4 David Collinson and Jeff Hearn

'Men' at 'work': multiple masculinities/multiple workplaces

Introduction

Throughout the twentieth century, researchers and writers on organizations have talked about 'men' at 'work'. Yet it is only relatively recently that men have actually been recognized as a gendered category requiring detailed critical analysis. Without problematizing gender, men or masculinity in any explicit way, classic texts of the 1950s, for example, referred to *Men who Manage* (Dalton 1959), *The Man on the Assembly Line* (Walker and Guest 1952) and *Organization Man* (Whyte 1956). Although these studies actively dealt with men, they did not explore either men's social construction or the specific implications for the reproduction of men and masculinity of being a manager, working on the assembly line or being trapped in the organization. It was as if men's pervasiveness gave their dominance a universality that precluded the need for further analysis: an assumption that was taken for granted not only in language, but also in analytical categories.[1] In many ways these assumptions mirrored those of everyday workplace life where, typically, the authority, power and dominance of men at various hierarchical levels was simply accepted and unquestioned by organization members.

Inspired by feminist analysis, a more critical literature has emerged that seeks to critique the gendered nature of these assumptions as well as the conventional power, practices and relations of men and masculinity/ies in various organizational positions and settings (e.g. Morgan 1992; Roper 1993). In this chapter we seek to review these arguments, not only to '*name* men [at work]' as men' (Collinson and Hearn 1994) and therefore to question the way in which these issues have often been taken for granted in the past, but also to examine critically the multiple conditions, processes and consequences of the continued domination of men and masculinities in various workplaces. We suggest that men and masculinity/ies continue to dominate many of the structures, cultures and practices of routine organizational life

♦ Hearn, J. y Collinson, D. "Men at work, multiple masculinities/ multiple workplaces", en Mac an Ghaill, M. Understanding Masculinities, Great Britain, Open University Press, 1997.

157

*Trabajo; masculinidad
Patriarcado /
masculinidad*

and that this in turn has significant implications for our understanding of the great diversity of workplaces that exist as well as the potential for their transformation. In the first half of the paper we briefly review some of the more theoretical issues that have been raised regarding the power/social relations of 'men' at 'work', while in the second half we draw upon empirical research to illustrate the multiplicity of men, masculinities and workplaces by identifying key aspects of this diversity within both manual and non-manual labour.

Analysing 'men' at 'work'

The analysis of 'men' at 'work' raises considerable conceptual difficulty, not least regarding what do we mean by 'men' and what do we mean by 'work'? First, while certainly existing in relation to the category 'male(s)', 'men' are not necessarily 'males', and vice versa. There are a number of reasons for this, including: cultural specificities in 'men' and 'males'; distinctions between 'boys', 'men', 'young males' and 'males'; the various physiological and cultural forms of gender change, whether 'temporary' or 'permanent'; and the differential relation of 'men' and 'males' to history and trans-history, respectively. We find it helpful to see 'men' as a gender that exists or is presumed to exist in most direct relation to the generalized male sex, that being the sex which is not female, or not the sex related to the gender of women (Hearn 1994). Second, feminist analyses have problematized the meaning of 'work'. They have criticized the way that in theory and everyday practices the home is often not recognized as a workplace at all and domestic tasks have failed to be acknowledged as 'work' for women and/or men. In so doing, feminist studies have highlighted the importance of unpaid domestic labour as an important site of gendered 'work' and of men's domination of women.

Feminist studies of men, work and workplaces have revealed how 'most organizations are saturated with masculine values' (Burton 1991: 3). By highlighting the embeddedness of masculine values and assumptions in the structure, culture and practices of organizations, such studies (e.g. Pringle 1989; Cockburn 1991) have encouraged the development of a critical perspective on 'men' at 'work'.[2] Critically analysing the centrality of the masculine model of lifetime, full-time, continuous employment and of the family breadwinner for the organization of paid work, these studies have emphasized the importance of men's continued domination of power relations in contemporary organizations. Relatedly, they have revealed the importance of paid work as a central source of masculine identity, status and power. For many men, employment provides the interrelated economic resources and symbolic benefits of wages/salaries, skills and experience, career progress and positions of power, authority and high discretion.

Typically, it seems, men's gender identities are constructed, compared and evaluated by self and others according to a whole variety of criteria indicating personal 'success' in the workplace. The foregoing studies also demonstrate how these organizational resources of power and status are less accessible to women employees. Many of these feminist writers have used the concept of patriarchy to delineate the recurrent and pervasive nature of men's workplace power.

