership roles. Women’s progression to leadership in politics,
57
58 business, and society surely remains instrumental for the feminist project. We propose that
59
60

1
2
3 simply by holding top organisational leader roles with significant power in otherwise men-only
4
5 hierarchies, women leaders disrupt the patriarchal social order and offer potential for structural
6
7 change and feminist progress.
8
9

11 12 **Challenges Facing Women-in-Leadership Researchers**

13
14 Women-in-management and -leadership researchers also face feminist critique for not
15
16 progressing feminism and perpetuating postfeminism. Women-in-leadership research is seen
17
18 to reproduce masculinity, (e.g., through sex variable comparisons of women to men leaders,
19
20 reproducing gender binaries, fixing the women, lack of intersectional analysis) and is viewed
21
22 as lacking a focus on gender equality (Calás et al., 2018). Further, women-in-leadership
23
24 research can appear to reinforce McRobbie's (2015: 15-16) argument that 'at most it will be
25
26 said that a competitive woman wants to make it to the top "in a man's world"', such that women
27
28 with 'inner-directed self-competitiveness' are safe guarding male privilege and reinforcing the
29
30 status quo. Thus, the 'collectivist feminist battle against patriarchal oppression and male
31
32 dominance is traded in for the axiom of individual female power and freedom of choice' (Lewis
33
34 et al., 2018: 6). The focus on the glass ceiling in women-in-leadership research is challenged
35
36 by Calás et al. (2018: 206) for reducing women-in-management literature 'to that of the life
37
38 history possibilities of only an elite few – a continuing blind spot in both the academic and the
39
40 popular literature on these topics'. In this way women-in-management literature is viewed as
41
42 'having a primary focus on the upward mobility of women' (Calás et al., 2018: 208) (read
43
44 white, middle class and privileged) through individualisation, empowerment and choice.
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 Women-in-leadership research also faces critique for producing scarce knowledge
52
53 about the experiences of women leaders from ethnic minorities. While gender has been shown
54
55 to destabilise the privilege of white women in leadership (Mavin and Grandy, 2016), they still
56
57 hold privilege as the majority of women leaders. Women of colour in leadership, as the
58
59
60

1
2
3 minority of women leaders, have their privilege destabilised further (Atewologun and Sealy,
4 2014). This ongoing instability is evident in the significant UK gender pay gap for women
5 leaders and an even wider one for women of colour who are leaders (Woodhams et al., 2015).
6
7 Showunmi et al.'s (2016) work on ethnic, gender and class intersections in women's leadership
8 experience offers a rare glimpse into the experiences of both white women leaders and minority
9 ethnic women leaders. They conclude that differences in self-definition of leadership exist in
10 the stories of white and minority ethnic women, such that the former were more likely to frame
11 their leadership identities in contemporary (neoliberal) models of leadership and the latter more
12 likely to indicate a 'simultaneous internal and external orientation that was grounded in their
13 ethno-cultural identities' (p. 928). Moreover, they also noted that white women were more
14 likely to discuss class and minority women's ethnicity. They also identify differences in the
15 experiences of Asian women leaders and Black women leaders, where the former more
16 frequently referenced cultural and religious identities while Black women leaders were more
17 likely to make reference to skin colour as part of their leadership identities. Dosekun (2015)
18 takes this argument further and ties it to postfeminism arguing that much more space needs to
19 be made for non-Western women in a postfeminism agenda and accounting for
20 intersectionality. Following Showunmi et al. (2016) and Dosekun (2015), we need to know
21 more about how intersections play out for women leaders with different ethnicities. As (white)
22 women-in-leadership researchers, we suggest that one step in this direction is that we could
23 also be explicit about our own researcher positionality and intersectional reflexivity to explain
24 why and how we produce new knowledge.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 The critiques we have highlighted leave women leaders, and women-in-leadership
52 research, in a polarised space full of tensions that risks blaming women leaders and researchers
53 for the systemic ills and inequalities that feminism reveals and seeks to counter. To progress
54 and sustain in leadership roles is to be discounted in feminist progress for advancing
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 postfeminism, corporate interests and diluting feminism, while it has been argued elsewhere
4
5 that the 'persistent rarity of women who hold senior positions in organizations illustrates why
6
7 their experiences are imperative in feminist futures' (Mavin and Grandy, 2019: 1547). In
8
9 considering new agendas for women-in-leadership researchers and contributions to feminism,
10
11 we suggest (arguably from our own privileged place) that *continued division* between women
12
13 in racialised, role, and social class terms, along with other intersecting social categories of
14
15 difference, constrains possibilities for change and challenge to patriarchy. For example, Scott
16
17 (2006) considers critiques of corporate feminists where gender is seen as trumping class while
18
19 women leaders work for capital and argues that such critique 'implies that feminism is not open
20
21 to all women; only to those of a certain class and place. These distinctions inevitably lead
22
23 toward selective discussions of who is 'inside' and who is 'outside'; a path that should be
24
25 forbidden to a social movement that hopes to encompass the world' (p. 14). Rather we view
26
27 feminism as a 'floating signifier' (Dean, 2010: 395) where feminism's precise meaning is left
28
29 open in order to explore different types of exclusions and associations as we 'see' feminism in
30
31 action.
32
33
34
35
36

