Men, Masculinities and Management : Unities, Differences and Their Interrelations

David L. Collinson

University of Warwick, England

and

Jeff Hearn

University of Bradford, England

For Academy of Management Review

'Forum on New Intellectual Currents'

Men, Masculinities and Management : Unities, Differences and Their Interrelations[1]

David L. Collinson and Jeff Hearn

Abstract

Informed by feminist and pro-feminist perspectives, this paper challenges conventional and more critical theories of management. It highlights how management practice is often shaped by various masculinities that have frequently been neglected in studies of management. This argument is elaborated through ethnographic material that illustrates how managerial practices can be characterized by discourses of entrepreneurialism, paternalism and personalism, that tend to unify men managers, and the discourse of careerism, that tends to fragment them. The paper concludes by reviewing some of the implications of this analysis for theories and theorists of management and considers why issues of men and masculinities have so frequently been avoided in the analysis of management.

Introduction

One of the most significant features of modern society has been the growth of management and large scale organizations. Indeed Mintzberg (1989) has characterized the twentieth century as the 'age of management'. In most contemporary organizations managerial prerogative over key decisions remains the taken for granted norm. Whether decisions concern strategic issues, for example, of capital investment, product development, market position and so on, or human resource matters, such as recruitment, supervision, promotion, appraisal and training, managements' influence over

these practices remains unquestioned and unchallenged, even by trade unions.

The emergence of management as the central organizational activity of modern corporations is reflected in the burgeoning literature that now seeks to examine the assumptions, responsibilities and practices of contemporary managements (see e.g. Barnard, 1938; Dalton, 1959; Child, 1969; Mintzberg, 1973, 1989; Drucker, 1979; Cole, 1982; Stewart, 1986; Kreitner, 1989; Reed, 1989). These prevailing discourses on management tend to adopt either a descriptive and/or prescriptive perspective. Rarely do they question managerial power, the elitist nature of most decision making in organizations or the terms and conditions of employment that are associated with the function.

Making sense of management is a difficult and complex task. While the dominant modes of analysis of management are immensely varied, most state a reluctance to attend to questions of gender and gender relations. A focus on gender and gender relations tends to disrupt taken-for-granted ways of thinking about management. This is especially important as management is often, indeed usually, presented as if it is a gender-neutral activity, whereas in reality it is clear that management remains strongly dominated by men in most organizations. This assumption of gender-neutrality in and of management has been strongly challenged by a range of feminist and feminist-influenced approaches in both practice and theory. Feminist theories and practices have actively shown how management often excludes women. Increasingly they have also shown how this exclusion particularly applies to black women, women of color, and ethnic minority women (Di Tomaso, 1988; Bell and Nkomo, 1992). Within feminist approaches

the priority has generally been to analyse and change women's relative absence from management and discourses on management. This has involved critical attention to the socially constructed invisibility of women's voices, speech, bodies, as well as women's ways of organizing, managing and leading (Helgeson, 1990; Rosener, 1990). Accordingly, feminist theories have stressed women's subordination, oppression and devaluation in relation to management. Implicitly, and sometimes explicitly, such approaches have also represented a critique of men and masculinities, and specifically men's domination of management.

This paper attends to the Other side, that is taken-for-granted in malestream discourses, and is theorized implicitly and sometimes explicitly in feminist discourses - the problem of men, masculinities and managements, of men's domination of management. These questions remain important even with the considerable transnational variations in women's participation in management (Adler and Izraeli, 1992), the increasing numbers of women in middle, if not top, management (Crompton and Sanderson, 1986), the burgeoning 'women in management' literature (e.g. Gordon and Strober, 1975), and the establishment of women centered theory of management (Calas et al., 1991). Indeed, as we elaborate later, the social construction of men and masculinities could become even more important, particularly where women adhere to discourses and practices defined, constructed and controlled by men.

In this paper we shall use research and theoretical perspective on gender and gender relations from feminism and recent critical studies on men and masculinities to question/disrupt/deconstruct the power and authority of managers and managements, particularly men in management.

Accordingly, our pro-feminist approach draws on new intellectual and theoretical work on men and masculinities to open up the topic of 'men and masculinities' as both important and problematic in the analysis of management and management theory. To set the scene for this, some introductory remarks are needed on our own approach to, first, gender, and, second, men and masculinities.

Our own theoretical approach to gender is paradoxically both simple and complex. We see gender as socially constructed, historically and culturally variable. We also see gender as a relational phenomenon, or set of phenomena - hence the term, gender relations. Furthermore, these are not just relations of any kind: rather gender relations are power relations. The power relations of gender are both material and discursive. They are constructed in and through discourses, and they are also constructed in the material world, in practice and in practical situations, not just in people's heads. When we say 'material', we are thinking of both the operation of the economy and economic relations, and other human relations, such as those concerning the body, sexuality and violence. The shorthand 'discursive practices' may be used to refer to this simultaneously material and discursive reproduction of gender. For these and other reasons, gender and gender relations cannot be reduced to a single theory, explanation or facet. Instead we think it is important to acknowledge multiple or plural perspectives in theory, research and practice. This postmodernist theme should not be taken as any dilution of the importance of power, including the power of men. Instead we see the interrelations of power between genders and power within genders as crucial in analysis.

The theoretical inspirations for our approach to gender are thus diverse. They include feminist theory (particularly materialist feminism, radical feminism, and postmodernist feminism), discourse analysis, post-modernism, and those critical studies on men and masculinities that are themselves influenced by these intellectual traditions. To follow Connell's (1985) terminology our understanding of gender is informed by both power analysis and practice-based approaches: it is between modernism and postmodernism.

Similarly, our approach to men and masculinities is also both simple and complex. Men and masculinities are not biologically or naturally determined. We also reject the view of 'sex role theory' that 'masculinity' is a singular phenomenon mechanically inscribed in men by their early social experiences (Connell, 1985, 1987) or other cultural patterns (Eichler, 1980). Men and masculinities are socially constructed, and hence will vary historically, and between and within cultures. Men and masculinities are also relational phenomena; they exist in relation to women, femininities and other gendered phenomena. These relations involve power, both between women and men, and between men, as well as between men, children and young people. Such power is simultaneously material and discursive. While men are particular gendered people, masculinities are discursive practices that indicate or confirm that someone is a man. As such masculinities can refer to institutional rules and practices, ideologies, sets of signs, identities or subjectivities. And as such they can be invested in by both women and men.