Patriarchy, dual systems and their limitations

Patriarchy has become an important concept in the critical analysis of men's power and identity in the workplace. Feminist analyses contend that any adequate understanding of 'men' at 'work' needs to consider the social relations of men in the wider society. The term, 'patriarchy', has become the usual shorthand for the kind of society founded on men's gender domination. However, a number of feminist critiques (e.g. Beechey 1979; Rowbotham 1979; Acker 1989) have suggested that patriarchy is too monolithic, ahistorical, biologically overdetermined, categorical and dismissive of women's resistance and agency. In the light of this, greater attention has been given first, to the historicizing and periodizing of patriarchy and second, to the presence of multiple arenas, sites and structures of patriarchy. Studies have addressed the historical movement from private (domestic) to public (capitalism and the state) forms of patriarchy. There have also been attempts to identify the various sites or multiple bases of patriarchy (e.g. Walby 1986, 1990; Hearn 1987, 1992).

Many writers who have used the concept of patriarchy have also adopted a critical perspective on capitalist work organizations, usually deriving their approach from a neo-Marxist focus upon the underlying conflicts and contradictions of economic interests in the workplace. However, these attempts to develop a 'dual systems' theory (e.g. Hartmann 1981) by integrating a critical gender (patriarchy) and class (capitalism) analysis have been less than fully successful. The problem here is that dual systems theory must inevitably treat patriarchal and capitalist relations as somehow outside each other. As Acker (1989: 237) argues, dual systems theory 'leaves intact the patriarchal assumptions buried in theories about the other systems to which patriarchy is related'. By pointing to analytically independent structures it is difficult, if not impossible, to capture the way that gender 'is implicated in the fundamental constitution of all social life' (p. 238).

The main conclusion to be drawn from these analytical difficulties is that notions of patriarchy need to be treated with considerable caution. At minimum they may be better understood as diversified and differentiated rather than unified and monolithic. Equally, in the case of paid work, they are likely to be interwoven in complex ways with other features of organization such as hierarchy, managerial control, culture, subordination, resistance and

a diversity of different inequalities. The complexity of men's power in 'work', highlighted by these debates, is reinforced by a growing concern with sexuality and subjectivity, which in turn has further stimulated awareness of the multiple and diverse nature of gendered power relations.

Sexuality, subjectivity and multiplicity

The growing interest in the analysis of sexuality(ies), which has come to be seen as a central feature of men's domination, has developed not only from feminist and gay theory and practices but also from post-structuralist and psychoanalytic work. Men's sexuality first became a topic of major interest in organization studies through a concern with sexual harassment. From the late 1970s, numerous studies have documented the extent, frequency and variability of workplace sexual harassment (Farley 1978; MacKinnon 1979; Hearn et al. 1989). Often studies have focused on the occurrence of 'individual' incidents, though there is increasing attention to sexual harassment as a structural, 'normal' or all-pervasive phenomenon (Hearn and Parkin 1987; Wise and Stanley 1988). Analyses of sexual harassment raise a number of paradoxical questions for men and men's sexualities. On the one hand, sexual harassment is usually an instance or a commentary on men's sexualities; on the other, sexual harassment is often understandable as about violence, power, authority, labour-power, protection of space and wage levels, economic discrimination, rather than just sexuality in any kind of isolation.

Focusing particularly upon male-dominated workplaces, Di Tomaso (1989: 72) argues that men often 'engage in a type of power play by which they use sexuality to put women in their "proper" subordinate role in relation to men'. She suggests that the paid work context seems to provide a licence for men's offensive behaviour and their attempts to take advantage of many working women; as one of her respondents stated, 'The men are different here than on the street. Its like they have been locked up for years' (p. 80). Masculinity can also be implicated in the organizational processing of sexual harassment claims. Where men as managers and/or trade union officials prefer to deal with claims of sexual harassment in an informal way, its significance is often downplayed and there is a tendency to redefine perpetrators of sexual harassment as victims and victims as perpetrators (Collinson and Collinson 1992). The anticipation by women that their claims will not be dealt with sympathetically by men in senior positions is an important barrier to their disclosure of sexual harassment.

Furthermore, 'heterosexual' sexual harassment is also often understandable in terms of relations (sometimes homosocial/homosexual relations) *between men*. This is most clearly the case in the use of pin-ups and pornography by men in workplaces and other organizations. Women are here displayed as signs for contact between men, just as women may figure as

currency of conversation, jokes and put-downs in men's socializing (Cockburn 1983; Collinson 1988). This general perspective can also apply to 'individual' harassments of women, as exchanges between men. There are two major, again apparently contradictory, aspects to such sexual dynamics: the organizational pervasiveness and dominance of men's heterosexuality (Collinson and Collinson 1989); and the organizational pervasiveness and dominance of men's homosociability/homosexuality (Hearn 1992). The contradiction of these aspects is clearest in such practices as horseplay, often performed by and between heterosexually identified men, in the form of (parodies of) homosexuality. More generally, gendered organizations are sites of both 'normal' heterosexuality for men, and men's homosociability in their preference for same gender company and spaces (Kanter 1977; Hearn 1985).