37
38 Our motivation for the Special Issue is to offer alternative lenses for women-in-
39
40 leadership research and through our differences focus on challenges to patriarchy. Feminism is
41
42 not over for women leaders and researchers of women-in-leadership. Inequalities are not
43
44 consigned to the past. We continue to face an unequal high risk of failure, marginalisation, and
45
46 stigma, as well as unstable privilege and legitimacy. As women-in-leadership researchers,
47
48 following Lewis et al. (2018), we agree that individualism in feminism is not always apolitical
49
50 and that the personal as political is part of identity politics. In outlining some of the critiques
51
52 of our field we raise consciousness to opportunities for future research. However, we see
53
54 women in leadership and women-in-leadership researchers, not just as subjects of
55
56 postfeminism and gendering, 'unable to recognize their predicaments – as almost having been
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 duped into them' (Calás et al., 2018: 14). While we are socially constructed by neoliberal and
4
5 postfeminist discourses, there is agency to make innovative responses.
6
7

8 We frame these challenges as central to developing agendas to achieve equitable and
9
10 sustainable leadership futures where women leaders and women-in-leadership researchers
11
12 *thrive in their differences*. We argue that space is opening up to consider alternative agendas
13
14 for women-in-leadership to contribute to feminist theorising.
15
16
17
18

19 **The Special Issue Papers**

20
21 In this Special Issue we asked researchers to consider the complexity and paradoxes and we
22
23 thank the researchers who accepted the challenge and crafted papers offering significant
24
25 provocations for women leaders and women-in-leadership research. They are (in alphabetical
26
27 order by last name): **Helene Ahl, Karin Berglund, Laura Bierema, Karin Berglund,**
28
29 **Yvonne Benschop, Alexandra Cox, Rafia Fiaz, Hayley Finn, Rita Gardiner, Elisabeth**
30
31 **Anna Guenther, Weixin He, Patricia Lewis, Katarina Pettersson, Jenny Rodriguez,**
32
33 **Malin Tillmar, Eunbi Sim, Sue Vinnicombe and Melissa Yoong.**
34
35
36
37

38 The complexity and inherent tensions for feminist theorising in women-in-leadership
39
40 research are explored in three broad themes within this Special Issue: i) **Resistance to**
41
42 **postfeminism and identifying alternative feminist futures**, including **Speaking (Out) as**
43
44 **resistance**; ii) **Intersectional approaches**; and iii) **Women-in-leadership progress in**
45
46 **practice and interventions for change for women-in-leadership.**
47
48

49 **Resistance to postfeminism and identifying alternative feminist futures** is a key
50
51 theme in the Special Issue in order to challenge postfeminist discourse, current feminist
52
53 critiques of women leaders and to pave the way for new avenues for women-in-leadership
54
55 research. In their paper *Gendered Hybridity in Leadership Identities: A Postfeminist Analysis*,
56
57 Patricia Lewis and Yvonne Benschop consider the discursive constitution of leadership
58
59
60

1
2
3 identities by senior women leaders working in the City of London. Through an empirical study,
4 they highlight how the gendered hybridity of leadership identities unfolds the possibility for a
5 fundamental makeover of leadership by opening-up space for a transformative change that
6 accommodates women leaders. In one of the very few studies that foreground the leadership
7 identities that women leaders construct within the confines of postfeminist gender regimes, the
8 study shows how these women invoke authenticity, unfolding possibilities for the
9 transformational change of and political challenge to, traditional gendered leadership in their
10 organisations.