These social, historical and cultural constructions of men and masculinities are, however, far from random. In particular we see it as

important to recognize men as having collective interests which may be opposed to women. This is most obviously so in terms of sexuality (MacKinnon, 1982); procreation/biological reproduction (O'Brien, 1981); work in the family (Delphy, 1970), nurture and violence (Hearn, 1987). To put this collective interest simply and directly, men, like women, can be understood as a gender class - in the sense that it may be analytically and politically useful to see men as having interests that are opposed to women's. Thus, for example, men in management can be understood as acting on behalf of or in defence of the interests of the collectivity of men.

On the other hand, both men and masculinities are not homogenous and are indeed characterized by diversity and differences. As Carrigan, Connell and Lee (1985) argue, masculinity (or femininity) is not fixed, undifferentiated or unchanging - hence the preference for the term masculinities rather than just masculinity. We see the interrelations of unities of men and masculinities (as in the notion of gender class) and differences between and within particular men and masculinities as especially important. Thus there are a wide range of particular masculinities, that is, forms of masculinities that operate as discursive practices in particular situations, at particular historical times, in particular cultural milieux. For example, the commonplace notion of aggressive ('macho') masculinity is not only specific to particular times, places and kinds of men, but it is also constructed in quite different ways in these different situations. There are in effect many different forms of even aggressive masculinity.

Furthermore, masculinities can themselves be internally divided. Hegemonic masculinities (e.g. white, heterosexual, dominant) may dominate

other masculinities (e.g. black, gay, subordinate). Other masculinities (e.g. white, gay masculinities or black, middle class masculinities) may carry internal contradictions between elements confirming or undermining power. Masculinities are as much about relations between men as relations between women and men (Connell, 1987; Brod, 1987; Chapman and Rutherford, 1988; Brittan, 1989; Kimmel and Messner, 1989; Segal, 1989; Hearn and Morgan, 1990; Collinson, 1992; Hearn, 1992b).

There are many points of interconnections between particular masculinities and particular managements, or rather managerial practices, for example, paternalism, entrepreneurialism, careerism, personalism. Different masculinities operate in different ways in different contexts with different effects. Specific managerial masculinities, such as paternalist masculinities, may not only reinforce the power of those men concerned but also confirm the 'rights' of both management and men to manage.

Following the tradition of labour process theory, this paper can also be understood as a contribution to the deconstruction of management and organizations. Particularly, the ways that managerial power is hierarchical, gendered and often masculinized. Deconstruction reveals 'power operating in structures of thinking and behavior that previously seemed devoid of power relations' (White, 1986:421). By highlighting the multiplicity of interpretations of texts and events, deconstruction challenges dominant discourses and their claims to absolute truth or objectivity (Martin, 1990a:340). In problematizing and articulating that which is often unsaid or marginalized by dominant discourses (in this case, about management), deconstruction exposes conflicts, disruptions and

contradictions, and reveals the power asymmetries in discursive practices. Here we seek to deconstruct dominant discourses about managements and men in organizations by exploring the way that masculinity (or masculinities) often both unites and differentiates men as managers in their exercise of power. While men and masculinities are our major theme, deconstruction is our approach.

As a final word of introduction, we think it is important to emphasize that our approach is not intended to be an extension of the 'women in management' literature that has characterized much of the debate on gender and organizations. Such analyses have generally adopted a liberal perspective that neglects critical examination of the power and practices of either men as managers or managers as men. Its recurrent emphasis upon developing the necessary skills for women to fit into contemporary managerial hierarchies reflects a concentration on women that is always in danger of blaming the victim and/or essentializing 'women'. Interestingly recent reviews of research on the possible differences between female and male managers, in terms of managerial behaviors, managerial commitment and motivation, decision style, managerial stress, and subordinates' responses, have found few consistent differences. Indeed there is some evidence that women managers and leaders display more achievement motivation than men, presumably as a way of overcoming gender discrimination (Powell, 1988; Donnell and Hall, 1980; Boulgarides, 1984).

In developing our argument, we begin by reviewing relevant literatures regarding managements, gender relations, and men and masculinities. First, there is the conventional management literature that fails to consider the structural basis of power asymmetries. The next three

sections examine literatures that deconstruct management (without gender); gender relations in organizations (without management); and men (without management). We then consider studies that have begun to bring together the deconstruction of men, gender and management. Drawing on their insights, we then develop our own argument that managerial power in organizations is often reproduced through particular unities and differences between men, masculinities and managements. This is illustrated by ethnographic data that focusses upon managerial practices. The final section relates these concerns to future directions in research.

Dominant Discourses on Management

While dominant discourses on management are immensely varied, what unites most of those discourses is their avoidance of gender as a major focus of concern. This is to be seen in the development of management theory, from scientific management to human relations theories, organizational psychology and motivation theories, systems and contingency theory, theories of job design and job enrichment, and so on (Calas et al., 1991). Equally, an avoidance of gender has characterized other dimensions of variation in management thought, for example, that between technicism and subjectivism. In the former case, management is treated as a neutral function concerned with rational and systematic coordination through formalized structures that often determine organizational practices (e.g. Lawrence and Lorsch, 1967). In the latter case, by contrast, power is recognized but only as a shifting inter-subjective set of negotiated processes that are separated from organizational structure (Dalton, 1959; Crozier, 1964). This approach thereby neglects the institutional formation of inter-organizational power struggles (Willmott, 1984; Reed, 1989).

Both these discourses generally fail to give attention to gender. Indeed this literature tends to treat the managerial function in a peculiarly neutered, asexual way. It has therefore failed to acknowledge that historically and in different societies, leaders generally and managers more specifically have been predominantly men (Hearn and Parkin, 1988, 1992). Managerial texts are usually written for or about the 'male manager' even where reference is made to the 'changing aspirations of women' (Rothwell, 1983). Thus the function is still often seen to be synonymous with men. Of course, this taken for granted association of men and masculinity with management has some plausibility given the historically gender-typed nature of the occupation. However, to assume that gender is not an issue simply because women are rarely in evidence is to confuse 'women' with 'gender' and to remain blind to the conditions, content and consequences of the reproduction of specific masculinities within and between the senior hierarchical ranks of contemporary corporations.

