

1

STUDYING MEN, MASCULINITIES, ORGANIZATIONS AND ORGANIZING

Introducing the Handbook

Jeff Hearn, Kadri Aavik, David L. Collinson and Anika Thym

A topic that is always topical

The links between men, masculinities, organizations and organizing are many and various. Studying these connections is particularly important because of the ubiquity, influence and power of organizations and organizing as pervasive human endeavours. Many contemporary societies are highly organized and organizational in character, so that from even before birth to even after death, lives are structured, shaped and mediated by organizations and organizing. While organizations and organizing can have transnational and global impacts, they can also reach into areas often considered to be the most personal and private.

Men continue to dominate many organizations, in particular, in their positions of power, authority and leadership, and effectively direct several forms of organizing, whether on the local and immediate, the national or the global scale. Men's contribution in bringing on and exacerbating some of the current crises of global dimensions is significant. For instance, men's practices and masculinities are central to understanding war, as in the Russian Federation's invasion of Ukraine,¹ the ecological crises (Pulé & Hultman, 2021),² the concentrations and inequalities of the global economic system,³ and the rise of populism, nationalism, the manosphere (Sugiura, 2021) and viral masculinity (Ashcraft, 2022).

Moreover, often such political and organizational issues are presented in strangely gender-neutral terms. To take just one item in the news, reported as we completed this Handbook, namely, that "1,000 super-emitting methane leaks risk triggering climate tipping points", mostly from oil and gas facilities in various locations across the globe, but especially Russia, Turkmenistan and the United States. One leak alone is equivalent to 67 million running cars. While there is no mention of gender in the report, these leaks are very much the business of certain men and masculinities, in terms of the ownership and economic interests of the sector, neglect and lack of care, and the actions of individuals and groups (Kühne et al., 2022; Carrington, 2023).

The connections between men, masculinities, organizations and organizing recur across multiple social realms – from global political economy and transnational flows to societal

gender orders and regimes, the organization of society and societies, gendered labour markets, social movements, vertical and horizontal gender divisions in and around organizations, to leadership, management and organizational cultures – all frequently reflecting and reinforcing men and masculinities. More conceptually, they are also central to questions of practice(s), discourses, communicative practices, identities, embodiments, stereotypes and symbols, social processes, and social structures – of different scales and scopes.

It is important to draw attention to men and masculinities in relation to not only (social) organization and organizations but also various forms of organizing. The concept of organizing can itself refer to several different aspects and phenomena. These include internal processes within formal organizations; organizing as action/agency, both individual and collective; organizing outside formal organizations, for example, social movement organizing; various kinds of distributed, dispersed and network organizations; online/digital/cyberorganizing; as well as what has come to be known as “organizationality”. All of these meanings extend beyond what is sometimes assumed by the notions of organization and organizations, and all are relevant to the Handbook.

In the Handbook, the first of its kind in specifically addressing the relations of men, masculinities, organizations and organizing, we bring together contemporary work by scholars, both well-established and emerging, from all major world regions. The collection considers a range of theoretical and methodological approaches, and engages with multiple topics on both formal organizations, such as businesses and state organizations, and processes of organizing within and beyond organizations. The volume addresses emergent and future issues on men, masculinities and organizations, such as men’s violences, tech masculinities, animal advocacy and environmental issues, and men and masculinities in pandemics. The Handbook provides a resource for scholars, policymakers, practitioners and students interested in links between men, masculinities, organizations and organizing, and working in and beyond such fields as gender studies, organization, leadership and management studies, political science, sociology, social and public policy, and social movement studies.

A growing body of studies

While there are a host of texts, including some so-called classics, not least *The Organization Man* (Whyte, 1956), in studies of organizations and organizing that are all about men and masculinities, the explicit gendering of men and masculinities has often been absent. In the wake of Second Wave feminism, and particularly from the late 1970s and 1980s onwards, a growing body of studies by women, men and further genders has focused on men and masculinities in and around organizations in explicitly critical, gendered and sometimes intersectional ways.

Kanter’s (1977) *Men and Women of the Corporation* was a landmark study, addressing social dynamics within men’s leadership and management (also see Kanter, 1993; Collinson & Hearn, 1995, 2005, 2014) and managerial homosociality. The area of research has become more consolidated in and since the 1990s, with many more specific sub-fields of study. Wide-ranging collections include *Men as Managers, Managers as Men* (Collinson & Hearn, 1996), the special journal issue of *Social Problems* on masculine contest cultures (Berdahl et al., 2018, also this volume), and *Making it Like a Man: Men, Masculinities and the Modern Career* (Aavik et al., 2020).

Among the many questions that were addressed relatively early in the 1980s and 1990s included men and masculinities in bureaucracies (Bologh, 1990; Morgan, 1996), on the

factory shop floor, and in management–labour relations (Collinson, 1992), along with their intersections with class inequalities (Cockburn, 1983) and national contexts (Reis, 2004; Tienari et al., 2010); the historical relations and transformations in reproducing patriarchies (Hearn, 1992; Collinson & Hearn, 1994; Roper, 1994; Wajcman, 1998); diverse occupational, managerial and professional identities formations (Kerfoot & Knights, 1993; Barrett, 1996; Kerfoot & Whitehead, 2000), and men’s sexualities at work (Metcalf & Humphries, 1985; Roper, 1996) and in leisure time (Allison, 1994). Many of these studies have been framed within analysis of gendered inequalities and inequalities regimes (Acker, 2006), including unequal pay and reward systems, largest pay gaps often at managerial levels, and more specific studies of discrimination against women in selection (Collinson et al., 1990), and (mis)management of sexual harassment cases (Collinson & Collinson, 1989, 1996).

Of the many more focused and more recent examples of studies on men and masculinities, examples include those in the finance sector (Thym, 2019, 2020; Blomberg, 2009; Ho, 2009; Zaloom, 2006; Knights & Tullberg, 2014); use of masculine metaphors (McCabe & Knights, 2016); the “masculinization” of ethical leadership (Lui, 2017, 2021; Knights, 2022); intersectional analysis of interviews with managers (Aavik, 2015); workplace surveillance regimes (Payne, 2018); men opting out of mainstream work (Thym, 2019, 2020; Biese, 2021); impacts of neoliberalism (Cornwall et al., 2016; Garlick, 2020; Wolfman et al., 2021); danger and disaster (Messerschmidt, 1995; Maier & Messerschmidt, 1998; Collinson, 1999); diversity and diversity management (Hearn & Collinson, 2006, 2009); possibilities for men’s non-oppressive, even profeminist, organizing, management and leadership (Hearn, 1989; Luyt & Starck, 2020); and global value chains and inter-organizational relations (McCarthy et al., 2021; also this volume). Men and masculinities in organizations also need to be understood in terms of the relations of home and work, and domestic situations. For example, some men managers can be usefully understood as “father-managers” (Hearn & Niemistö, 2012) sometimes distancing themselves from children and family, showing corporate commitment, yet reinforcing gendered stresses in families, with their own gendered power relations (Collinson & Collinson, 1997). This Handbook builds on these and many other earlier research studies.

In addition, management, and indeed management studies, especially corporate management, have often assumed to be consistent with characteristics traditionally valued in men, despite contrary evidence. Indeed not all versions of men’s (dominating) leadership rely on what might be seen as heroic models of leadership and management; in some contexts, there seem to be movements towards the post-heroic, and the development of subordinates’ capabilities within distributed, project and network organizing; such shifts do not, however, necessarily reduce men’s power at the structural level. While much of the research on men and masculinities has been driven by critical, feminist(ic) scholarship concerned with the analysis of gender power relations in workplaces, organizations and management, some are linked to more corporate agendas, such as that on “talent management”, management development and diversity management.