21 Karin Berglund, Helene Ahl, Katarina Pettersson and Malin Tillmar's paper
22 *Conceptualising Feminist Resistance in the Postfeminist terrain*, focuses on women
23 entrepreneurs as leaders and women leaders as entrepreneurs, discussing an empirical study of
24 women rural entrepreneurs. They draw upon philosopher Jonna Bornemark (2020; 2018) who
25 has interest in the connections between contemporary neoliberal culture and the thought system
26 established during the enlightenment (mind over body), who suggests that we are able to resist
27 the ratio(nality) of neoliberalism, including the autonomous individual, by leaning on our
28 *intellectus* ability. Berglund et al. (2022) explore how feminist resistance unfolds as an
29 interactive and iterative learning process where the subject recognises their voice, strengthens
30 their voice, believes in a relational process, and finally sees themselves as a fully-fledged actor
31 who finds ways to overcome obstacles that get in their way. Conceptualising resistance as a
32 learning process stands in sharp contrast to the idea of resistance as enacted by the autonomous
33 self. The study enables researchers to understand that what they may have seen as a sign of
34 weakness among women, is instead a sign of strength: it is a first step in learning resistance
35 that may help women create a life different from that prescribed by the postfeminist discourse.
36 In this way, researchers can avoid reproducing women as 'weak and inadequate'.

1
2
3 *Speaking (Out) as Resistance* is considered by Melissa Yoong, who uses feminist
4 critical discourse analysis in the paper “*If Your Voice Isn’t Accepted, Does it Mean You Stop*
5 *Talking?*”: *exploring a woman leader’s reversal of postfeminist confidence discourses*. Yoong
6 (2022) offers a lens for the exploration of women leaders’ production of resistance through
7 postfeminist discourses. Through the case study of Bozoma Saint John, a high-profile Black
8 C-Suite executive, the study examines micro-acts of subversion and considers the extent to
9 which they can promote feminist thinking in the corporate world and the implications for
10 feminist theorising about women in leadership. The paper demonstrates how Saint John
11 reproduces elements of the postfeminist confidence discourse to defy stereotypes of Black
12 women, while simultaneously reversing the individualistic conception of confidence in favour
13 of corporate and collective action. Combining reverse discourse, intersectionality, and feminist
14 poststructuralism with a micro-level analysis of women leaders’ language use can help to
15 capture the ways postfeminist concepts are given new subversive meanings. Whereas existing
16 studies have focused on how elite women’s promotion of confidence sustains the status quo,
17 this study shifts the research gaze to the resistance realised through rearticulations of
18 confidence, illustrating how women-in-leadership research can advance feminist theorising
19 without vilifying senior women even as they participate in postfeminist logics of success.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 Speaking out as resistance using policy is also illustrated in the paper by Rita Gardiner
43 and Hayley Finn, *Implementing gender-based violence policies in the neoliberal university:*
44 *challenges and contradictions*, where they outline three women leaders’ engagement in the
45 implementation of a gender-based violence policy in academia. They highlight the challenges
46 women leaders in academia face in putting policy into practice through four interconnected
47 themes: 1) The insidious institutional roots of gender-based violence (GBV); 2) naming, or
48 lack thereof; 3) pockets of resistance, and 4) balancing contradictions. Gardiner and Finn
49 (2022) illustrate how leading institutional policy change, in and of itself an act of resistance,
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 requires determination and courageous action to combat organisational sexism (Ahmed, 2021).
4
5 They offer learning from women leaders' practical experiences to support feminist scholars in
6
7 understanding the difficulties effecting institutional change, especially regarding turning GBV
8
9 policy into practice. They demonstrate how this action is not without risk to the careers of those
10
11 willing to speak out against gender injustice in the workplace (Gardner and Finn, 2022).
12
13