In addition to focusing upon men's sexuality, recent studies have examined the way that gendered/patriarchal workplace relations are reproduced, which in turn has led to an increasing concern with subjectivity/ies and their complex interrelations with power dynamics, and with multiplicity and diversity. For example, Henriques et al. (1984) critiqued the unitary and rational subject found in much social science. They conceptualized subjectivity as embedded in prevailing power relations, discourses and practices, and as a specific, historical product that is ambiguous, fragmentary, discontinuous, multiple, sometimes fundamentally non-rational and frequently contradictory. This approach is particularly relevant to the analysis of gendered power, men and masculinities, not just in the sense of acknowledging subjective variation, for example in the different 'types' of men and masculinities (or women and femininities), but also in the way that these are perceived and experienced and may shift over time and place.

Increasingly research has highlighted the way that men often seem preoccupied with the creation and maintenance of various masculine identities and with the expression of gendered power and status in the workplace (Willis 1977; Collinson 1992a). Men's search to construct these identities often draws upon a whole variety of organizational resources, discourses and practices and appears to be an ongoing, never-ending project that is frequently characterized by ambiguity, tension and uncertainty (Brittan 1989). Like all identities, masculine selves constantly have to be constructed, negotiated and reconstructed in routine social interaction, both in the workplace and elsewhere, through simultaneous processes of identification and differentiation (Collinson and Hearn 1994). Various studies have highlighted the fragility and precariousness underpinning and surrounding these recurrent attempts to construct masculine identities that superficially appear strong, authoritative and self-assured. Masculine identities have been shown to be threatened by social and economic forces such as new technology (Cockburn 1983; Baron 1992), unemployment (Walter 1979), feminism/ equal opportunity initiatives (Cockburn 1991) and by class and status

divisions (Sennett and Cobb 1977). In addition, men's tendency to become preoccupied with seeking to secure clearly defined and coherent identities may in itself, paradoxically, further reinforce, rather than resolve, their sense of insecurity and threat (Collinson 1992a).

It is against this background of a growing recognition of analytical difficulties with patriarchy that a more detailed interest has developed in men, masculinities and gendered power. In the second half of the chapter, we now discuss the findings of empirical studies that reveal the various ways in which these multiple masculinities are frequently reproduced in diverse workplace settings.

Multiple masculinities

The concept of multiple masculinities (Carrigan et al. 1985) has been used to refer to the temporal, spatial and cultural diversity of masculinity. It tries to convey the way in which specific forms of masculinity are constructed and persist in relation both to femininity and to other forms of masculinity. Different masculinities are embedded in relations of power, and particular forms may be characterized as 'hegemonic' or 'subordinate' in relation to one another (Connell 1995). In turn these masculinities are not fixed, but continually shifting. Multiplicity and diversity are relevant not only to the analysis of masculinity, but also to the different forms and locations of workplaces – the sites of work and of masculinity. These sites will vary, for example, according to occupation, industry, culture, class and type of organization. Thus multiple masculinities interconnect with multiple sites. We will now briefly consider four such sites: the home, the shopfloor, the office and management. Rather than operate in a simple or discrete way, these sites overlap with each other, and there may well be significant interstices between them which might reinforce their complex and ambiguous nature.

The home

Feminist analysis has argued that notions of 'work' and 'the workplace' are ideological because they reduce the meaning and status of 'work' to the organizational or 'workplace', the employed, the public. For men in particular, work and workplaces still refer primarily and overwhelmingly to the organizational, to employment and to what happens in 'public'. This even applies negatively in the sense of men being 'out of work' and being unemployed (see also Willott and Griffin in this volume). Accordingly, the home is often not seen as a workplace at all. This may apply to both women and men, albeit for different reasons. For women, this is one of the many ways in which they and their contribution remain invisible and undervalued; for men, this may be because of their persistent avoidance of domestic tasks and

responsibilities. Research suggests that women are mainly or solely responsible for three quarters of all housework (Henwood et al. 1987) and that there are also major differences between the kind of domestic tasks performed by men and women. The former tend to 'specialize' in putting children to bed, taking out/playing with children, waste disposal, household repairs and do-it-yourself. Such tasks are generally 'preferred' by men over the much more time-consuming, supposedly mundane and indeed socially subordinated tasks of cleaning, daily shopping, washing, ironing, cooking and the routine care of children (Oakley 1985).