Yet, despite all of this, the taken-for-grantedness of men and certain organizational masculinities, as unmarked categories, is very widespread in both everyday organizational practice and policy, and studies thereon. Men’s domination of leadership, management, organizations and organizing is still not an explicitly gendered topic of concern in mainstream social science, and not even in much critical social science. Most mainstream studies of organizations, leadership and management do not seem to notice they are very often talking about men and masculinities: they generally do not gender men.

Theories, disciplines and methodologies

In focusing on men, masculinities, organizations and organizing, the Handbook brings together and creates dialogue between various critical approaches and disciplines. These diverse fields of research, such as gender, feminist and queer studies, leadership and management studies, organization studies, business studies, social movement studies, decolonial and post-colonial approaches, internet studies, science and technology studies (STS), and research in education and higher education, have not necessarily engaged with each other significantly, as well as sociology, political science, economics, cultural studies, psychology and social psychology.

In studying these questions, a wide range of methodological approaches and research methods have been employed (on men, masculinities and methodologies, see Pini & Pease, 2013). Quantitative methods have been important in addressing the numerical dominance of men, especially at the highest levels, and pay and reward systems and outcomes. Qualitative methods, including case studies, often drawing on feminist methodologies, have been more widely used, for example, in examining gendered organizational processes. Discursive and textual methods of various kinds have become more popular in recent years. There has been a consistent impact of feminist theories, and a persistent concern with the intersections of gender with class, racialization and ethnicity, occupation, and organizational position and status.

More recent work inspired by posthumanist and feminist new materialist approaches, as well as affect theory (see Mellström & Pease, 2023) highlights the material, including embodied, affective and relational dimensions pertaining to men and masculinities, contesting the centrality of the discursive. These perspectives have methodological implications for the study of men and masculinities, including in the context of organizations and organizing. Existing methodologies and methods in critical studies on men and masculinities (CSMM), however, are predominantly focused on studying men and masculinities through discursive representations which have significant limitations for accessing the non-discursive. Thus, new methodological approaches could be considered and developed in studying men, masculinities, organizations and organizing that go beyond textual analysis to capture elements of life such as affects, embodiment, performances, relations, the more-than-human and their entanglements (Vannini, 2015).

Critical studies on men and masculinities

Further to various disciplines and disciplinary contexts and influences noted, particular mention needs to be made of CSMM, as a sub-field of feminist and gender studies. These studies examine men, boys and masculinities critically in the light of feminist, gender, queer and kindred studies. Though theoretically and methodologically diverse, these studies are generally historical, cultural, relational, materialist, deconstructive, anti-essentialist (Hearn, 1997) and indeed critical studies on men and masculinities. In some cases, there is more emphasis on homogenizations, generalizations and categoricism in talking about “men”, without taking into account differences among men and struggles, but often there has been close attention to context, specificity and difference. These two tendencies have also often been held in creative tension.

Accordingly, in talking about “men” and “masculinities”, the terms and their usage always need to be contextualized, including the differences and struggles among and between men as well as other genders and transgressions towards non-binary genders (Aultman, 2019;

Köllen, 2016). In many situations and societies, men are assumed to contrast with women, to be seen as adult cis-males, and to be the “foundation” of masculinities. But that is not always so. Some societies, probably an increasing number, recognize third, or fourth, sexes and genders, non-cis and trans men.

Masculinities can be understood variously as, for example, the traits, identities, psychodynamics and individual and collective practices of men, and boys, but masculinities can also be taken up by women, female-identified people, and non-binary, agender and queer people. To talk about men and masculinities, it is necessary to recognize structural gendered power relations at local, institutional, societal, transnational and global levels, as well as how differently positioned men’s and boys’ experiences vary and relate to ideals of masculinity differently. This is part of the attempt to avoid simplified or distorted accounts of men, masculinities and gender relations.

Intersectionality in studying men and masculinities

In addition, intersectional perspectives to studying men are imperative. Indeed, intersectionality has been present implicitly and more explicitly in much of the key theoretical and empirical works in CSMM. For instance, the concept of hegemonic masculinity is theorized in relation to other, marginalized and subordinated masculinities (see Connell, 1987; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005), thus distinguishing more privileged forms of masculinity from less privileged ones and considering their interactions. Scholarship on the notion of hybrid masculinities (Bridges & Pascoe, 2014) primarily concerns young white heterosexual men and intersections between these categories.

Approaching men and masculinities through intersectionality, however, poses a number of conceptual difficulties and dilemmas, including those related to definitions of the concept of intersectionality itself. Debates in existing literature concern, for example, questions of what intersects and how, and the difficulties of analysing several categories simultaneously (Hearn & Louvrier, 2015; Meyer, 2017). More fundamental disagreements involve questions of how intersectionality should be used and by whom. For instance, some scholars argue that the concept of intersectionality was often blind to practices of the dominant groups and their effects (Rommelspacher, 2009; Walgenbach, 2007), while others link intersectionality specifically to Black feminist thought and anti-racist commitments (Crenshaw, 1989; Nash, 2019), and therefore any analysis using an intersectional approach should always consider how the categories of race and racialization are used and to be used, along with the insights of Critical Race Theory more generally. Others, however, propose that intersectionality could be used as a tool to examine any intersections, including among dominant social groupings.

A number of authors want to steer away from some of the challenges related to the concept of intersectionality, as with the problem of referring to identity categories and additivity (when social categories are added, but without attending to their intersectional mutual constitution and possible tensions), which do not assist in grasping the complexity of power relations. Alternative terms include “multidimensionality” to focus on the constitutive connection between different dimensions of power and domination within individuals and social fields,⁴ grids and assemblages (Puar, 2012), or “matrix of domination” (Collins, 2008). Given these debates, any approach chosen has theoretical, methodological and political implications and challenges.

With regard to the use of the term, intersectionality, we find it insightful to draw on scholars who emphasize that what matters most is the purpose for which intersectionality is used,

arguing that central to any use of intersectionality should be a commitment to social justice and an intent to challenge social inequalities (Bilge, 2013; Collins & Bilge, 2020). Thus, intersectionality could be understood as a form of critical inquiry, as well as praxis. In this sense, critically examining the practices of men and dominant forms of masculinity adheres to these commitments.

Histories, power, men, masculinities, organizations and organizing

The notion of organization is historical, and deeply associated with forms of power, that is, intersectional gendered power. Large organizations are not a specifically modern phenomenon, as evidenced in the ancient hydraulic societies and the Chinese, Egyptian and Sumerian bureaucracies. Across many centuries, complex organization and organizing have been promoted by military, land-owning, economic and religious interests. In recent history, a pervasive image of an organization has been that of a factory, office, building that may appear to function within four walls, but in practice is not isolated from its environment, however defined. In some cases, supposed organizational isolation depended on, and still depends on, global relations of colonialism, slavery, imperialism and of course capitalism. Interestingly, such a visualization of the organization does not derive from the conglomerations of the Industrial Revolution heyday but rather from the industrial mill that could be *seen*. Paradoxically, organization and organization theory became constituted through the passing of that organizational form to the multiple-unit organization, which could not be fully seen, and required less immediate means of control.