14
15 **Intersectional approaches** to women-in-leadership research and feminist futures is a
16
17 theme developed in the Special Issue. First, in their paper, *Feminist futures in gender-in-*
18
19 *leadership research: self-reflexive approximations to intersectional situatedness*, Jenny
20
21 Rodriguez, Elisabeth Anna Guenther and Rafia Fiaz, reveal the narrow and restricted
22
23 understandings of leadership and how this influences who is regarded as a legitimate leader.
24
25 Utilizing memory work, a methodology that is not commonly used in gender-in-leadership
26
27 research, they situate their understandings and experiences of leadership as part of socio-
28
29 historical contexts. Intersectional situatedness helps to identify tangible ways to see how
30
31 inequalities impact women's career progression to leadership and enable more nuanced
32
33 conversations about privilege and disadvantage to advance feminist social justice agendas
34
35 (Rodriguez et al., 2022). They argue that adopting an intersectional situatedness approach helps
36
37 to advance the field by embedding the recognition, problematisation, and theorisation of
38
39 situated difference as critical to understanding leadership, its meaning, and its practice in
40
41 management and organisations. They contend that, memory work and intersectional reflexivity
42
43 offer more inclusive understandings of leadership that recognise difference positively and
44
45 support changing the narratives around the meaning of "leader" and "good leadership"
46
47 (Rodriquez et al., 2022).
48
49
50
51
52

53
54 Second, in an invited Viewpoint article, *Reflections on Women's Progress into*
55
56 *Leadership in the UK and Suggested Areas for Future Research*, Sue Vinnicombe in
57
58 collaboration with Sharon Mavin, draw on data from the annual UK Female FTSE Board
59
60

1
2
3 Report (2021) and the Hidden Truth Report (2022), tracking gender diversity on UK company
4 boards. They outline reflections on progress and jointly suggest areas for future women-in
5 leadership research. They argue that intersectional representation of women in company boards
6 is dire and unacceptable. They call for intersectional approaches as a priority to extend research
7 into how race, ethnicity and social class as social identities impact on women's experiences of
8 leadership and in reproducing inequalities (Vinnicombe and Mavin, 2022).
9

10
11 The third theme in the Special Issue is a focus on **women-in-leadership progress in**
12 **practice and interventions for change in practice for women-in-leadership**. In their paper,
13 Vinnicombe and Mavin (2022) reflect on the progress of women on boards and identify a
14 research agenda of 12 specific areas for future women-in-leadership research. Key areas of
15 focus for change include: stop making the business case for gender diversity in leadership and
16 stop focusing on fixing women; examining access and appointment to the roles of Chief
17 Finance Office/Finance Director, Senior Independent Director and Chair of the board, and
18 conducting structured research into the role of bias in these senior appointments; interrogating
19 why we have so few Finance Directors in FTSE companies when as many women as men study
20 and qualify in finance/accounting; and returning to examining barriers to women's progress at
21 middle management and the role of managers and leaders in progressing gender diversity in
22 the middle of organisations.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 Laura Bierema, Eunbi Sim, Weixin He and Alexandra Cox's paper *Double Jeopardy:*
45 *The Paradox and Promise of Coaching Women Leaders from a Critical Feminist Perspective*,
46 identifies coaching as offering potential for **Interventions for change in practice for women-**
47 **in-leadership**, and also speaks to the themes of **Resistance, and Speaking (out) as resistance**.
48 Bierema et al. (this issue) interrogate the "double-jeopardy" in widely-adopted women's
49 leadership development interventions aimed at "fixing" women. Their paper explores critical
50 feminist coaching perspectives and practices, and offers more equitable and just alternatives
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 for developing women leaders. Their study highlights how postfeminist approaches in
4
5 organisations are little scrutinized due to the dominant postfeminist discourse that women's
6
7 subordination and oppression have been “resolved” through neoliberal, individualistic
8
9 interventions, such as postfeminist coaching programs. Infusing the message of “fixing
10
11 women” through emphasizing “4 C’s”—confidence, control, courage, and competition,
12
13 postfeminist coaching programmes have been submitting women leaders to “double jeopardy.”
14
15 They critique this postfeminist coaching paradox from a critical feminist perspective
16
17 foregrounding “4 R’s”—reflecting, reforming, raising, and rebuilding— promising more
18
19 equitable, just development. Their study is the first of its kind in describing critical feminist
20
21 coaching and presentation of a conceptual and practical model of the process. Identifying
22
23 postfeminist coaching as the disavowal of feminist values and failure to challenge gender
24
25 hegemony in the coaching process, Bierema et al (this issue) propose a model of critical
26
27 feminist coaching—CFC—defined as the explicit embrace of feminist values and challenge of
28
29 gender hegemony in the coaching process. CFC offers alternatives for developing women
30
31 leaders amid paradoxical, complex, capitalist systems, through a critical lens challenging
32
33 postfeminism.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 **Future Research**