These dominant masculinities in the home complement, albeit often in difficult and contradictory ways, the masculinities of employment. On the one hand, the very physical/geographical separation of paid work and domestic life may reflect and reinforce specific masculinities both at home and in the public workplace; on the other hand, for some men, paid work may take over the house and the home. This may apply to vicars, doctors, computer workers, research scientists, and particularly academics! Such masculinities may be constructed around a life vocation, an obsession with technology, the working of long hours or the need to maximize earnings. For example, in demonstrating men's obsession with computers in a Cambridge high tech company, Massey (1993) discusses how paid work dominates home and family life in terms of space, time and interaction. Even when wives persuaded their husbands to spend more time with their children, the most frequent outcome was that games were played by fathers and children on home computers! The domination and erosion of the private sphere of home by the public world of paid employment is likely to increase as new technologies and corporate concerns with the reduction of costs and overheads results in greater homeworking and teleworking, where distinctions between domestic and occupational tasks become increasingly blurred and difficult to manage (Collinson 1992b). This is also a growing reality for many managerial and professional workers who are employed by 'greedy organizations' demanding more and more of the domestic time and space of employees. By contrast, as the following section discusses, some groups of men workers make a highly conscious effort to retain a clear psychological and symbolic separation between the spheres of paid work and home.

The shopfloor

A key issue, particularly in the UK, which reinforces and indeed structures the multiplicity of masculinities, is the deep-seated nature of economic class inequalities, subcultures and identities that continue to be reproduced in and through routine workplace practices. There is now a considerable literature highlighting the way in which working-class masculinities are frequently embedded in the 'productive' manual skills, experience and relations of all male shopfloor life. Cockburn's (1983) study of printers reveals some of the

ways that manual skills can be defined and widely accepted as highly masculine. She shows how the hot-metal skills of linotype compositors have historically been treated and protected as the exclusive province of men. Willis (1977) describes the ways in which masculinities are often central features of working-class countercultures both in schools and in paid work. He examines how working-class lads resist school authority by 'celebrating' the so-called 'freedom' and 'independence' of manual work only to realize the reality of class subordination once they reach the factory with no educational qualifications and therefore little chance of escape.

These themes are developed by Collinson (1988, 1992a), who argues that the complex and sometimes contradictory amalgam of resistance, compliance and consent that simultaneously comprises shopfloor sub/countercultures is frequently expressed in highly masculine discourses and practices. The study focused on examines the interwoven class- and gender-specific values of men manual workers and their subcultural reproduction of masculine identities through, for example, the negation of management (as effeminate and ignorant about the processes of production); middle-class office workers (as unproductive 'pen pushers'); and women (as manipulative and exploitative). Within organizational conditions that treat manual workers as second-class citizens, working-class men may tend to redefine their sense of self, dignity and respect within the counterculture. They not only negate others, but also seek to elevate themselves through specifically masculine values of being, for example, a family breadwinner, 'practical', 'productive', 'having common sense', and being 'able to swear when you like' and 'give and take a joke like a man'. Informal shopfloor interaction between men manual workers is often highly aggressive, sexist and derogatory, humorous yet insulting, playful but degrading. New members are teased incessantly and tested to see whether they are 'man enough' to take the insults couched in the humour of 'piss taking' and the embarrassment of highly explicit sexual references. Those who display a willingness to 'give it and take it' are accepted into the masculine subculture, while those who 'snap' have failed this particular test of manhood and are likely to be kept at a distance.

' Typically, masculine shopfloor values emphasize workers' 'honesty', 'independence' and 'authenticity'. In many cases rejecting even the very idea of promotion because it would compromise their sense of masculine 'independence' and 'freedom', men manual workers often insist that this would require them to change and become conforming 'yes men'. Office work is seen as an unacceptable limit on one's freedom and (gender) identity, as one worker stated, 'You can't have a laugh and a joke in the offices. They're all twats and nancy boys there' (Collinson 1992a: 87). Similarly, shopfloor workers know that supervisors and managers are expected to take their work home and 'worry about it' in the evening and at weekends. By contrast, they seek to maintain an impenetrable psychological wall between 'public' and 'private' life, as one engineer explained: 'I leave here at 4.30 and I'm not

taking my work home. I'm not getting home at seven o'clock with a briefcase full of notes'; and another added 'Work does not affect my social life, I won't let it. It's 8.00 to 4.30 and that's it' (p. 95). Together, the foregoing studies of shopfloor dynamics reveal how highly male-dominated working-class cultures often symbolically invert the values and meanings of class society, but in ways that often unintentionally reinforce the status quo.