With many organizations growing in size, and becoming more consolidated and more powerful (intersectional gendered) concentrations of resources, expansion occurred through horizontal and vertical connection and integration, and geographical and temporal expansion and diffusion. During Fordism, the largest organizations operated more nationally, more in industry than finance and tech, more under the power of the state, and had much smaller revenues than during neoliberalism. In 1960, for example, the largest companies were General Motors, Exxon Mobil and Ford Motor, which are all in the fossil fuel and automobile industry, all from the United States, with annual revenues up to US\$11.2 billion, and assets up to US\$9.8 billion (CNN Money, 2021). In 2022, despite the pandemic and the ongoing war by Russia on Ukraine, the world's largest public companies managed to increase sales and profits (Murphy & Contreras, 2022). The largest organizations, measured by sales, profits, assets and market value, were the US multinational conglomerate Berkshire Hathaway with the main business and source of capital in insurance as number one, followed by the Industrial and Commercial Bank of China which dropped to number two after nine consecutive years at the top of the list. Third is the Saudi Arabian Oil company. Tech companies such as Amazon, Apple, Alphabet (including Google), and Microsoft range between numbers 6 and 12. In 2022, the top company reached US\$958 billion in assets, which is almost 100 times more than in 1960. They operate transnationally and have increasing influence in relation to and over states, while at the same time inequality is growing for more than 70% of the global population, exacerbating the risks of divisions and hampering economic and social development (UN, 2020).

All those companies are directly or indirectly owned, operated or chaired by men, now from not only the United States but also China, Hong Kong, Japan and Saudi Arabia. For Fordism, hegemonic masculinity in organizations has been described as paternalistic and fatherly (Kerfoot & Knights, 1993). During neoliberalism, however, hegemonic transnational

business masculinities are pictured as more ruthless, less loyal and more focused on individual profits (Connell & Wood, 2005). For these new global business masculinities, big tech has played an increasing role, also in social media and films.⁵ Thereby, not only the gender of those men in power but also the organizing of global capitalism and the capitalist ruling class are gendered and configured through key transnational players, with increasingly close connections between politics and economics (Hearn, 2015, p. 135ff.). Women in the Global South who work informally and/or for little pay serve as “resource for globalizing capital” (ibid., 141). At the same time, there seems to be a development towards respecting characteristics and social fields that have been associated with women in bourgeois societies, such as care, responsibility, relationships and childcare. The Global Workforce Report 2022 (KellyOCG, 2022) refers to a survey of 1,000 senior executives across 12 countries and 10 industries which shows that “leading employers are moving to meet employees’ expectations for greater flexibility in how they integrate work in their lives, supporting their mental health, and showing greater authenticity and urgency in engaging with diversity, equity and inclusion”. This seems to mark an important difference from previous hegemonic forms of masculinity, which required men to prioritize their career and work requirements above personal and family issues.

In all these various ways, notions of organization, organizations and organizing have become increasingly complex, diverse, differentiated, dispersed and networked, now operating globally and glocally. Organizations encompass multi-organizations, meta-organizations, transnational organizations, inter-organizational relations, network organizations, net-organizations and cyberorganizations, not existing in one specific time–place reality. In some parts of the world, economies have shifted and are shifting from primary and secondary production to tertiary and quaternary production, and their associated changing forms of post-Fordist organizations and organizing, including what has been called surveillance capitalism (Zuboff, 2019). These historical conditions also create many more possible forms of gender power, predominantly, though not exclusively, for men (Little & Winch, 2021). In different ways, these material and immaterial shifts are formed by and form men, masculinities and gender relations in organizations. Meanwhile, the metaphorical conceptualization of organization simply as the organizational building or organizational chart can easily neglect the multiple views from below and from the margins, including women’s experiences. Seeing organizations as collections of more complex and diffuse relations of ruling (Smith, 1990) also underlines the importance of knowledge from the margins.

Overview of the volume

Developing the Handbook has been an extended process, with some obvious topics, some less obvious and the recognition that even across 30 chapters with almost 60 authors there were bound to be gaps and omissions. The book has grown organically, with some sought-after chapters not emerging, some new ideas for chapters added, and others developing in new ways from their initial conceptualization, taking a broader, more open-ended approach to organizations and organizing. In one initial draft of the contents, from early 2020, we had 45 possible chapters, including, for example, those on homosociality, hierarchy, resources, and communication and group processes. In the final contents, Part I, “Theories and Frameworks”, Part III, “Organizational Settings”, and Part IV, “Current and Future Issues”, emerged as relatively similar to that plan. Part II, “Structures and Processes of Organizing”, underwent much more selective focusing on areas that are still relatively neglected.

The final contents are a negotiation between the state of knowledge and research, the wish to explore new perspectives, and the practicalities of producing the Handbook. Inevitably, some topics and sectors have been studied well and are represented here, others much less, such as agriculture, heavy industry, dangerous work and extreme contexts, Indigenous men and masculinities, trans/gender identities, and some aspects of internal organizational dynamics like recruitment, socialization, negotiation, resistance and dissent. These are important topics for further research, along with the broader questions of ethics, politics and social change. Additionally, we have tried to include a wide range of perspectives, both geographically and theoretically, and attend to questions of location, context and geopolitics.

Overall, in many different ways, the chapters of this Handbook engage in debates between: first, gender, gender relations, men and masculinities; second, organizations and organizing; and, third, the topic in focus, whether it is more theoretical, more concerned with an organizational form, sector, structure or process, or certain social or societal trends or tendencies. Moreover, these theoretical, societal and organizational concerns themselves interconnect in multiple ways.

Part I, “Theories and Frameworks”, situates the Handbook in terms of the range of different theoretical positions and influences that have been and are important in examining men, masculinities, organizations and organizing. These include theoretical positions focusing on historical studies, social theory, feminist, gender and queer studies, organization studies, social movement studies, and global and transnational studies. Additionally, gender, men, masculinities and organizations are considered through intersectional perspectives.

The part opens with a broad contemporary global overview, Chapter 2, “New maps of struggle for gender justice: locating men, masculinities and organizations in feminist research on organizations and work”, by Raewyn Connell. This is especially fitting, as Connell’s work has, in a whole range of ways, inspired this area of theory, practice and politics. The chapter reviews succinctly recent developments in studies of gender, organizations and gender studies, in organizations, organizing and technologies in the world, and in geopolitics more broadly. The following chapter, Chapter 3, by Tigist Shewarega Hussen and Tamara Shefer, titled “Conditional solidarity: men and masculinities in social justice activist movements”, provides a somewhat contrasting feminist intervention, in itself, in its topic focus, and its analysis, focusing on the practices and processes of organizing, specifically through the lens of gender and sexuality social movement organizing, including men supporters of feminist causes in public activism. Two movements in South Africa are examined, both feminist activist responses to challenge the larger activist movement: #PatriarchyMustFall, against masculinist structures in the #FeesMustFall (FMF) movement; and #MbokodoLead, feminist activism focused on enhancing the visibility and impact of female leaders in the #FMF movement. The gendering of social movements is shown, whether progressive, regressive or ambiguous in their aims.