43
44 We wish to add *Interrogating Public Responses to Sexism* to agendas for future women-in-
45
46 leadership research to problematise the critique that privileged (white) women leaders, holding
47
48 both a place of marginalization (as a minority relative to men), and privilege (as white and with
49
50 positional power), reject discrimination and sexism and deny the feminist cause. We propose
51
52 that a new avenue for future women-in-leadership research in contributing to feminism is to
53
54 interrogate the changing contours of postfeminism, examining whether and how it is changing
55
56 by interrogating public responses to sexism. Rather than women leaders denying inequalities
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and withholding challenges to patriarchy, we identify profound examples of women leaders in
4
5 the UK calling out sexism, calling for collective action, provoking others into feminism, and
6
7 challenging masculine hegemony. We offer the case of Amanda Blanc, a white, elite, privileged
8
9 CEO of global company Aviva. In her position as CEO, Amanda Blanc increased the number
10
11 of women on the Board by recently appointing the first woman to the role of Chief Finance
12
13 Officer for the FTSE organisation Aviva. Shortly afterwards as she faced sexism and misogyny
14
15 from her shareholders in the company's Annual General Meeting (May 2022). She very
16
17 publicly calls out the shareholder behaviour in her personal LinkedIn post (Blanc, 2022), which
18
19 states:
20
21
22
23

24 In all honesty, after 30+ years in Financial Services I am pretty used to sexist and
25 derogatory comments like those in the AGM yesterday. Sadly, just like many other
26 women in business, I've picked up my fair share of misogynistic scars whilst travelling
27 on my journey through various companies and boardrooms until arriving at Aviva. We
28 all have our own stories... I guess that after you have heard the same prejudicial rhetoric
29 for so long though, it makes you a little immune to it all. I would like to tell you that
30 things have got better in recent years but it's fair to say that it has actually increased -
31 the more senior the role I have taken, the more overt the unacceptable behaviour. The
32 surprising thing is that this type of stuff used to be said in private, perhaps from the
33 safety of four walls inside an office - the fact that people are now making these
34 comments in a public AGM is a new development for me personally. I can only hope
35 that initiatives seeking gender equality like [#womeninfinance](#) and others can slowly
36 eradicate this type of occurrence for the next generation - but in truth that seems a long
37 way off; even with the help of some fantastically supportive men who speak out on the
38 issue. So we have little choice other than to redouble our efforts together...
39
40
41
42

43 Amanda Blanc's post raises a number of key issues. She is 'used to sexist comments',
44
45 has 'misogynistic scars' and after so long 'it makes you a little immune to it' but she recognises
46
47 that sexism and inequalities increase the closer to power you get as a woman, where the
48
49 unacceptable behaviour is more overt. She uses her voice in a public space to outline how the
50
51 backlash to women achieving power has moved from secret to public spaces and calls on
52
53 gender equality initiatives and others to 'redouble our efforts together'. Amanda Blanc, a white,
54
55 privileged, elite leader who has power and freedom of choice, does not brush this sexism aside.
56
57 She does not deny feminism, and although subject to the discourse of having it all, she does
58
59
60

1
2
3 not ignore the inequalities she faces. Amanda Blanc does not safeguard male privilege nor
4
5 reinforce the status quo; she publicly resists and challenges patriarchal oppression, using her
6
7 privilege to call for collective action against gender inequality and sexism. In doing so, she
8
9 provokes others into feminism.
10
11

12
13 Amanda Blanc's LinkedIn post was picked up by UK broadsheet newspapers and
14
15 others, as well as social media who, unusually, communicated a clear message that gender
16
17 inequality and sexism is unacceptable. This is an important stance by the media who have
18
19 power in constructing who is culturally intelligible in discourse. The Guardian newspaper
20
21 headline (Makortoff, 2022) is an example, "*Unacceptable*": *Aviva CEO hits back at*
22
23 *shareholder sexism along*', along with the by-line of '*Amanda Blanc says sexism in business*
24
25 *has actually got worse after being told she is "not the man for the job"*'.