The office

Compared to the shopfloor, the office has been relatively little explored as a site of masculinities. Until the late nineteenth century, office jobs tended to be very much men's preserve. Then, with the expansion of the state and private sector bureaucracies, there was a rapid growth of women's clerical employment to the extent that much clerical and secretarial work became sex-typed as women's occupations (Barker and Downing 1980). 'Women's clerical work' in contemporary organizations is not only downgraded and undervalued but also frequently reflects stereotypical 'homemaker' tasks within the workplace (Pringle 1989). Men, by contrast, are often employed in well-paid and high discretionary positions that sometimes reflect and reinforce an inflated status based on their defined role as organizational 'breadwinners'.

In the UK, insurance sales is one such occupation where men often elevate and exaggerate their contribution in ways that reinforce their power, status and identity within the workplace (Collinson *et al.* 1990). Despite the work involving predominantly mental rather than manual skills, a certain masculine mystique abounds in the selling of insurance. The task is often described in terms of a heroic drama in which 'intrepid' and 'valiant' men venture out into the 'dangerous' world of finance and commerce and, 'against all the odds', return with new business: winning 'bread' for their organization. Men in selling frequently construct an image of self-control and resilience to 'take the knocks' in the aggressive financial market-place. The images of intrepid middle-class masculinities crucially impact on selection criteria and practices in ways that frequently exclude women.

Yet closer analysis of insurance sales reveals that this masculine imagery may be misleading. Much of the work consists of establishing long-term 'business relationships' with intermediaries and agents who then recommend the company's products to customers. Far from aggression and toughness, the nurturing of this business rapport requires a high degree of interpersonal skills. After-sales service is a central and key part of the sales process and it is women working in the offices who frequently play a crucial role in resolving clients' difficulties and thereby retaining their product loyalty. Where selling is conducted direct to the public, a more aggressive style is frequently adopted by 'financial consultants', who are self-employed and thus remunerated according to performance (Collinson *et al.* 1990). Yet in this part of the market the encouragement of a more 'macho' and entrepreneurial approach

to selling, particularly in the 1980s, has led to major scandals throughout the UK financial services industry because of the high-pressure, unethical sales practices that have sometimes ensued. Various research studies suggest that other middle-class, male-dominated professions and technical occupations such as doctors, computer specialists, lawyers and academics are equally characterized by gender divisions and highly masculine values and assumptions (e.g. Podmore and Spencer 1987; Massey 1993). It is to the middle-class masculinities of management that we now turn.

Management

It is truly amazing that men's domination of management has not become a serious topic of concern even in critical social science. Yet it is managers who exercise formal power in the workplace and men who frequently exercise power over women. While labour process perspectives have critically examined management as part of a general critique of capitalism (with little consideration of gender issues), feminist analyses have been more concerned with the gendered power of trade unions (with little consideration of management). This neglect is even more evident in mainstream/malestream management theory and indeed management ideology and practice. Yet a closer analysis reveals innumerable ways in which management, both in theory and practice, implicates 'men' and 'masculinities'. This applies in the construction of dominant models of management, styles of management, the language of management (often using militaristic and/or sporting metaphors), management culture, managerialism, and so on.

A few, more recent studies have begun to take up these themes of the simultaneous deconstruction of 'men'/'masculinities' and management in the context of patriarchy (e.g. Rogers 1988; Cockburn 1991; Roper 1993). They provide the basis for a more detailed assessment of the variety of inter-relations between 'men', 'masculinities' and management. In one sense, this approach extends the labour process tradition (e.g. Knights and Willmott 1986) by attempting to retrieve the agency of management from an exclusively structuralist analysis, and by rejecting assumptions of managerial omniscience and unity in favour of a focus on the contradictions that characterize managerial control. These contradictions are embedded, first in the relationship between management/labour, and men/women, second within management itself and third within and between different men and masculinities. Each of these is now examined in turn.

First, management is set within complex tensions between ownership and control, the market and the institution, technological relations and social relations. Alongside the antagonistic relations between capital and labour, based on the material conflict between wages and profit, is a coexisting and contradictory interdependence which limits managerial power (Cressey and Macinnes 1980). Retaining a continued dependence on workers' skills,

commitment and consent, management – particularly in certain labour and product market conditions – will have to relax its control and seek a relatively cooperative relationship with labour (Friedman 1977). Employers' contradictory demands for both dependable yet disposable workers result in a changing emphasis, first upon managerial prerogative and coercion (scientific management) and second upon worker cooperation and consent (human relations) as product and labour market conditions shift. Yet neither of these strategies can fully reconcile the contradiction between control and coordination in the capital/labour relation (Hyman 1987). Management control is therefore constrained by its contradictory relationship with labour. It is also highly gendered and reflects specific masculinities. Kanter (1977: 22) has argued that scientific management, with its emphasis on rationality and efficiency, is infused with an irreducibly 'masculine ethic'. She also suggests that despite its emphasis on the social group rather than economic remuneration, human relations theory still rests on the image of the rational/masculine manager who remains, 'the man who could control his emotions whereas workers could not' (p. 24).