The next two chapters are more historical and more theoretical in tone. First, Chapter 4, “Social theory and critical theory”, by Richard Howson, delves into the historical connections of critical theory and theorizing, broadly from the Enlightenment. Focusing on Marx, Weber and Gramsci, Howson examines how critical and/or feminist approaches to masculinity contribute to critical studies of organizations and organizing. These issues and arguments are relevant for not only critical theorizing on organizations and organizing but also critical theorizing on gender, masculinity and many strands of feminism, as well as the intersections of organization theory and critical studies on men and masculinities, and feminist theory and critical theory. The chapter is, in many ways, complemented by the next, Chapter 5,

“Paradigms, gender and the making of men and masculinities in organization theory” by Albert J. Mills, Jean Helms Mills and Liela A. Jamjoom. This takes up the more recent history of paradigmatic developments in organization theory, including detailed activities and artefacts, such as textbooks, professional associations and “schools” of thought, seen explicitly or implicitly in gender terms, and then extends that analysis to the social place and power of men and masculinities. This chapter also moves the analysis further on by raising the important issue of intersectional gendering, including in relation to decolonial and critical race perspectives.

This latter focus is taken up more directly and at greater length in the last three chapters of Part I of the Handbook. Banu Ozkazanc-Pan’s chapter, Chapter 6, “Decolonizing masculinities: a decolonial and transnational perspective”, is a more focused examination of these very issues, with their various emphases and trajectories spelt out in relation to men, masculinities, organizations and organizing. This includes not only addressing coloniality, postcolonialism and decolonizing but also Indigenous perspectives on and ontologies of the matters at hand. Importantly, this arena is not just one theory but encompasses a range of different approaches, theories and practices that do not necessarily coincide. This applies to both organization studies and substantive organizations and organizing. The following chapter, Chapter 7, “Masculinities in the wasteland: (Post)colonial capitalism in the West, China, and Africa”, by Sofia Aboim, Mabel Machado and Ling Eleanor Zhang, follows through on these very themes, more substantively with a focus on three world regions. This entails more detailed attention to the interplay between such issues as gender, masculinities, migration and trade, and how they bear on organizations and organizing. It also necessarily attends to the importance of specificities and localities, rather than sticking with the homogenization that accompanies some references to “internationalization” and “international” perspectives. The last chapter continues some of these themes. In Chapter 8, “Global, transnational, national and “local” organizations and organizing: the case of space and place”, Jeff Hearn considers how spaces and places figure in understanding the differential relations and mutual construction of men, masculinities, organizations and organizing, transnationally, across localities and national contexts. This is even while the transnational and the global also operate locally and with local specificities. While much of the focus is on the macro-picture and historical picture of global and transnational organizations and organizing, including growing concentrations and inequalities, some implications of the transnational social-spatial lens for migration, nation and location are noted.

Organizations operate internally and externally, at one and the same time. Part II, “Structures and Processes of Organizing”, delves deep inside organizations to examine how their internal workings continue to reflect and reinforce gendered assumptions and dominant discourses that privilege men and masculinities. The chapters “open the lid” on these dynamics to reveal how organizational processes continue to be “saturated” with masculine values and assumptions in ways that inform men’s persistent domination of power and authority. These chapters examine how men’s hegemony in many organizations and sectors is experienced and reproduced by organizational members and employees, not only men, and explores the effects, both intended and unwitting, of such gendered organizational asymmetries.

Internally, organizations are characterized by both formal and informal processes. Formal processes present an idealized version of how an organization operates, whereas informal dynamics occur in the shadow world of the formal, sometimes offering a contrary view. Formal hierarchical positions, for example, in leadership and management can facilitate the reproduction of men’s power, privilege, status and identity in organizations through processes

such as recruitment and selection, promotion, job design, training and development, and even work–life balance programmes. While distinctions can be made between the formal and informal, in practice there is often considerable overlap and interaction between these processes. In addition, managers, leaders and organizations are also outward-facing, as with externally oriented organizational practices such as corporate strategy, marketing, selling and organizational reputation/identity management.

The chapters in Part II address an array of different themes related to men and masculinities in organizations and organizing. These range from leadership, contest cultures, careers and work–life balance issues to caring work, emotions and affect, heterosexuality and homosexuality as well as violence and abuse (mainly) against women and girls in organizations and organizing. In the first chapter of Part II, Chapter 9, “Critical dialectical perspectives on men, masculinities and leadership”, David L. Collinson argues that leadership is an important but often taken-for-granted source of men’s power, privilege and status within organizations. He suggests that the combined insights of critical studies of men and masculinities and critical leadership studies help to reveal how power is exercised through men’s leadership discourses, decisions and practices. Questioning overly deterministic perspectives and highlighting the value of dialectical approaches, the chapter discusses some of the paradoxical, contradictory and self-defeating consequences that can emerge when men leaders’ decisions and discursive practices are informed by hypermasculine ways of thinking and acting. The following chapter, Chapter 10, “Workplace masculinity contests and culture”, by Jennifer L. Berdahl, Marianne Cooper, Peter Glick, Robert W. Livingston and Joan C. Williams argues that many workplace cultures continue to be sites of “masculinity contests” in which men feel pressured to prove themselves as “real men”. The authors identify different dimensions of masculinity along which men compete and they show how this competition differs by work context. The authors contend that organizations with “Masculinity Contest Cultures” are characterized by dysfunctional organizational climates (e.g. toxic leadership, bullying, and harassment) and poor individual outcomes for men as well as women (e.g. burnout, low organizational dedication, lower well-being).

The next two chapters raise further questions about men and careers, highlighting various pressures that can ensue from intense career aspirations. In Chapter 11, “Doing meta-work to navigate conventionally masculinist careers and work norms in professional workplaces”, Marta Choroszewicz and Ingrid Biese highlight the hidden, invisible and laborious organizational work (i.e. “meta-work”) professionals often have to perform in seeking to live up to the ideals surrounding socially prestigious careers and identities. Meta-work is also an important coping mechanism through which professionals deal with feelings of inadequacy, dilemmas and disappointments surrounding their conventionally masculinist careers. Drawing on two empirical case studies of white, professional men in Finland, Canada and the United States, the authors demonstrate that living up to masculinist careers and work norms requires continuous meta-work. Career aspirations can also impact on work–life balance (WLB). Chapter 12, “Changing and challenging work–life negotiations for men and organizations”, by Majda Hrženjak, examines men’s negotiations over WLB. In WLB research, men have primarily been viewed as fathers in heterosexual nuclear families of dual-career middle-class couples in rich countries. Men have been found to be stretched between work-centred and breadwinning norms of masculinity, and gendered norms of the carefree, ideal employee. By expanding paid work into private time and space neoliberal corporate colonization undermines the search for work–life balance. Hrženjak recommends that WLB studies widen their scope to explore intersectional locations and multicultural contexts, new developments,

such as the gig economy and digitalization, broader understandings of care, diverse family arrangements and life-course stages.

Building on this focus on new understandings of care, the following two chapters address various connections between men, organizations and caring work. In Chapter 13, “Bodies, embodiment, bodywork, care, caring and self-care”, Henri Hyvönen questions the findings of recent studies in post-industrialized labour markets which suggest that many men now practise seemingly “softer” forms of “healthy” and “caring” masculinity in organizations. Hyvönen’s research on caring work in social services and healthcare finds that although men have adapted to changes in working life, care has also been redefined in masculine terms. His chapter seeks to deconstruct the dichotomy between men’s power, often associated with dominance, harm and inequality, and men’s caring capabilities. It reveals how caring relations are also power relations that can produce dominance, harm and inequality. Contemporary discourses around “softening” and “caring” masculinity are also central to the following chapter, Chapter 14, by Sam de Boise titled “Emotions and affect in organizing men and masculinity/ies” which addresses how men express emotions within and in relation to organizations. This chapter identifies differences between approaches to emotions and affect and discusses the tendency to view emotions within organizations as inherently gendered, including a focus on men’s unemotionality. It also indicates how thinking about men’s organizational behaviour and organizing as structured through affective practice may help to avoid the progressive/regressive binary associated with a focus on men’s emotional expression while still foregrounding emotional experience.