26
27
28 Significantly, in different media, we hear how the Aviva Chairman George Culmer who
29
30 chaired the AGM, 'hit out at shareholders after investors subjected female company executives
31
32 to a barrage of sexist comments, at the company's first in-person AGM since the start of the
33
34 pandemic' (CITY A.M, 2022). This is important public ally-ship from a man demonstrating
35
36 feminism and resistance to sexism and misogyny. Culmer is reported by CITY A.M as being
37
38 left 'flabbergasted' by a barrage of 'inappropriate' comments, such as one investor suggesting
39
40 that 'Blanc – who joined Aviva in July 2020 as the insurer's first female chief executive – was
41
42 'not the man for the job''. The article reports that another shareholder asked whether 'Blanc
43
44 should be wearing trousers', as he made reference to Blanc's (men) predecessors at the firm.
45
46 A small investor, after congratulating the board for its high levels of gender diversity, was
47
48 reported as saying: 'they are so good at basic housekeeping activities, I'm sure this will be
49
50 reflected in the direction of the board in future' (CITY A.M, 2022). The chairman reportedly
51
52 'hit back as he slammed the shareholders' inappropriate comments' (CITY A.M, 2022).
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 This is an example of sexism centred on women's bodies and appearance and highlights
4
5 the continued policing of women's bodies as a way of silencing them. This discrimination not
6
7 only objectifies women - what they are good for - but is also a powerful way to oppress women.
8
9
10 What is the counterargument to the claim that Amanda Blanc should be 'wearing pants'? The
11
12 interpretation of silence is that there is no answer.
13

14
15 One critique of women leaders subject to postfeminism is that they are more likely not
16
17 to publicly confront sexist comments because by virtue of their top role they are expected to
18
19 rise above them and to do otherwise is challenging and dangerous (Ronen, 2018). We suggest
20
21 that there are public indications that (some) women leaders in the UK are no longer prepared
22
23 to accommodate aspects of postfeminism. They are rejecting the need to downplay sexism as
24
25 something from the past or that occurs in other contexts (e.g., not here but maybe somewhere
26
27 else). Nor are they accepting discrimination as part of the status quo (Gill et al., 2017; Ronen,
28
29 2018). Are the voices of women leaders, men allies and the public in the UK growing louder
30
31 in calling out unacceptable gendering and inequalities? Is there change as a result of women
32
33 holding powerful positions of leadership which is aggravating public displays of sexism?
34
35 Publicly calling out sexism and provoking feminism may be a space where women leaders can
36
37 *be* feminist, articulate experiences of disadvantage, call for collective action and, acknowledge
38
39 inequality and challenge patriarchy. We suggest that interrogating public responses to sexism
40
41 is a fruitful avenue for future feminist women-in-leadership research and offers potentialities
42
43 for agency in defiance of postfeminism agendas.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 **Concluding Reflections**

52
53 The collection of papers that form this Special Issue present a critical and creative challenge to
54
55 theorising women leaders in relation to postfeminism, and women's leadership within
56
57 neoliberal political economies. Collectively, the empirical and theoretical diversity of this
58
59
60

1
2
3 collection of papers shifts the binary, and the gendered ways in which women leaders are
4 studied and understood. The themes that thread through the different contributions illustrate
5 how women leaders resist the postfeminist and neoliberal contexts that are intimately
6 intertwined with their leadership positions and how women-in-leadership researchers can
7 pursue alternative feminist theorising: i) Resistance to postfeminism and identifying alternative
8 feminist futures, including Speaking (Out) as resistance; ii) Intersectional approaches; and iii)
9 Women-in-leadership progress in practice and interventions for change for women-in-
10 leadership. The papers identify the structural constraints and challenges women leaders face,
11 and suggestions for the insights that can emerge by taking research stances that are reflexive
12 and draw attention to researcher intersectionality, and that further communicate how women
13 speak out to resist sexism, provoking feminism. The proposals and contributions here also urge
14 a resistance to gendered approaches to women's leadership development that can reinforce a
15 cycle of post-feminist orthodoxy that traps women leaders within conformist subordination.
16 Taken together, the papers in the Special Issue challenge women-in-leadership feminist
17 theorising to recognise and make explicit similarities in the way women in leadership roles
18 may face common challenges of institutional sexism whilst simultaneously experiencing
19 leadership differentially. In doing so, the Special Issue identifies multiple and intersecting axes
20 of difference as essential for advancing women-in-leadership research. Finally, this Special
21 Issue illustrates the potential for more in-depth and nuanced methodologies that bring forth the
22 complexities of the field and the need to continue to press for progress and change.