A second contradictory element is the variety of divisions and differences within management itself, in terms, for example, of hierarchical, spatial and functional differentiations. By no means a completely integrated and cohesive function, management is rather a set of arenas for diverse, hierarchically orientated careers, promotions and power struggles (Dalton 1959; Jackall 1988; Watson 1994). Internal divisions within the managerial structure can also emerge in the possible attenuation between the formulation of corporate policy and its implementation at grassroots level, between the core and the periphery, and through extensive interfunctional rivalry. For example, Armstrong (1984, 1986) has explored the conflicts and competition between the managerial professions of accountancy, engineering and personnel to secure ascendancy for their own approach to the control of the labour process. Strategic solutions to management's 'control problem' might therefore be competing and internally fragmented. The division between line and personnel managers is often reinforced by stereotyped assumptions of the line manager as 'producer', 'provider' and breadwinner for the organization and the personnel manager as dependent, domestic and organizational 'welfare worker' (Collinson et al. 1990).

Third, there are contradictions between different men and masculinities. We have already noted how management differentiates men, both between managers and non-managers, and between different types of managers. Thus 'managerial masculinity/ies' might be understood as a form (or forms) of hegemonic masculinity. Equally, contradictions may exist between hegemonic managerial authority and diverse managerial masculinities. They may also exist between ambitious male managers seeking to purchase their career progress at the cost of others. Such differences between management, men and masculinities may be interrelated and intertwined with other social

differences, around age, class, ethnicity, locality, nationality, religion, sexuality, and so on.

These three interwoven contradictions highlight the complex conditions, processes and consequences of managerial control in the workplace. They question conventional assumptions regarding managerial power and reveal the analytical importance of similarities and differences between men, masculinities and managements. Equally, they demonstrate that the power of men as managers and managers as men is circumscribed in various ways. Yet despite the contradictory conditions and consequences of the exercise of gendered and hierarchical power, research suggests that men managers' preoccupation with control over women and labour continues to characterize many routine workplace practices. This preoccupation can be expressed and reproduced through various discourses of managerial masculinity such as authoritarianism, paternalism, entrepreneurialism, informalism and careerism (Collinson and Hearn 1994).

Conclusion

Focusing upon 'men' at 'work', this chapter has discussed several dominant masculinities that continue to remain pervasive, persistent and privileged within a diversity of workplaces and occupations. In addition to identifying these multiple masculinities and workplaces, we have been concerned to examine the conditions, processes and consequences of their reproduction in routine organizational practices. Masculinities in contemporary workplaces are characterized by contradictory tensions. On the one hand, men often seem to collaborate, cooperate and identify with one another in ways that reinforce a shared unity between them; but on the other hand, these same masculinities can also be characterized simultaneously by conflict, competition and self-differentiation in ways that highlight and intensify the differences and divisions between men. Given these deep-seated tensions, ambiguities and contradictions, the unities that exist between men should not be overstated. They are often more precarious, shifting and highly instrumental than first appearances suggest.

Neither the multiple masculinities nor the various workplaces or occupations discussed in this chapter comprise an exhaustive account of 'men' at 'work'. Our focus has been shaped by analyses and studies conducted by ourselves and others. Further empirical work is necessary to develop the understanding of these gendered power relations, cultures and subjectivities. This is especially the case with regard to management, where analyses of gender and masculinity have been particularly neglected both by conventional and radical writers alike (Collinson and Hearn 1996).

Yet, in addition to further empirical research, more theoretical work is

necessary to develop the analysis of multiple masculinities/multiple workplaces. Several conceptual and theoretical problems remain unresolved within these debates (see also Collinson and Hearn 1994, and Hearn in this volume). First, the conceptualization of 'masculinity/ies' requires clarification. For example, how do the ideological/discursive and symbolic features of masculinities interrelate with economic, material and physical aspects? Second, the ways in which masculinities relate to other elements of power, culture and subjectivity in organizations needs greater consideration. For example, in what ways and with what consequences are multiple masculinities embedded and interwoven in other workplace practices, such as those of control, consent, compliance and resistance? Finally, while recognizing a multiplicity of possible masculinities and workplace sites, analyses also need to retain a focus upon the asymmetrical nature of gendered power relations and subjectivities.