Another dimension of difference within dominant discourses on management is that between description and prescription. The descriptive work of Mintzberg (1973, 1975, 1983, 1989) has been particularly influential in management studies. His empirically based research findings challenge the conventional highly rational, objectivist and 'scientific' view of management revealing a more complex, less ordered and much more subjective reality. His later analysis explores the political alliances and strategies played out by managers in their search for power, influence and organizational security. In many ways, such descriptions of managerial work are similar to those of Dalton (1959) in his classic study of Men who

1973). This historical neglect of gender in the study of leadership persists in the psychological literature today. For example, a recent influential American review of the literature on 'power and leadership in organizations' (Hollander and Offerman, 1990) devotes only two sentences to women in organizations and totally neglect issues of masculinity in relation to power and leadership. Its prescriptions for future research are equally gender-blind.

Similarly, Bennis' (1989) recent prescriptions about how to 'become a leader' illustrate the dangers of neglecting gender and of highly subjective analyses. He presents various taxonomies of prescriptions based on research interviews with twenty-nine leaders all of whom he defines as 'distinctive' and 'successful'. Yet although nine of these respondents are women, Bennis uses the pronoun 'he' all the way through the text when making abstract references to leaders. The dominant discourse of the text therefore excludes women and fails to problematize men and masculinity in relation to leadership. At the very least, Bennis could have paid more attention to the interesting claims of respondent Barbara Corday that women deploy quite different leadership styles (also see Helgeson, 1990; Rosener, 1990). Moreover, he could have avoided conflation of 'gender' with 'women', and so addressed the relationship between masculinities, management and leadership. The neglect of mascul-inity in a book from one of the 'gurus' of leadership studies re-affirms the pressing nature of the need to increase intellectual scrutiny and intensive research on this potentially rich area for leadership studies.

The theme of charismatic leadership has also been a primary influence on the emergence in the 1980s of a highly prescriptive managerial discourse

on corporate culture. Psychologists, such as Schein (1985), and management consultants, such as Peters and Waterman (1982), have emphasized corporate leaders' responsibility for 'managing meaning' (Morgan 1986) and establishing strong organizational cultures (Deal and Kennedy, 1982). Like Bennis, writers such as Peters and Austin (1985) present long taxonomies of prescriptions on how to be a visionary leader who above all else can and must manage and manipulate organizational culture. The subjective personal qualities of leadership are therefore a pre-condition for the construction of corporate culture which in itself appeals to the subjective, emotional and social concerns of individual employees.

These 'corporate culture merchants' (Thompson and McHugh, 1990:228) see the management of culture as an alternative to the exercise of managerial power and coercion. Yet their highly subjectivist focus upon consensus-building, shared values and meanings, and harmonious organizational relations neglects or denies the exercise of hierarchical and masculine power in organizations. Managerial attempts to control the workforce are embedded in and central to the manipulation of corporate culture (Knights and Willmott, 1987; Thompson and McHugh, 1990; Hollway, 1991). This 'hidden agenda' is merely disguised behind the calls for intersubjective communication, understanding and harmony.

In addition, charismatic leadership and the establishment of strong corporate cultures often draw upon the gendered imagery of the organizations as a family. Such familial imagery is a condition and consequence of management's position as patriarchal 'heads' of the family whose authority is expressed in paternalistic discourses. The inherent masculinity of this discourse is rarely addressed in the literature. Likewise, the way in

which particular workplace cultures appeal to highly masculine values of individualism, aggression, competition, sport and even alcohol is often neglected even by more critical studies of corporate culture (e.g. Alvesson, 1988).

Thus dominant discourses on management fail to examine both hierarchical and gendered masculinized power in organizations. The following three sections review more critical discourses that present a partial critique of management and masculinity. The first discourse, that is derived from labour process analysis, deconstructs managerial power, but often neglects gender; the second, drawn from feminist and related studies, deconstructs gender but neglects management; the third deconstructs men but without attending to management.

Management Without Gender

Critical discourses on management emerge from critiques of power-blind conventional approaches. They seek to make explicit and then to deconstruct management's extensive power and control in organizations. Inspired by Braverman's (1974) critical analysis of the labour process, writers such as Friedman (1977), Edwards (1979) and Burawoy (1979, 1985) have developed this political economy of managerial practices in capitalist organizations. Highlighting the structural economic imperatives of capitalist production, these writers emphasise how managerial practices are shaped by a primary concern to control the labour process. Managers are therefore regarded as the bearers of an economic logic in which labour is controlled and directed for the benefit of profit and sectional interests (Reed, 1989:11).

This critical approach contains three general features: employers exercise control over labour. They also need to motivate employees and secure their consent; employers seek to cheapen production and labour costs through deskilling, relocation, work intensification etc.; and capitalist organizations are characterized by a division of labour sustained by hierarchy, science and technology that facilitates managerial control and the pursuit of profitability (Thompson and McHugh, 1990).

Increasingly, labour process analysts have recognized that an exclusive focus upon the structural basis of managerial power asymmetries tends to attribute a unity, homogeneity and omniscience to management that fails to capture the complex realities of the function. Accordingly, recent contributions have contextualized managerial power and discretion within broader social, economic and political conditions and examined the diversity and differences that characterize managerial hierarchies through a closer focus upon subjectivity and managerial agency. For example, it has been argued that whilst the labour process is the core of productive activity, it must be located within 'the full circuit of capital' (Kelly, 1985). Managers are concerned with sales and marketing, financial controls, the supply of components and product quality, as well as the control of labour. Similarly, since non-capitalist organizations also display strong evidence of bureaucratic control, rigid hierarchies and work fragmentation, power inequalities cannot simply be conflated with capitalism (Thompson and McHugh, 1990).

Recent labour process contributions have also begun to reveal the diversity, discontinuities and differences that can undermine or strengthen relations within and between managerial functions. Power asymmetries of

organizations are reproduced through particular divisions thus revealing the heterogeneity and contingent power basis of a managerial function once treated as all-powerful and homogenous by early labour process writers. The following managerial differences have been shown to be a routine characteristic of the function; discipline and function (Dalton, 1959; Armstrong, 1984, 1986, 1989; Reed, 1989); hierarchical position and status (Torrington et al., 1982; Child, 1985; Collinson, 1987; Hyman, 1987; Collinson et al., 1990); careerism and ambition (Offe, 1976; Collinson et al., 1990); industry and organization (Collinson et al., 1990); age (Collinson et al., 1990); region and country (Clegg, 1990); identity interests and orientations (Collinson et al., 1990; LaNuez and Jermier, 1992) and biographical and personal characteristics (Nord and Jermier, 1991).