The next chapter highlights issues of sexuality, desexualization in organizations and the persistent workplace dominance of hegemonic heterosexual masculinity. In Chapter 15, “Mingle with men: sexuality and gay men in organizations”, Laura Eigenmann addresses the mutually constitutive relationship between masculinity, sexuality, heteronormativity and organizations, and investigates the negative implications for gay men of this inherent heteronormativity. Her chapter also acknowledges the empowering aspects of shared gay male identities, for example, in constructing closer workplace relationships, mutual support and strong informal networks, all of which help to compensate for gay men’s marginalization. This is illustrated through research on informal networks among gay male EU employees in Brussels’ LGBTIQ+ advocacy community. The final chapter in Part II “Men’s violence and abuse in organizations and workplaces” by Nicole Westmarland examines the complex relations of men, masculinities and violence within organizations and organizing. Drawing on empirical research, the author shows how men’s violence can operate within policing, higher education and residential care homes for children looked after by the state. All three empirical contexts have been sites of major UK investigations in recent years. While the chapter focuses on men’s violence and abuse against women and girls, the conclusion also highlights some of the harms that men and boys experience within institutions where cultures of violence against women and girls are ingrained.

Part III, “Organizational Settings”, captures differences in organizational settings and the importance of men and masculinities in them. Organizations play different roles in society, for example, concerning the economy, politics, securitization, sports and education, to mention the ones mostly covered here. These separate fields, which are connected in many ways, operate with various institutional apparatuses and imply different normative requirements concerning men and masculinities. Without taking into account the multifaceted gendered aspects of organizational settings, they cannot be understood adequately. At the same time, these different settings may deal with similar contemporary dynamics and challenges in

human resources, career paths, concerning wealth distribution, work–life balance and care work. These chapters focus on men and masculinities in these organizational settings.

Part III begins with a focus on organizations and organizing in the economy. Chapter 17, “Hegemonic masculinities and the hegemony of men in business and finance organizations: persistence of and challenges to patriarchal power”, by Anika Thym, Helen Longlands and Richard Collier looks at how institutions of law, business and finance interact with a range of discourses around masculinities. Particularly, it investigates how patriarchal power is maintained as well as questioned in hegemonic masculinity discourses in those fields. The chapter contributes to understanding the contradictory developments of masculinity discourses, which may have more authoritarian, more emancipatory or paradoxical outcomes. However, developments will turn out, men and masculinity discourses not only impact but also are – for now – constitutively connected with changes in the economy.

The following four chapters focus more explicitly on politics, the state, political organizations and organizing. In her chapter, Chapter 18, “Masculinity of the modern Western state and of state institutions”, Birgit Sauer provides an overview of different dimensions of state masculinism. Informed by feminist-materialist as well as Foucauldian concepts, she elaborates on relations of gender and the state. She describes how organizational masculinity manifests itself in masculine procedures, norms and ideas and how they are embedded in the state-bureaucratic apparatus. In addition, she discusses current transformations of state masculinism by using the example of empirical research on the increasing importance of affects and emotions in the actions of street-level bureaucrats. The following chapter, Chapter 19, by F. Oya Aktaş, David L. Collinson, Jeff Hearn and Nurseli Yeşim Sünbülöğlü, is titled “Men, masculinities and military organizations”. Modern states could not be imagined without the military including its mechanisms of largely securing the status quo also by repressive means, securitization and surveillance, protection and self-defence as well as expansion of territory – all of which are connected to military masculinities. Military organizations are among the most obviously gendered of all organizational activities. Indeed the military is also one of the clearest arenas of social power, violence and killing in their many guises; military matters are urgent, powerful and lethal, literally questions of life and death for all concerned. This chapter examines the place of men and masculinities in some key organizational issues in military organization and militarism, most notably recruitment, hierarchies and segregations, disability and veterans, and the impacts of these organizations on civilians, before concluding remarks on wider processes and impacts, on research, scientific and technological organizations, on international relations and geopolitics, and on the environment. The chapter thus brings together studies on men and masculinities with those in the military and military organizations.

The next chapter, Chapter 20, by Kopano Ratele, Nick Malherbe, Josephine Cornell and Shahnaz Suffla, titled “Masculinities, political organizations and political organizing: queering anti-apartheid struggle”, approaches politics and political organizations through a social movement perspective. The chapter highlights organizing as a political activity, and with a particular emphasis on queer masculinities. While clearly located in a more specific location and political context, the chapter points to a wider range of possible interconnections between men, masculinities, gender, sexuality, racialization, organizations and organizing. Chapter 21, by Michele Rene Gregory and Daniel Alsarve, titled “Beyond the public light: political strongmen, masculine embodiment and sports organizations”, focuses on men, masculinities and sports organizations, while also highlighting the relevance of sports metaphors in politics and how they are used by so-called political strongmen. The chapter illustrates

how discourses around masculinity and sport are connected with social discourses more generally, pointing to how different social fields and discourses overlap and interplay with one another. By drawing upon high-profile events, research on male-dominated sports, and arguments on sports and hegemonic masculinities, they illustrate how so-called strongmen create locker room spaces to reinforce white, male, heterosexual supremacy and thereby devalue “others”. They illustrate how such demeaning behaviour is connected to the fragility of hegemonic masculinity.

The final three chapters in Part III discuss aspects of education at different stages of learning – including nurseries, kindergartens, schools and higher education – in various fields and contexts. Chapter 22, “(Un)doing masculinity? Men working in women’s occupations”, by Julia Nentwich and Chieh Hsu, provides an overview of studies on men in women’s occupations in different parts of the world, particularly Asian contexts, while taking an intersectional perspective. They illustrate how across studies, men engage in “boundary work” that reaffirms their masculinity or how they develop “alternative masculinities” to reconcile any dissonance between their personal and professional identities. The chapter engages with complicated inter-relations of marginalization, privilege and hegemony within these men. While many men in “women’s occupations” often develop alternative masculinities, Nentwich and Chieh show how more often than not, men in women’s occupations reinforce central aspects of hegemonic masculinity. The following chapter, Chapter 23, by Ann Phoenix, titled “Boys and schooling: intersectional perspectives”, examines schools from gender and intersectional perspectives, focusing specifically on boys, masculinities and schooling. Drawing on empirical insights from Denmark, Finland and the United Kingdom, the chapter considers how dominant masculinity scripts are reproduced as well as resisted in the everyday practices of boys at school. Part III closes with a chapter, Chapter 24, on higher education by Ana Luisa Muñoz-García, Mara Silva Hope, Gabriela Bard Wigdor and Liisa Husu. In their chapter titled “Men, gender and knowledge construction in higher education”, the authors critically investigate gender-equality efforts in higher education with a focus on Latin America or *Nuestra América* (Viveros Vigoya, 2023) by studying the university discipline of education studies, characterized by the presence of a majority of women in the lower hierarchical levels. Based on a qualitative study in Chile, they emphasize that it is not enough to “count heads”, that is the proportion of women especially in top positions and in certain fields. Rather they make a case for questioning, critically engaging with and transforming structures of hegemonic masculinity, institutionalized sexism and men’s privilege even in historically feminized spaces.