In highlighting the diversity of mens workplace power, status and domination, this chapter is not advocating a form of enquiry that merely categorizes different 'types' of men and/or masculinity in a highly descriptive and static way. Rather, we are seeking to develop analyses that can begin to reflect and comprehend the multiple, shifting but tenacious nature of gendered power regimes as they characterize diverse workplaces. We believe that such empirically informed analytical studies have the potential to examine and understand the dynamic, shifting and often contradictory organizational relations through which men's differences and similarities are reproduced and transformed in particular practices and power asymmetries. The critical studies discussed in this chapter of both 'men'/'masculinities' and 'work' are all part of the general deconstruction of the unified, rational and transcendent subject of men. The possibility of a challenge to men's taken-for-granted dominant masculinities could facilitate the emergence of less coercive and less divisive organizational structures, cultures and practices, a fundamental rethinking of the social organization of the domestic division of labour and a transformation of 'men' at 'work'.

Notes

1 In these accounts the initial focus on 'men' was soon displaced by analysis in terms of workers, managers or bureaucrats; categories that then became interchanged in the text with 'men'. Even so, there is a mass of information in such texts that can be reformulated in terms of the construction of specific masculinities (see Morgan 1992).

2 It is crucially important that the emphasis upon men and masculinities does not become a new means of forgetting/excluding women. This exclusionary tendency is a serious difficulty with the 'men's studies' approach advocated by Bly (1990) among others. The analysis of men and masculinities is likely to be enhanced, we

contend, when the relation to women and femininity is acknowledged and addressed.

References

Acker, J. (1989) The problem with patriarchy, *Sociology*, 23(2): 235–40.

Armstrong, P. (1984) Competition between the organisational professions and the evolution of management control strategies, in K. Thompson (ed.) *Work, Employment and Unemployment*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Armstrong, P. (1986) Management control strategies and inter-professional competition: the cases of accountancy and personnel management, in D. Knights and H. Willmott (eds) *Gender and the Labour Process*. Aldershot: Gower.

Barker, J. and Downing, H. (1980) Word processing and the transformation of patriarchal relations of control in the office, *Capital and Class*, 10(Spring): 64–99.

Baron, A. (1992) Technology and the crisis of masculinity: the gendering of work and skill in the US printing industry, in A. Sturdy, D. Knights and H. Willmott (eds) *Skill and Consent*. London: Routledge.

Beechey, V. (1979) On patriarchy, *Feminist Review*, 3: 66–82.

Bly, R. (1990) *Iron John: A Book About Men*. New York: Addison-Wesley.

Brittan, A. (1989) *Masculinity and Power*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Burton, C. (1991) *The Promise and the Price*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

Carrigan, T., Connell, R.W. and Lee, J. (1985) Hard and heavy: toward a new sociology of masculinity, *Theory and Society*, 14: 551–604.

Cockburn, C. (1983) *Brothers*. London: Pluto Press.

Cockburn, C. (1991) *In the Way of Women: Men's Resistance to Sex Equality in Organizations*. London: Macmillan.

Collinson, D.L. (1988) Engineering humour: masculinity, joking and conflict in shopfloor relations, *Organization Studies*, 9(2): 181–99.

Collinson, D.L. (1992a) *Managing the Shopfloor: Subjectivity, Masculinity and Workplace Culture*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Collinson, D.L. (1992b) Researching recruitment: qualitative methods sex discrimination, in R.G. Burgess (ed.) *Studies in Qualitative Methodology*, vol. 3. London: JAI Press.

Collinson, D.L. and Collinson, M. (1989) Sexuality in the workplace: the domination of men's sexuality, in J. Hearn et al. (eds) *The Sexuality of Organization*. London: Sage.

Collinson, D.L. and Collinson, M. (1992) Mismanaging sexual harassment: protecting the perpetrator and blaming the victim, *Women in Management Review*, 7(7): 11–17.

Collinson, D.L. and Hearn, J. (1994) Naming men as men – implications for work, organization and management, *Gender, Work and Organization*, 1(1): 2–22.

Collinson, D. L. and Hearn, J. (eds) (1996) *Managements and Men*. London: Sage.

Collinson, D.L., Knights, D. and Collinson, M. (1990) *Managing to Discriminate*. London: Routledge.

Connell, R.W. (1995) *Masculinities*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Cressey, P. and Macinnes, J. (1980) Voting for Ford: industrial democracy and the control of labour, *Capital and Class*, 11: 5–33.

Dalton, M. (1959) *Men Who Manage*. New York: John Wiley and Son.

DiTomaso (1989) Sexuality in the workplace: discrimination and harassment, in J. Hearn et al. (eds) *The Sexuality of Organization*. London: Sage.

Farley, L. (1978) *Sexual Shakedown*, London: Melbourne House.

Friedman, A.L. (1977) *Industry and Labour*. London: Macmillan.

Hartmann, H. (1981) The unhappy marriage of Marxism and feminism, in L. Sargent (ed.) *The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism*. London: Pluto Press.

Hearn, J. (1985) Men's sexuality at work, in A. Metcalf and M. Humphries (eds) *The Sexuality of Men*. London: Pluto Press.