Yet despite these recent contributions, the continued predominance of men and the relatively limited presence of women in managerial positions has still not been given sufficient attention in the labour process literature. This has resulted in a failure to recognize that the divisions and differences within and between managements often reflect and reinforce particular masculinities. Within managerial hierarchies, managers are frequently highly sensitized to career advancement: this might generate motivation and cooperation, or it could produce power struggles and communication breakdowns as individuals seek to differentiate and elevate themselves and/or to defend self and deny responsibility. The ways in which these unities and differences within managements are a condition and consequence of particular masculinities will be discussed later in the context of careerism.

Recent research has also highlighted the way in which management can be fragmented between functions. Writers have pointed to the extensive nature of intra-managerial competition and functional rivalry. For example, Armstrong (1984, 1986) has explored the battle 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. These intra-managerial struggles may also reflect and reinforce particular competitive masculinities that subordinate women. This is illustrated by the way that personnel management has developed historically as 'women's work' (Legge, 1987).

To summarise, the labour process debate has emphasised the unity of managers in the imperative to control labour, and extract production and profit. More recent contributions have considered the differences and fragmentations that also characterize the function. We argue that these managerial unities and differences are crucially shaped by gender inequalities and particular masculinities. The deconstruction of managerial power suggested by labour process analysis requires further consideration of masculinity and gender in organizations. It is to the literature which more explicitly considers gender that we now turn.

Gender Without Management

The major force in developing the explicit analysis of gender in organizations has been and is feminist scholarship. Other important contributions have been made by other traditions, such as psychoanalysis, structuralism and ethnomethodology. It is impossible to review in detail feminist contributions to social science; instead, we simply highlight

some of the relevant contributions to the deconstruction of gender relations in organizations, whilst also noting their tendency to neglect management.

The first kind of contribution is that which attempts to deconstruct gender as a general social phenomenon without specific reference to organizations or management. While there are major variations and differences in approaches to the theorizing of gender within and in relation to feminism, there is a general, though not a universal, recognition of the social, political, historical and cultural nature of what is meant by gender, and indeed 'woman' and 'man' (Kessler and McKenna, 1978; Stanley, 1984; Oakley, 1985; Hess and Ferree, 1987; Connell, 1987; Lorber and Farrell, 1990). Above all, gender is now recognized as a diverse and multi-faceted phenomenon (Scott, 1986).

Secondly, there are the range of feminist and related studies of gender in organizations (Sheriff and Campbell, 1981; Hearn and Parkin, 1983). These again approach their topic from a wide range of theoretical and methodological perspectives. They include Marxist feminism, dual systems approaches, and theories of patriarchy. For example, Marxist feminist theories have been concerned with economic power relations, and women's subordination in organizations particularly. Early writers suggested that women's labour was used by employers as a flexible and disposable reserve army, and labour markets are often segmented by gender so that women are entrapped within the secondary sector of low paid and unskilled jobs (Benston, 1969; Beechey, 1977, 1978). More recently, some feminist writers concerned to explain the persistence of job segregation have focussed upon patriarchy as a separate system of men's control over

women (Hartman, 1979; Cockburn, 1983; Walby, 1986, 1990). Studies of patriarchy reveal the way that organized groups of men workers (in the United States and the U.K. in particular)have been able to oppose the entry of cheap female labour by demanding the 'breadwinner wage' and by controlling both the provision of training and the definition of skill. They disclose how men workers have contributed to the segmentation of labour markets and to the way in which 'skill has become saturated with sex' (Phillips and Taylor, 1980:85), wherein men are associated with skilled work and women are automatically regarded as unskilled labour. Middle and working class men have exaggerated and mystified their own skills so as to secure labour market closure and job demarcation (Witz, 1986; Walby, 1986; Legge, 1987).

Craft unions, in particular, have been the object of extensive feminist historical critique. This has exposed the attempts of organized labour to reproduce and protect segregated work patterns and the family wage by sustaining labour market control and self-serving masculine ideologies of skill (Cockburn, 1983). Presenting a detailed historical account of the exclusionary practices of men as skilled and semi-skilled organized labour, Walby (1986) argues that many feminist writers have failed to acknowledge the full significance of the role of trade unions in the reproduction of job segregation.

We would also contend that many feminist studies have tended to either neglect managerial power in organizations or treat it relatively deterministically. In early feminist theories, managerial power, intentions and practices were often assumed to be the wholly determined

outcome of capitalist tendencies to extract surplus value and to accumulate capital: managers were treated as the 'unproblematic, agents of capital' (Storey, 1985:795). Even theories of patriarchy that have examined the exclusionary practices of trade unions and the ideologies which are their condition and consequence have paid little corresponding attention to the exclusionary practices of managers and their justifications and rationalizations. Indeed it could be argued that this literature has overestimated the power of organized labour as against management in the recruitment process (Thompson, 1983; Brenner and Ramas, 1984).

Men Without Management

In recent years there has been growing interest in more explicit study and theorizing of men and masculinities. This is partly a development from within feminism; indeed the problem of men (Friedman and Sarah, 1982) has been a central one throughout the growth of feminism (Hanmer, 1990). Men have been analyzed and criticised in a variety of different ways, often, though not always, negatively: men have been understood as a gender class , as 'the main enemy' (Delphy, 1970), as potential allies, as '... a group ... used ... to oppress women' that is itself oppressed (Women, 1985). The focus on men has also been emphasized in certain areas of study, most obviously violence, sexual assault and pornography. Some feminists have also revealed the importance of contradictions in analyzing men (Segal, 1989), as, for example, when men are both defined as 'political enemies' and urged 'to stop being men' (Sebestyen, 1982). Other approaches have been developed in gay scholarship, 'men's studies', and pro-feminism.