Finally, Part IV, “Current and Future Issues”, addresses some emergent and future issues pertaining to men, masculinities and organizations, for both research and activism. Organizations and organizing operate in the context of various crises that currently characterize various societies, and which are likely to escalate in the near future, such as global environmental and health crises, and with new and developing technologies shaping organizations, organizing and their futures.

Part IV begins with the neglected question of men, masculinities and gender relations in international trade organizations. Chapter 25, “The hegemony of men in global value chains: insights for intersectional labour governance”, by Lauren McCarthy, Vivek Soundararajan and Scott Taylor, problematizes substandard labour practices in global value chains (GVCs), even in contexts with strong legal frameworks and where ethical accreditation schemes exist. They attribute these poor labour relations practices in part to the insufficient attention paid to the interplay of men, masculinities and GVC operations. They highlight the need to

recognize the social category of “men” with its material and discursive effects on GVCs and to take an intersectional perspective to improve governance mechanisms in GVCs.

This is followed by a theoretical engagement with crises. Following an introductory framing text by Anika Thym, Chapter 26, “Multiple crisis, crisis of gender relations and crisis of masculinity”, by Alex Demirović and Andrea Maihofer, offers a social theoretical framework to understand the constitutive connection as well as specific logic and relative autonomy of the different crises. Rather than intersectionality, they suggest using the term multidimensionality to conceptualize the interconnectedness of relations of power and domination therein. The authors highlight the familial sphere and men’s subjectivities as important sites of change. From this perspective, they state and elaborate on the ongoing crisis of masculinity, which questions core aspects of bourgeois masculinity.

The subsequent chapters in Part IV deal with themes and highlight specific issues which are likely to become increasingly relevant to organizational dynamics and processes in the (near) future. The first two of these deal with violences. The issue of men’s violence against women remains a key ongoing and future issue to be tackled both practically and theoretically, including in organizational contexts. In Chapter 27, titled “Allyship and accountability in organizations engaging men in violence prevention: principles, practices and political dilemmas”, Bob Pease considers questions of men’s allyship and accountability to women in organizations engaging men in violence prevention. The chapter examines personal, interpersonal and organizational forms of accountability, various models of accountability and ways to implement them. The author discusses several political dilemmas related to men’s allyship in the context of men’s violence prevention efforts, such as decisions about which strand of feminism to engage with and how to deal with social divisions between men in violence prevention efforts. Pease suggests that for this anti-violence work to succeed, men must move beyond dominant forms of masculinity, to embrace greater humility.

The global ecological crisis, and notably climate change, has brought increasing critical attention to humanity’s exploitative relationship with the more-than-human world. In response to current violent and unsustainable ways of relating to other species and ecosystems, social movements and activisms to reimagine these relationships are becoming increasingly vocal and visible. In Chapter 28, “Men and masculinities in animal advocacy organizations and organizing: from men’s domination and masculinized strategies towards an ethics of care and intersectional activism”, Kadri Aavik focuses on animal advocacy organizations and organizing, examining how men and masculinities figure in these gendered sites and processes. She argues for the importance of moving beyond masculinized values and strategies that have shaped the movement and its exclusions, towards intersectional activism and building alliances with other progressive social movements. Finally, the chapter considers the potential of vegan men and masculinities in developing less exploitative human–animal relations and more sustainable masculinities.

Given the significance of men and masculinities in the now ubiquitous technologization of society and predominance of global capitalism, men’s practices and masculinities in these spheres continue to shape gendered and other power relations on global and local scales. In Chapter 29, titled “Tracing the superheroes of our time: contemporary and emergent masculinities in tech entrepreneurship”, Ulf Mellström, Dag Balkmar and Anne-Charlott Callerstig examine masculinity in relation to technology, entrepreneurship and organizations in these areas. The chapter discusses how masculinity features in the configuration of tech entrepreneurship and the predominance of this masculinity in cultural representations. The authors consider the intersection of gender with race in the construction of a hegemonic geek masculinity.

The recent global COVID-19 pandemic can be considered a manifestation of various social and ecological crises that humanity has brought upon itself. Notably, in large part, many unsustainable practices of privileged white Western men and hegemonic masculinities can be identified as the originators of these crises. In Chapter 30, “Men and COVID-19: pandemics and organizing in the ‘new normal’”, focusing on organizing in the context of pandemics, Stephen Burrell and Sandy Ruxton draw connections between men, masculinities and the COVID-19 crises, underscoring how gender has shaped both the crisis and efforts to mitigate it in three sites of organizing – work, governmentality and social movements. The authors argue for an intersectional approach to understanding and responding to COVID-19 and future pandemics as sites of reconfiguration of social norms.

Finally, we need to highlight how men, masculinities, organizations and organizing are themselves intensely relevant for understanding, and critiquing, the activities of research and academia, and indeed writing and authorship (Hearn, 2020). Men’s contribution to academic knowledge production is frequently elevated over women’s through dominant authorial and citational practices. For instance, men are more likely to refer to the work of other male scholars (Dion et al., 2018) and cite their own work 70% more than women (King et al., 2017). These practices produce and exacerbate “gender gaps” in academic knowledge production, or more specifically, what are known as the “Matthew effect” (men’s contributions to a research field are considered the most prominent) and the “Matilda effect” (women’s work is regarded as less valuable or even attributed to originate with men) (see Dion et al., 2018). Taking the insights of critical studies of men, masculinities, organizations and organizing to the heart of academia and knowledge production would indeed be transformative not just for research, publishing, universities and higher education but for the planet.

Notes

- 1 On men, masculinities and militarism, see Aktaş et al. (Chapter 19), this volume.
- 2 On the links between men, masculinities and sustainability, see Aavik (Chapter 28), this volume.
- 3 On global concentrations and inequalities, see Hearn (Chapter 8), this volume.
- 4 On the term multidimensionality as an alternative for intersectionality, see Demirović and Maihofer (Chapter 26), this volume.
- 5 On media and technology, see Mellström et al. (Chapter 29), this volume.

References

- Aavik, K. (2015). *Intersectional Disadvantage and Privilege in the Estonian Labour Market: An Analysis of Work Narratives of Russian-speaking Women and Estonian Men*. PhD dissertation, Tallinn University, Tallinn.
- Aavik, K., Bland, C., Hoegaerts, J., & Salminen, J. (2020). *Men, Masculinities and the Modern Career. Contemporary and Historical Perspectives*. Oldenbourg: De Gruyter.
- Acker, J. (2006). Inequality regimes: Gender, class, and race in organizations. *Gender & Society*, 20(4), 441–464. doi: 10.1177/0891243206289499
- Allison, A. (1994). *Nightwork: Sexuality, Pleasure, and Corporate Masculinity in a Tokyo Hostess Club*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ashcraft, K. L. (2022). *Wronged and Dangerous: Viral Masculinity and the Populist Pandemic*. Bristol: Bristol University Press.