Hearn, J. (1987) *The Gender of Oppression: Men, Masculinity and the Critique of Marxism*. Brighton: Wheatsheaf.

Hearn, J. (ed.) (1989) Men, masculinities and leadership: changing patterns of new initiatives. *Equal Opportunities International*, special issue, 8–10.

Hearn, J. (1992) *Men in the Public Eye: The Construction and Deconstruction of Public Men and Public Patriarchies*. London: Routledge.

Hearn, J. (1994) Research in men and masculinities: some sociological issues and possibilities, *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology*, 30(1): 47–70.

Hearn, J. and Parkin, W. (1987) *'Sex' at 'Work'. The Power and Paradox of Organisation Sexuality*. Brighton: Wheatsheaf.

Hearn, J., Sheppard, D., Tancred-Sheriff P. and Burrell, G. (eds) (1989) *The Sexuality of Organisation*. London: Sage.

Henriques, J., Hollway, W., Urwin, C., Venn, C. and Walkerdine, V. (1984) *Changing the Subject*. London: Methuen.

Henwood, M., Rimmer, L. and Wicks, M. (1987) *Inside the Family: Changing Roles of Men and Women*. London: Family Policy Studies Centre.

Hyman, R. (1987) Strategy or structure? capital, labour and control, *Work, Employment and Society*, 1(1): 25–55.

Jackall, R. (1988) *Moral Mazes: The World of Corporate Managers*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Kanter, R.M. (1977) *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York: Basic Books.

Knights, D. and Willmott, H. (1986) *Managing the Labour Process*. Aldershot: Gower.

MacKinnon, C.A. (1979) *The Sexual Harassment of Working Women*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Massey, D. (1993) Scientists, transcendence and the work/home boundary, in J. Wajcman (ed.) *Organization, Gender and Power: Papers from our IRRU Workshop*, Warwick Papers in Industrial Relations, 48: 17–25.

Morgan, D.H.J. (1992) *Discovering Men*. London: Routledge.

Oakley, A. (1985) *Sociology of Housework*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Podmore, D. and Spencer, A. (eds) (1987) *In a Man's World*. London: Tavistock.

Pringle, R. (1989) *Secretaries Talk*. London: Verso.

Rogers, B. (1988) *Men Only. An Investigation into Men's Organizations*. London: Pandora.

Roper, M. (1993) *Masculinity and the British Organization Man, 1945 to the Present*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rowbotham, S. (1979) The trouble with patriarchy, *New Statesman*, 98(2344/5): 970–1.

Sennett, R. and Cobb, J. (1977) *The Hidden Injuries of Class*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Walby, S. (1986) *Patriarchy at Work*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Walby, S. (1990) *Theorizing Patriarchy*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Walker, C. R. and Guest, R. H. (1952) *The Man on the Assembly Line*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Walter, J. A. (1979) *A Long Way from Home*. Exeter: Paternoster Press.

Watson, T. J. (1994) *In Search of Management*. London: Routledge.

Whyte, W. H. (1956) *The Organization Man*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Willis, P. (1977) *Learning to Labour*. London: Saxon House.

Wise, S. and Stanley, L. (1987) *Georgie Porgie: Sexual Harassment in Everyday Life*. London: Pandora.

5   Sara Willott and Christine Griffin

Men, masculinity and the challenge of long-term unemployment

Introduction

Traditional discourses of masculinity describe the man as the member of the household who goes out and makes a living (see, for example, Bernard 1981; Hood 1986). Paid employment, as a means both of making money and of getting out of the house, is therefore likely to be an important anchor for traditional masculine identities (Morgan 1992). Unemployment, on the other hand, decreases a man's ability to provide for himself and his family – if he has one. It typically also affects where he spends his time (Morgan 1992). Because of this, unemployment at least potentially provides a challenge to traditional masculine identities. This chapter explores the ways in which unemployed men position themselves in relation to established discourses of masculinity.

Social science approaches

To date, relatively little research has looked specifically at unemployment and masculinities. Fryer and Payne (1986) identified three main theories from mainstream psychological research on unemployment. The stage theory approach, initially proposed by Eisenberg and Lazarsfeld (1938), has seen a plethora of studies concerned with the various stages of psychological 'adjustment' that unemployed men move through over time. Kelvin and Jarrett (1985) criticize the simplistic use of stages and prefer to concentrate on the critical transition between each stage. In Fryer's opinion, however, the 'stage' literature has been largely discredited. Jahoda *et al.* (1933; 1982) championed the function and need theory (see also Warr 1983), or what Fryer prefers to call 'the deprivation hypothesis'. According to Fryer, the Jahoda model has dominated the literature. Fryer's more recent approach