Men as a group or gender class have been shown to benefit from the routine material relations that characterize domestic and capitalist labour

processes. However, focussing exclusively upon the structural relationship of power between men and women can be misleading. It can caricature men's power and women's subordination, and over-emphasize the uniformity of men. Paralleling recent developments in labour process analysis, recent studies on men have highlighted not only men's power, but also the material and symbolic differences through which that power is reproduced. Men and 'masculinity', like management, are by no means homogenous, unified or monolithic cate-gories. Increasingly, the importance of speaking of multiple masculinities has been recognized in feminist and pro-feminist literature. This diversity and heterogeneity includes differences between men according to age; class; ethnicity; bodily facility; sexuality; world view; region; nationality; appearance; parental/marital/kinship status; leisure; occupation; size; and propensity for violence (Hearn and Collinson, 1990). In deconstructing men's power, we are therefore concerned to explore the diversity of men's subjectivities and identities which constitute sources of unities and differences between men (and in contrast to women). These unities and differences are crucially important, often interrelated factors in the reproduction of power relations in organizations. However, most studies, and especially those labelled 'men's studies', have not applied these insights to men in positions of formal power, such as management.

Men, Masculinities and Managements

While the majority of studies on management have neglected gender, and the majority of studies on gender and men have neglected management, there is a growing body of work, by women and men, that does recognize some of the interconnections between gender and management. These approaches to gender

and management reflect debates in and around feminism on the rethinking of the meaning of 'work' itself, in the light of developments in feminist epistemology (e.g. Beechey, 1988). Such studies, along with those by men sympathetic to feminist and gender analysis, provide the basis for a more detailed assessment of the variety of interrelations between men, masculinities and managements. We shall now consider such studies under three broad headings: feminist ethnographies of workplace organizations; post-structuralist feminism and critiques of gender and organizations; critical studies on men and masculinities. Each of these three kinds of studies have not only brought gender and management together but also necessarily raise important questions for the analysis of the interrelations of men, masculinities and managements.

Feminist ethnographics of workplace organizations

The path-breaking study of this type is Kanter's (1977) Men and Women of the Corporation, in which, on the basis of detailed ethnographic research, she argues that scientific management with its emphasis on rationality and efficiency, is infused with an irreducibly 'masculine ethic' (p.22). A central assumption of this strategy is that only men hold the requisite qualities of the 'new rational manager': a tough minded approach to problems, analytical abilities to abstract and plan, a capacity to subordinate personal concerns in order to accomplish the task and a cognitive superiority in problem solving. Women tend to be stereotyped as 'too emotional', and so excluded from managerial positions: only those women who show the ability to 'think like a man' will be admitted into management.

Kanter further suggests that despite its emphasis on the social group rather than economic renumeration, Human Relations theory rests on the image of the rational manager who remains, 'the man who could control his emotions whereas workers could not' (p.24). The Human Relations emphasis on shared interests and mutual responsibility has been associated in other studies with the masculine managerial strategy of paternalism (e.g. Norris, 1978; Lawson, 1981; Lown, 1983; Westwood, 1984; Bradley, 1986). Instead of a coercive or dictatorial approach, managers insist on a reciprocal working relationship and call for moral cooperation and the development of 'personal', trust relations. This approach often emerges when management's economic power is weakened, for example, in the context of labour shortages, high product demand or severe competition. Another factor shaping the emergence of this ideology is the 'gender of the labour force' (Bradley, 1986). Paternalism towards women, children and young people may reflect and reinforce the patriarchal imagery of the conventional ('happy') family, where the employer's power is legitimized by their concern to 'protect' the worker's 'best interests' (Lown, 1983). These claims encourage personal loyalty and worker identification with the organization in order to ensure cohesion, stability, production and profit.

Pollert (1981), in studying women workers in Imperial Tobacco, points to the contradiction between management's traditional welfare paternalism in 'looking after people' and the priorities of the organization, namely to maximize efficiency, productivity and profitability. Similarly, Westwood (1984) outlines how the management of a hosiery factory employing large numbers of women tried to maintain an image of a caring, paternalistic family firm to insist on the equal and shared responsibilities of workers

and managers in maintaining high quality products. Yet this harmonious image was contradicted by the tedium of the job, the level of exploitation and the nature of control (p.15).

Whilst a variety of structural feminist theories have attended to the reproduction of gender inequality in labour markets, they have tended to be overly deterministic in their treatment of management, and have not problematized the ways management and managerial practices reflect and reinforce particular masculinities. In contrast, feminist ethnographies of organizations point to a more complex analysis of structural, agency and their relations. Through detailed study of specific organizational events, they have begun to reveal the power and authority of men and managements, and how that power and authority can be 'normalized'.

Post-structuralist feminisms and critiques of gender and organizations.

The interaction of post-structuralism and feminisms, and hence the growth of post-structuralist feminisms, are increasingly important developments (e.g. Weedon, 1987). These conjunctions, influenced by discourse analysis, semiotics, linguistics and psychoanalysis, are inevitably diverse (e.g. Henriques et al., 1984). They deal in difference, diversity and practices in discourse. While the topics addressed by these approaches are themselves also diverse, it is very important to note that the deconstruction of gender and organization has become a major focus of concern within post-structuralist feminism. The path-breaking text here is Ferguson's (1984) The Feminist Case Against Bureaucracy. This has been followed by studies on organization theory and epistemology (Calas and Smircich, 1991, 1992); organizational conflict (Martin, 1990a); organizational power

(Czarniawska-Joerges 1990, 1991), organizational forms (Ferguson, 1987), and managers and secretaries (Game, 1989, Pringle, 1989). There are also a number of texts that have been written collaboratively by women and men, such as those on management theory (Jacobson and Jaques, 1990; Calas et al., 1991), rationality (Mumby and Putman, 1990) and sexuality (Hearn and Parkin, 1987; Hearn et al., 1989), or by men alone, such as those on shopfloor humour (Collinson, 1988), communication (Mills and Chiaramonte, 1991) and identity (Mills, 1991), that are influenced by post-structuralist feminism. We see this emerging tradition as a particularly powerful and positive approach to gender organizations and management. The acceptance of philosophical and theoretical diversity and fragmentation, that applies in post-structuralism and post-structuralist feminism, may, perhaps surprisingly to some, have assisted the academic recognition of people's diverse, fragmented and gendered lives in and around organization and management. In this sense, post-structuralist feminism has in the last few years accomplished much in the analysis of gender and management, and in turn prompts a concern with men, masculinities and managements.