- Aultman, B. L. (2019). Nonbinary trans identities. In D. Haider-Markel (Ed.), *The Oxford Encyclopedia of LGBT Politics and Policy* (p. 23). New York: Oxford University Press. doi: 10.1093/acrefore/9780190228637.013.1195
- Barrett, F. (1996). The organizational construction of hegemonic masculinity: The case of the U.S. Navy. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 3(3), 129–142. doi: 10.1177/0891243205278639
- Berdahl, J. L., Cooper, M., Glick, P., Livingston, R. W., & Williams, J. C. (Eds.). (2018). Work as a masculinity contest. Special issue. *Journal of Social Issues*, 74(3).
- Biese, I. (2021). *Men Do It Too: Opting Out and In*. Oldenbourg: de Gruyter.
- Bilge, S. (2013). Intersectionality undone: Saving intersectionality from feminist intersectionality studies. *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race*, 10(2), 405–424. doi: 10.1017/S1742058X13000283
- Blomberg, J. (2009). Gendering finance: Masculinities and hierarchies at the Stockholm stock exchange. *Organization*, 16(2), 203–225. doi: 10.1177/1350508408100475
- Bologh, R. W. (1990). *Love or Greatness: Max Weber and Masculine Thinking*. *Feminist Inquiry*. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Bridges, T., & Pascoe, C. J. (2014). Hybrid masculinities: New directions in the sociology of men and masculinities. *Sociology Compass*, 8(3), 246–258. doi: 10.1111/soc4.12134
- Carrington, D. (2023). Revealed: 1,000 super-emitting Methane leaks Risk Triggering Climate Tipping Points. Retrieved 6 March, from The Guardian: www.theguardian.com/environment/2023/mar/06/revealed-1000-super-emitting-methane-leaks-risk-triggering-climate-tipping-points?CMP=share_btn_link
- CNN Money (2021). Fortune 500: 1960 Archive Full List 1–100. Retrieved 13 February 2023, from https://money.cnn.com/magazines/fortune/fortune500_archive/full/1960/
- Cockburn, C. K. (1983). *Brothers*. London: Pluto Press.
- Collins, P. H. (2008). *Black Feminist thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. New York: Routledge.
- Collins, P. H., & Bilge, S. (2020). *Intersectionality*. New York: Wiley.
- Collinson, D. L. (1992). *Managing the Shopfloor: Subjectivity, Masculinity and Workplace Culture*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Collinson, D. L. (1999). Surviving the rigs: Safety and surveillance on North Sea oil installations. *Organization Studies*, 20(4), 579–600. doi: 10.1177/0170840699204003.
- Collinson, D. L., & Collinson, M. (1997). Delaying managers, time space surveillance and its gendered effects. *Organization*, 4(3), 373–405. doi: 10.1177/135050849743005
- Collinson, D. L., & Hearn, J. (1994). Naming men as men: Implications for work, organizations and management. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 1(1), 2–22. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-0432.1994.tb00002.x
- Collinson, D. L., & Hearn, J. (1995). Men managing leadership? ‘Men and Women of the Corporation’ revisited. *International Review of Women and Leadership*, 1(2), 1–24.
- Collinson, D. L., & Hearn, J. (Eds.). (1996). *Men as Managers, Managers as Men: Critical Perspectives on Men, Masculinities and Managements*. London: Sage.
- Collinson, D. L., & Hearn, J. (2005). Men and masculinities in work, organizations and management. In M. Kimmel, J. Hearn & R. W. Connell (Eds.), *Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities* (pp. 289–310). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Collinson, D. L., & Hearn, J. (2014). Taking the obvious apart: Men, masculinities and the dynamics of gendered leadership. In R. J. Burke & D. A. Major (Eds.), *Gender in Organizations: Are Men Allies or Adversaries to Women’s Career Advancement?* (pp. 73–92). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Press.
- Collinson, D. L., Knights, D., & Collinson, M. (1990). *Managing to Discriminate*. London: Routledge.
- Collinson, M., & Collinson, D. L. (1989). Sexuality in the workplace: The domination of men’s sexuality. In J. Hearn, D. Sheppard, P. Tancred-Sheriff & G. Burrell (Eds.), *The Sexuality of Organization* (pp. 91–109). London: Sage.
- Collinson, M., & Collinson, D. L. (1996). It’s only Dick: The sexual harassment of women managers in insurance sales. *Work, Employment and Society*, 10(1), 29–56. doi: 10.1177/0950017096101002
- Connell, R. (1987). *Gender and Power*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.
- Connell, R., & Messerschmidt, J. W. (2005). Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the concept. *Gender and Society*, 19(6), 829–859. doi: 10.1177/0891243205278639

- Connell, R., & Wood, J. (2005). Globalization and business masculinities. *Men and Masculinities*, 7(4), 347–364. doi: 10.1177/1097184X03260969
- Cornwall, A., Karioris, F. G., & Lindisfarne, N. (Eds.). (2016). *Masculinities under Neoliberalism*. London: Zed.
- Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 1989(1), 139–167. doi: <http://chicagounbound.uchicago.edu/uclf/vol1989/iss1/8>
- Dion, M. L., Sumner, J. L., & Mitchell, S. M. (2018). Gendered citation patterns across political science and social science methodology fields. *Political Analysis*, 26(3), 312–327. doi: 10.1017/pan.2018.12
- Garlick, S. (2020). The nature of markets: On the affinity between masculinity and (neo)liberalism. *Journal of Cultural Economy*, 13(5), 548–560. doi: /10.1080/17530350.2020.1741017
- Hearn, J. (1989). Leading questions for men: Men's leadership, feminist challenges and men's responses. *Equal Opportunities International*, 8(1), 3–11. doi: 10.1108/eb010495
- Hearn, J. (1992). *Men in the Public Eye: The Construction and Deconstruction of Public Men and Public Patriarchies*. London: Routledge.
- Hearn, J. (1997). The implications of critical studies on men. *NORA – Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research*, 5(1), 48–60. doi: 10.1080/08038740.1997.9959706
- Hearn, J. (2015). *Men of the World: Gender, Globalizations, Transnational Times*. London: Sage.
- Hearn, J. (2020). Men and masculinities in academe: Extending gender-sensitive perspectives, processes, policies and practices. In E. Drew & S. Canavan (Eds.), *The Gender-Sensitive University: A Contradiction in Terms* (pp. 97–109). London: Routledge.
- Hearn, J., & Collinson, D. L. (2006). Men, masculinities and workplace diversity/diversion: Power, intersections and contradictions. In A. Konrad, P. Prasad & J. Pringle (Eds.), *Handbook of Workplace Diversity* (pp. 299–322). London: Sage.
- Hearn, J., & Collinson, D. L. (2009). Men, diversity at work, and diversity management. In M. Özbilgin (Ed.), *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion at Work: A Research Companion* (pp. 383–398). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Hearn, J., & Louvrier, J. (2015). Theories of difference, diversity, and intersectionality: What do they bring to diversity management? In R. Bendl, I. Bleijenbergh, E. Henttonen & A. J. Mills (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Diversity in Organizations* (pp. 1–27). Oxford: Oxford University Press. doi: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199679805.013.28
- Hearn, J., & Niemistö, C. (2012). Men, 'father managers' and home-work relations: Complexities and contradictions in national policy corporations and individual lives. In P. McDonald & E. Jeanes (Eds.), *Men, Wage Work and Family* (pp. 95–113). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Ho, K. (2009). *Liquidated: An Ethnography of Wall Street*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York: Basic.
- Kanter, R. M. (1993). *Men and Women of the Corporation*, 2nd edition. New York: Basic.
- KellyOCG. (2022). Re:work Calibrating to Power the Life-work Shift. Retrieved 27 September 2022, from KellyOCG Global Workforce Report 2022: www.kellyocg.com/insights/featured-content/whitepapers/rework-calibrating-to-power-the-life-work-shift/
- Kerfoot, D., & Knights, D. (1993). Management, manipulation and masculinity: From paternalism to corporate strategy in financial services in Britain. *Journal of Management Studies*, 30(4), 659–677. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6486.1993.tb00320.x
- Kerfoot, D., & Whitehead, S. (2000). Keeping all the balls in the air: Further education and the masculine/managerial subject. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 24(2), 183–201.
- King, M. M., Bergstrom, C. T., Correll, S. J., Jacquet, J., & West, J. D. (2017). Men set their own cites high: Gender and self-citation across fields and over time. *Socius*, 3, 2378023117738903. doi: 10.1177/2378023117738903
- Knights, D. (2022). *Leadership, Gender and Ethics: Embodied Reason in Challenging Masculinities*. London: Routledge.
- Knights, D., & Tullberg, M. (2014). Masculinity in the financial sector. In S. Kumra, R. Simpson & R. J. Burke (Eds.), *The Handbook of Gender in Organizations* (pp. 499–518). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Köllen, T. (Ed.). (2016). *Sexual Orientation and Transgender Issues in Organizations: Global Perspectives on LGBT Workforce Diversity*. New York: Springer.