50 **Acknowledgements:**

51 We thank all contributors, Adelina Broadbridge (Journal Editor), Lynne Brierley (Editorial
52 Office) and Emma Ferguson (Commissioning Editor, Emerald), for their ongoing support in
53 producing the Special Issue.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- Ahmed, S. 2021. *Complaint!* Duke University Press.
- Atewologun, D., & Sealy, R. (2014). Experiencing privilege at ethnic, gender and senior intersections. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*.
- Berglund, K., Ahl, H., Pettersson, K. and Tillmar, M. 2022. Conceptualising Feminist Resistance in the Postfeminist terrain. *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, (ahead-of-print).
- Bierema, L., Sim, E., He, W. and Cox, A. 2022. Double Jeopardy: The Paradox and Promise of Coaching Women Leaders from a Critical Feminist Perspective. *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, (ahead-of-print).
- Blanc, A. (2022). Aviva CEO LinkedIn feed:
<https://www.linkedin.com/feed/update/urn:li:activity:6929930550027665408/>
(accessed 17.5.22).
- Boatman, S.A. (2007) Twenty Years of Women's Leadership: Have We Come "A Long Way, Baby?" (2007). *Journal of Women in Educational Leadership*. P.46.
<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/jwel/46>
- Butler, J. (2013). For white girls only? Postfeminism and the politics of inclusion. *Feminist Formations*, 25(1), pp.35-58.
- Calás, M. B., Smircich, L., & Ergene, S. (2017). Postfeminism as new materialisms: A future unlike the present?. In *Postfeminism and organization* pp. 197-228. Routledge.
- CITY A.M. (2022) Aviva chair hits back at shareholders following 'inappropriate' comments at AGM, CITY A.M WEDNESDAY 11 MAY 2022 8:29 AM,
<https://www.cityam.com/aviva-chair-hits-back-at-shareholders-following-inappropriate-comments-at-agm/> accessed 17.5.22

- 1
2
3 Dean, J. (2010). Feminism in the papers: Contested feminisms in the British quality press.
4
5 *Feminist Media Studies*, 10(4), pp. 391–407.
6
7
8 Dosekun, S. (2015). For Western girls only? *Feminist Media Studies*, 15(6), pp.960-975.
9
10 Eisenstein, H. (2010). Interview with Campbell, S. and Orr, J. The corporate seduction of
11
12 feminism, *The Socialist Review*, (343) Jan [http://socialistreview.org.uk/343/corporate-](http://socialistreview.org.uk/343/corporate-seduction-feminism)
13
14 [seduction-feminism](http://socialistreview.org.uk/343/corporate-seduction-feminism) (accessed 3/01/2017).
15
16
17 Elliott, C., & Stead, V. (2018). Constructing women’s leadership representation in the UK
18
19 press during a time of financial crisis: Gender capitals and dialectical
20
21 tensions. *Organization Studies*, 39(1), pp. 19-45.
22
23
24 Gardiner, R. and Finn, H. 2022. Implementing gender-based violence policies in the neoliberal
25
26 university: challenges and contradictions. *Gender in Management: An International*
27
28 *Journal*, (ahead-of-print).
29
30
31 Gill, R. (2007). *Gender and the Media*. Cambridge, Polity
32
33
34 Griffin, C. (1995). Feminism, social-psychology and qualitative research. *Psychologist*, 8(3),
35
36 pp. 119-121.
37
38 Lewis, P. and Benschop, Y. 2022. Gendered Hybridity in Leadership Identities: A Postfeminist
39
40 Analysis. *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, (ahead-of-print).
41
42
43 Lewis, P., Adamson, M., Biese, I. and Kelan, E., (2019). Introduction to special issue:
44
45 Exploring the emergence of moderate feminism (s) in contemporary organizations. *Gender,*
46
47 *Work & Organization*, (26), pp.1063-1072.
48
49
50 Lewis, P., Benschop, Y., & Simpson, R. (Eds.). (2018). *Postfeminism and organization*. New
51
52 York: Routledge.
53
54
55 Makortoff, K. (2022) ‘Unacceptable’: Aviva CEO hits back at shareholder sexism Amanda
56
57 Blanc says sexism in business has actually got worse after being told she is ‘not the man for
58
59 the job’ *The Guardian Newspaper online*, Thursday 12th May,
60