Critical studies on men and masculinities

We have already noted how much of what has been called 'men's studies' has not addressed the power of men in management and other formal positions of power; it has also, in some cases at least, been politically ambiguous, in relation to feminism, and theoretically ambiguous, in reifying, reaffirming or deconstructing the category 'men'. For these and other reasons, it is important that the study of men is open to women and men, critical, pro-feminist and directly focussed upon men's power. Such an approach has been labelled 'critical studies on men and masculinities'

or simply 'the critique of men' (Hearn, 1987, 1989b; Hearn and Morgan, 1990). Without such a critical orientation, the study of men by men may reproduce the patriarchalism it seeks to analyze. In critical studies on men and masculinities, the question of power is central.

A number of recent feminist studies have focussed on managerial men and the ways that managerial power is gendered and men's power is embedded in organizational hierarchies and control strategies (see Collinson and Knights, 1986). They have taken up these themes of the simultaneous deconstruction of 'men'/'masculinities' and management in the context of patriarchy. These include Rogers (1988) on men-only organizations and Cockburn (1989, 1990) on the mechanisms of the reproduction of power used by men, particularly men as managers (assertion of the 'main aim'; autonomous labour market policy; the evasiveness of power; leaving domestic ties to women; defining when difference is legitimate; organization sexuality; and shaping women's consciousness). Other feminist analyses have focussed on men in terms of the domination of organizational thinking, as in the critique of Weber's theorizing as a masculine and patriarchal view of the world (Bologh, 1990; Martin, 1990b).

There are also signs, amongst men, of an increasingly explicit focus on men in formal positions of power, and specifically management. Among the issues that have recently received attention are the importance of analyzing the relationship of men and managements in terms of historical change rather than an ahistorical function (Roper, 1989, 1991; Hearn, 1992b); the close connections between masculinities and dominant models of leadership (Hearn, 1989a); the reconceptualization of management-labor relations in terms of interrelations of masculinities (Collinson, 1992);

The following discussion seeks to highlight this taken for granted character of these masculinities by examining several of the unities and differences through which the power of men as managers can be reproduced in organizational practices. Two of the overall findings from the E.O.C. research illustrate the respective unities and divisions that may characterize the interrelations between men, masculinities and managements.

First, men as managers frequently invested in masculine discourses that united them with other men (colleagues and candidates) and differentiated them from women. These investments reflected a diversity of masculinities ranging from paternalism through to a more commercially-driven, competitive entrepreneurship. They were also often united through highly masculinized discourses on sexuality.

Second, extensive tensions often characterized relations between personnel and line managers regarding recruitment practices and equal opportunities. These inter-functional tensions were usually reinforced by gendered assumptions of the line manager as 'producer', 'provider' and breadwinner for the organization and the personnel manager as dependent, domestic and organizational 'welfare worker' (cf. Legge, 1987).

These deepseated tensions revealed the heterogeneity and fragmentation of the management function. We will now discuss in turn the unities found in the managerial function that were reproduced through the dominant discourses of paternalism, entrepreneurialism and personalism and the divisions within management that were reinforced by excessive careerism across various industries.

Entrepreneurialism

The research revealed that many managers articulated a 'hard nosed' entrepreneurial approach to business which prioritized profits, production and costs. Such men managers often believed that their entrepreneurial concerns were incompatible with the appointment or promotion of women. One manager in a food processing company, for example, argued that for a trainee manager position, women employees were problematic because they could get married, pregnant and/or leave to follow their husband's career. Each of these possibilities could increase costs and reduce production. It was therefore simply 'rational' for managers seeking efficient practices to select men candidates to key posts. These assumptions resulted in the manager and his assistant appointing two men candidates (whose specifications did not meet formal selection criteria) whilst they rejected better qualified and competent women jobseekers (whose specifications did meet formal requirements). The way in which these managers associated production with masculinity reinforced both their sense of difference from women and their unity or identification with each other and with other men.

Many managers treated pregnancy in particular as a deepseated threat to everyday business practices. Pregnancy challenges the taken for granted masculine/managerial discourse that separates 'public' and 'private' life (Martin 1990a). Several examples were found in the research where men managers were concerned about the potential effects of (possible) pregnancy on production and profits. Hence, highly masculine assumptions were often shared between men managers that shaped their practices in quite crucial ways. One insurance branch manager went so far as to express a strong

preference for the paperless office. He preferred machines to women employees because 'they don't answer back and they don't have periods'.

The research uncovered many examples of men managers who prioritized entrepreneurial discourses and defined these in highly masculinized terms. These entrepreneurial discourses were not only self-justifying in the way that they tended to blame women themselves for the practices perpetrated against them, but also reinforcing of particular unities between men which in turn differentiated them from women. Hence they were a crucial source of masculine identity and power for men managers. These unities could also be reproduced through less overtly entrepreneurial practices, as the following section outlines.

Paternalism

Paternalism was an equally prominent masculine discursive practice of managerial control found in the research. It is a discourse that seeks to exercise power by emphasizing the moral basis of cooperation; the importance of personal trust relations and the need for employees to invest voluntarily in their work task and to identify with the company. Highlighting the interdependent nature of hierarchical relations, paternalism is also a specifically masculine discourse of control that draws on the familial metaphor of the 'rule of the father' who is authoritative, benevolent, self-disciplined and wise. A central self-justifying claim of paternalism is that power is exercised in ways which enhance subordinates' self-interests. Such practices are usually represented as 'benefitting' and 'protecting' its victims.

Paternalism was particularly evident in the insurance industry. For example, one branch manager repeatedly refused to promote a highly skilled

and competent woman pensions clerk into the salesforce. Using a personal, informal and paternal approach, he was able to persuade the clerk that becoming a salesperson was not in her best interests. Despite receiving strong encouragement from other salespeople, she was persuaded by the branch manager of the "severe pressures" found in selling pensions (e.g. the company's geographical mobility requirement, the performance related pay system, the male dominated client market, and her own age and personality). The manager's paternal and personal approach enabled him to exaggerate the mobility requirement and overemphasize the difficulties surrounding the job. The clerk began to internalize the managers' doubts believing that his primary concern was her own welfare.

This is merely one of many examples of paternalism found in the insurance industry where sex discrimination was often perpetrated and rationalized by men managers on the grounds that they were protecting women. For example it was argued that 'women would not be taken seriously' by male clients if they invited clients out to lunch. The latter would 'read more into it than that' and there were also difficulties for women in making night calls to sell insurance that men did not experience. Managers argued that it was 'unfair' to subject women to the 'dangers' of selling insurance. Indeed one woman job interviewee was rejected by two men interviewers in part because, without a steady boyfriend 'she had not had enough experience of men'.