- Kühne, K., Bartsch, N., Tate, R. D., Higson, J., & Habet, A. (2022). “Carbon bombs” – Mapping key fossil fuel projects. *Energy Policy*, 166, 112950. doi: 10.1016/j.enpol.2022.112950
- Little, B., & Winch, A. (2021). *The New Patriarchs of Digital Capitalism: Celebrity Tech Founders and Networks of Power*. London: Routledge.
- Liu, H. (2021). *Redeeming Leadership*. Bristol: Bristol University Press.
- Lui, H. (2017). The masculinisation of ethical leadership dis/embodiment. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 144(2), 263–278. doi: 10.1007/s10551-015-2831-x
- Luyt, R., & Starck, K. (Eds.). (2020). *Masculine Power and Gender Equality: Political Masculinities as Agents of Change*. Berlin: Springer.
- Maier, M., & Messerschmidt, J. W. (1998). Commonalities, conflicts and contradictions in organizational masculinities: Exploring the gendered genesis of the challenger disaster. *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 35(3), 325–344. doi: 10.1111/j.1755-618x.1998.tb00726.x
- McCabe, D., & Knights, D. (2016). Learning to listen? Exploring discourses and images of masculine leadership through corporate videos. *Management Learning*, 47(2), 179–198. doi: 10.1177/1350507615586334
- McCarthy, L., Soundararajan, V., & Taylor, S. (2021). The hegemony of men in global value chains: Why it matters for labour governance. *Human Relations*, 74(12), 2051–2074. doi: 10.1177/0018726720950816
- Mellström, U., & Pease, B. (Eds.). (2023). *Beyond Anthropocentric Masculinities: Posthumanism, New Materialism and the Man Question*. London: Routledge.
- Messerschmidt, J. W. (1995). Managing to kill: Masculinities and the space shuttle challenger explosion. *Masculinities*, 3(4), 1–22. doi: 10.1177/0891243205278639
- Metcalfe, A., & Humphries, M. (Eds.). (1985). *The Sexuality of Men*. London: Pluto.
- Meyer, K. (2017). *Theorien der Intersektionalität zur Einführung*. Hamburg: Junius Hamburg.
- Morgan, D. H. J. (1996). The gender of bureaucracy. In D. L. Collinson & J. Hearn (Eds.), *Men as Managers, Managers as Men: Critical Perspectives on Men, Masculinities and Managements* (pp. 43–60). London: Sage.
- Murphy, A., & Contreras, I. (2022, December 5). The Global 2000 2022. Retrieved 13 February 2023, from Forbes website: www.forbes.com/lists/global2000/
- Nash, J. (2019). *Black Feminism Reimagined after Intersectionality*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Payne, J. (2018). Manufacturing masculinity: Exploring gender and workplace surveillance. *Work and Occupations*, 45(3), 346–383. doi: 10.1177/0730888418780969
- Pini, B., & Pease, B. (Eds.). (2013). *Men, Masculinities and Methodologies*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Puar, J. K. (2012). ‘I would Rather be a Cyborg than a Goddess’. Becoming-intersectional in Assemblage Theory. Retrieved 14 February 2023, from Transversal Texts website: <https://transversal.at/transversal/0811/puar/en>
- Pulé, P. M. H., & Hultman, M. (Eds.). (2021). *Men, Masculinities, and Earth*. Berlin: Springer.
- Reis, C. (2004). *Men Managers in a European Multinational Company*. Mering: Rainer Humpp Verlag.
- Rommelspacher, B. (2009). Intersektionalität – Über die Wechselwirkung von Machtverhältnissen. In I. Kurz-Scherf, J. Lepperhoff & A. Scheele (Eds.), *Feminismus: Kritik und Intervention* (pp. 81–96). Münster: Westfälisches Dampfboot.
- Roper, M. (1994). *Masculinity and the British Organization Man since 1945*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Roper, M. (1996). ‘Seduction and succession’: Homosocial circuits of desire in management. In D. L. Collinson & J. Hearn (Eds.), *Men as Managers, Managers as Men: Critical Perspectives on Men, Masculinities and Managements* (pp. 210–226). London: Sage.
- Smith, D. E. (1990). *Texts, Facts and Femininity: Exploring the Relations of Ruling*. London: Routledge.
- Sugiura, L. (2021). *The Incel Rebellion: The Rise of the Manosphere and the Virtual War against Women*. Bingley: Emerald.
- Thym, A. (2019). Hegemony self-critique: How men in finance question aspects of masculine and economic hegemony from within. In J. Hearn, E. Vasquez del Aquila & M. Hughson (Eds.), *Unsustainable Institutions of Men: Transnational Dispersed Centres, Gender Power, Contradictions* (pp. 71–86). New York: Routledge.
- Thym, A. (2020). Men in finance for emancipatory social change? In R. Luyt & K. Starck (Eds.), *Masculine Power and Gender Equality: Masculinities as Change Agents* (pp. 81–88). Cham: Springer.

- Tienari, J., Vaara, E., & Meriläinen, S. (2010). Becoming an international man: Top manager masculinities in the making of a multinational corporation. *Equal Opportunities International*, 29(1), 38–52.
- United Nations. (2020, January 21). Rising Inequality Affecting More than Two-thirds of the Globe, but it's Not Inevitable: New UN Report. Retrieved 13 February 2023, from UN News website: <https://news.un.org/en/story/2020/01/1055681>
- Vannini, P. (Ed.) (2015). *Non-Representational Methodologies: Re-envisioning Research*. New York: Routledge.
- Viveros Vigoya, M. (2023). The colors of masculinity: Experiences of power and intersectionality in Nuestra América. *Men and Masculinities*. doi: 1097184X231151824.
- Wajcman, J. (1998). *Managing like a Man: Women and Men in Corporate Management*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Walgenbach, K. (2007). Gender als interdependente Kategorie. In K. Walgenbach, G. Dietze, A. Hornscheidt & K. Palm (Eds.). *Gender als interdependente Kategorie. Neue Perspektiven auf Intersektionalität, Diversität und Heterogenität* (pp. 23–64). Opladen: B. Budrich.
- Whyte, W. H. (1956). *The Organization Man*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Wolfman, G., Hearn, J., & Yeadon-Lee, T. (2021). Hollow femininities: The emerging faces of neoliberal masculinities. *NORMA: International Journal for Masculinity Studies*, 16(4), 217–234. doi: 10.1080/18902138.2021.1996829
- Zaloom, C. (2006). *Out of the Pits: Traders and Technology from Chicago to London*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Zuboff, S. (2019). *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power*. New York: Simon & Schuster.



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group
<http://taylorandfrancis.com>