1
2
3 [https://www.theguardian.com/inequality/2022/may/11/used-to-it-aviva-ceo-responds-after-](https://www.theguardian.com/inequality/2022/may/11/used-to-it-aviva-ceo-responds-after-sexist-comments-at-agm)
4 [sexist-comments-at-agm](https://www.theguardian.com/inequality/2022/may/11/used-to-it-aviva-ceo-responds-after-sexist-comments-at-agm) (accessed 17.5.22)
5
6

7 Mavin, S., Elliott, C., Stead, V., & Williams, J. (2019). Economies of visibility as a
8 moderator of feminism: 'Never mind Brexit. Who won Legs-it!'. *Gender, Work &*
9 *Organization*, 26(8), pp. 1156-1175.
10
11
12

13 Mavin, S., & Grandy, G. (2019). Women leaders, self-body-care and corporate moderate
14 feminism: An (im) perfect place for feminism. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 26(11), pp.
15 1546-1561.
16
17
18
19

20 McRobbie, A. (2015). Notes on the perfect: Competitive femininity in neoliberal times.
21 *Australian Feminist Studies*, 30(83), pp. 3–20.
22
23

24 McRobbie, A. (2009). *The aftermath of feminism: Gender, culture and social change*. Los
25 Angeles, CA: Sage.
26
27
28

29 Negra, D. (2009). *What a girl wants?: Fantasizing the reclamation of self in postfeminism*.
30 London: Routledge.
31
32
33

34 Ozkazanç-Pan, B., (2019). On agency and empowerment in a# MeToo world. *Gender, Work*
35 *& Organization*, 26(8), pp.1212-1220.
36
37
38

39 Rodriguez, J.K., Guenther, E.A. and Faiz, R., 2022. Feminist futures in gender-in-leadership
40 research: self-reflexive approximations to intersectional situatedness. *Gender in*
41 *Management: An International Journal*, (ahead-of-print).
42
43
44
45

46 Ronen, S. (2018). The postfeminist ideology at work: Endorsing gender essentialism and
47 denying feminine devaluation in the case of design work. *Gender, Work &*
48 *Organization*, 25(5), pp. 514-530.
49
50
51
52

53 Rottenberg, C. (2014). The rise of neoliberal feminism. *Cultural studies*, 28(3), pp. 418-437.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Showunmi, V., Atewologun, D. & Bebbington, D. (2016). Ethnic, gender and class
4 intersections in British women's leadership experiences. *Educational Management*
5
6 *Administration & Leadership*, 44(6), pp.917-935.
7
8
9
10 Scott, L. M. (2006). Market feminism: The case for a paradigm shift. *Advertising & Society*
11
12 *Review*, 7(2).
13
14 Sealy, R., & Singh, V. (2008). The importance of role models in the development of leaders'
15 professional identities. In *Leadership perspectives* (pp. 208-222). Palgrave Macmillan,
16
17 London.
18
19
20
21 Stead, V., & Elliott, C. (2019). Pedagogies of power: Media artefacts as public pedagogy for
22 women's leadership development. *Management Learning*, 50(2), pp. 171-188.
23
24
25
26 Tzanakou, C. and Pearce, R., (2019). Moderate feminism within or against the neoliberal
27 university? The example of Athena SWAN. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 26(8),
28
29 pp.1191-1211.
30
31
32
33 Whelehan, I. (1995). *Modern feminist thought: From the second wave to post-feminism*. New
34
35 York: NYU Press.
36
37
38 Vinnicombe, S. and Mavin, S., 2022. Reflections on women's progress into leadership in the
39
40 UK and suggested areas for future research. *Gender in Management: An International*
41
42 *Journal*, (ahead-of-print).
43
44
45 Woodhams, C., Lupton, B., & Cowling, M. (2015). The snowballing penalty effect: multiple
46
47 disadvantage and pay. *British Journal of Management*, 26(1), pp. 63-77.
48
49
50 Yoong, M., 2022. "If your voice isn't accepted, does it mean you stop talking?": exploring a
51
52 woman leader's reversal of postfeminist confidence discourses. *Gender in*
53
54 *Management: An International Journal*, (ahead-of-print).
55
56
57
58
59
60