Only by recognizing the central importance of paternalism and the way it can be disguised as welfarism can these managerial processes be adequately understood. Paternalism not only often united managers and resulted in the exclusion of women, but it also facilitated a bond or

identification between selectors and men jobseekers. The research uncovered several examples of paternalistic men managers who 'gave the benefit of the doubt' to men candidates in a way that they would never have considered when assessing women jobseekers.

Paternalistic discourses were partly a function of age as well as masculinity. Older men managers were particularly (but not exclusively) likely to engage in paternalistic discourses. The preference for informality which is a central feature of paternalism was also found in the masculine discursive practices that often characterized relations between men managers, as the next section will now discuss.

Personalism

The research found a strong preference for informality in the workplace interaction between managers. The discourses of: men's sexuality; joking, and sport/entertainment were especially influential in uniting men managers. We have discussed elsewhere how men's sexuality is often pervasive and unchallenged in contemporary organizational practices (Burrell and Hearn, 1989; Collinson and Collinson, 1989). The following examples reveal how men's discourses on sexuality united men managers and excluded women jobseekers.

In evaluating one woman candidate for a trainee marketing manager vacancy in a food processing company, the two managers engaged in the following dialogue:

> 'lovely, lovely, lovely. She was a right dolly bird wasn't she?.

His colleague replied,

feature so important for salespeople and managers alike when engaged in the process of selling their products.

Accordingly, these shared masculine discourses were found to unite managers across as well as within particular organizations. Indeed many managers as well as salespeople spend a great deal of time in negotiations with other managers from separate firms who are buyers and sellers of supplies, components and products. These informal managerial relations can be as influential in securing good deals and service as price fixing. Where prices are standardized, managers' social skills and the perks they can offer could crucially differentiate specific companies from their competitors. Indeed the provision of company perks is one area in which sport and entertainment can be particularly important in integrating commercial activity and dominant masculinities. The research found that some men managers expected to provide customers and to be provided with leisure activities as part of the sales process. This might include tickets to major sporting events, for example, football matches, 'golf days', etc.) or to theatres. It could also include visits to expensive restaurants and stays in prestigious hotels. Some corporations make heavy financial commitments in supporting these personalized practices (e.g. corporate golf club memberships). Many men managers seem to enjoy the sense of 'prestige by association' conferred by these inter-organizational perks. Such attempts to integrate sport with business reflect and reinforce dominant masculinities that often lead in various ways to the exclusion of women.

To summarize, men managers were found to invest in discourses of entrepreneurialism, paternalism and personalism. These masculinities are a

identities are reinforced by the remuneration, status, and perks of most management jobs. Salaries tend to be large, implicitly assuming a bread-winner responsibility, whilst perks, including company care, personal secretary and entertainment allowance, tend to embellish the male ego. Moreover, (men) managers are often expected to work long hours, meet tight deadlines, travel extensively away from home and move house when required by the company. These work demands are likely to be incompatible with domestic responsibilities. Seeking to comply with the increasingly unrealistic expectations of corporate cultures, men managers frequently depend upon the support of wives to manage all domestic and familial matters. Whilst managers are employed to control the labour process, it seems that they are also controlled by it, particularly through their investment in identities that confirm them as upwardly mobile, successful men.

Indeed during the research, senior managers at one financial services company were told by their new American owners, 'we don't expect any of our managers to want to go home in time to bath the baby'. This illustrates how the discourse of 'the organization man' (Whyte, 1956) remains dominant in many contemporary corporations. Inevitably, this pressure to conform to corporate demands, combined with individuals' own concern with career progress, creates deepseated divisions, not only between men managers, but also between their paid work and home life. Attempts to manage these demands can lead to increasing levels of stress and tension, which in societies such as Japan can literally have fatal consequences for managers.

Careerism also had important implications for the few women managers who participated in the research, most of whom were employed in the personnel function. The research found that these women tended to prioritize their career and organizational loyalty above any concern to resist dominant masculinities through either a professional commitment to equal opportunities or a specific attachment to alternative notions of gender identity. Women as personnel managers usually invested in discourses more readily associated with men and dominant masculinities. Concerned primarily to protect and enhance their career, women personnel managers often sought to avoid the difficulties which resistance can produce and to comply with selection practices that excluded or subordinated women jobseekers. This consistent finding of women's compliance with dominant masculinities raises important questions in the context of the increasing presence of women in managerial positions within various Western societies. Accordingly, the presence of women managers in itself may not overcome and may even help to legitimize the deeply entrenched middle class masculinities that so often seem to characterize managerial discourse and practices.

Conclusion

This paper challenges both conventional and more critical perspectives on management by revealing their mutual neglect of dominant masculinities and the way that these are often embedded in managerial discursive practices. Drawing upon and seeking to extend critical contributions from feminism and recent studies on men, we propose a radical reformulation of the way that management is analyzed. We argue that theorists of management should explicitly turn their attention to the gendered-ness of the managements

they study. This applies both to the content of managements (for example, how many men are present, with what power and authority, on what conditions) and to their form (for example, how are these distributions related to the style, organizational process, hierarchy, culture, traditions and practices of managements).

In pursuing this new intellectual current in the analysis of management, we highlighted some of the unities and divisions through which the dual sources of power of men as managers and managers as men can be reproduced. We contend that the hierarchical and gendered power of management is neither homogenous nor monolithic. Although men's power as managers should not be underestimated, it is also more contradictory, precarious and heterogeneous than often it at first appears. Power relations are fragmented, shifting, partial, incomplete and characterized by disjunctures and multiple subjectivities (Kondo, 1990). In order to address the partial, multiple, ambiguous and indeed fluctuating character of subjectivities as they are reproduced through particular power relations, the paper highlighted the unities and differences, not only of men and masculinities, but also between and within managerial functions. In complex ways, these unities and differences are both simultaneous in organizational practices and reciprocal in organizational effects.

Our challenge to dominant analyses of management in turn raises a whole series of further issues and questions to be addressed in the development of an alternative, pro-feminist analysis of management. First, there are some broader questions around the analysis of men in management in relation to societal power and particularly men's domination more generally. For example, how is men's power in management maintained by the

gendered structuring of largely unpaid domestic work and childcare, both throughout society and for those powerful men in management? Less obviously, what are the implications for both women and men of the tendency for increasing organizational power in management to be associated with growing encroachments of organizational business into personal and domestic time? More grandly, how does men's domination of management assist in the reproduction of patriarchy?

Second, these issues suggest major changes in the business of theorizing management. Paralleling the managerial function in modern corporations, management theory itself until recently has remained very much a domain of men. This, in turn, raises important questions: what perceptions and priorities are emphasised by men management theorists? What issues are thereby neglected? Should Business Schools be seen as another area of men's domination? Why do men as management theorists find so many 'good reasons' for avoiding these issues? To what extent are these theorists simply reproducing precisely the same, highly instrumental practices of careerism and personalism identified earlier when discussing management practitioners?

These self-reflexive questions speak to the very heart of management practice and management theory as it has been constructed historically and genderically. Not least, they critically examine what counts as 'theory', and how 'theory' is developed, written, referred, published and circulated. The practice of critical self-reflexivity, we argue, is an essential precondition for the development of management theorizing. The deconstruction of power in organizations is inextricably linked to the more reflexive processes involved in the deconstruction of self. For all these reasons,

we argue for the development of explicit, critical, feminist/pro-feminist and self-reflexive studies on the enduring dominance and interrelations of men, masculinities and managements.

NOTE

1. We are grateful to the guest editors and anonymous reviewers for their critical comments in developing this paper from an earlier version (Collinson and Hearn, 1990).

REFERENCES

Alvesson, M. (1988), 'Management, Corporate Culture and Labour Process in a Professional Service Company', Paper presented at the 6th UMIST-ASTON Organizational and Control of the Labour Process Conference, Aston University, Birmingham.

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, 97-120.

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, 19-43.

Armstrong, P. (1989) 'Limits and Possibilities for HRM in an Age of Management Accountancy', in J. Storey (ed.) New Perspectives on Human Resource Management, London: Routledge, 154-166.

Barnard, C. (1938) The Functions of the Executive, Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Beechey, V. (1977) 'Some Notes on Female Wage Labour in Capitalist Production' Capital and Class, 3, 45-66.

Beechey, V. (1978) 'Women and Production' in A. Kuhn and A.M. Wolpe (eds.) Feminism and Materialism, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Beechey, V. (1988) 'Rethinking the Definition of Work' in J. Jenson, E. Hagen and C. Reddy (eds.) Feminisation of the Labour Force, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bell, E. and Nkomo, S. (1992) 'Revisioning Women Managers' Lives' in A. Mills and P. Tancred (eds.) Gendering Organizational Theory, Newbury Park, Ca., Sage.

Bennis, W. (1989) On Becoming A Leader, Wilmington, Mass: Warren Bennis Inc.

Benston, M. (1969) 'The Political Economy of Women's Liberation', Monthly Review, 21, 4, 13-27.

Bologh, R.W. (1990) Love or Greatness? Max Weber and Masculine Thinking - A Feminist Inquiry, London and Boston: Unwin Hyman.

Boulgarides, J.D. (1984) 'A Comparison of Male and Female Business Managers', Leadership and Organisational Development Journal, 5(5), 27-31.

Bradley, H. (1986) Men's Work, Women's Work: A Sociological History of the Sexual Division of Labour in Employment, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Braverman, H. (1974) Labor and Monopoly Capital, New York: Monthly Review Press.

Brenner, J. and Ramas, M. (1984) 'Rethinking Women's Oppression', New Left Review, 144, 33-71.

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

Brod, H. (ed.) (1987) The Making of Masculinities. The New Men's Studies, London and Boston: Allen & Unwin.

Burawoy, M. (1979) Manufacturing Consent, Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Burawoy, M. (1985) The Politics of Production, London: Verso.

Burrell, G. and Hearn, J. (1989) 'The Sexuality of Organization' in J. Hearn, D. Sheppard, P. Tancred-Sheriff and G. Burrell (eds.) The Sexuality of Organization, London and Newbury Park, Ca., Sage, 1-28.

Calas, M., Jacobson, S., Jacques, R. and Smircich, L. (1991) 'Is a Woman Centered Theory of Management Dangerous?' Paper at the National Academy of Management Conference, Women in Management Division, Miami, FL., August. Mimeo. University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA.

Calas, M. and Smircich, L. (1991) 'Re-writing Gender into Organizational Theorizing: Directions from Feminist Perspectives' in M.I. Reed and M.D. Hughes (eds.) Rethinking Organization: New Directions in Organizational Research and Analysis, London and Newbury Park, Ca.: Sage.

Calas, M. and Smircich, L. (1992) 'Using the "F" Word: Feminist Theories and the Social Consequences of Organizational Research' in A. Mills and P. Tancred (eds.) Gendering Organizational Theory, Newbury Park, Ca.: Sage.

Carrigan, T., Connell, R.W. and Lee, J. (1985) 'Toward a New Sociology of Masculinity', Theory and Society, 14, 5, 551-604.

Chapman, R. and Rutherford, J. (eds.) (1988) Male Order. Unwrapping Masculinity, London: Lawrence & Wishart.

Child, J. (1969) British Management Thought, London: Allen & Unwin.

Child, J. (1985) 'Managerial Strategies, New Technology and the Labour Process', in D. Knights, H. Willmott and D. Collinson (eds.) Job Redesign, Aldershot: Gower, 107-141.

Clegg, S.R. (1990) Modern Organizations, London and Newbury Park, Ca.: Sage.

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

Cockburn, C. (1989) 'Equal Opportunities: The Short and the Long Agendas' Industrial Relations Journal 20, 3, 213-225.

Cockburn, C. (1990) 'Men's Power in Organisations: Equal Opportunities Intervenes' in J. Hearn; and D.H.J. Morgan (eds.) Men, Masculinities and Social Theory, London and Boston: Unwin Hyman, 72-89.

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

Cole, G.A. (1982) Management: Theory and Practice, Eastleigh, Hants: D.P. Publications.

Collinson, D.L. (1987) 'Who Controls Selection?', Personnel Management, May, 32-35.

Collinson, D.L. (1988) 'Engineering Humour: Masculinity, Joking and Conflict in Shopfloor Relations', Organization Studies, 9, 2, 181-199.

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

Collinson, D.L. and Collinson, M. (1989) 'Sexuality in the Workplace: The Domination of Men's Sexuality' in J. Hearn, D. Sheppard, P. Tancred-Sheriff and G. Burrell (eds.) The Sexuality of Organization, London and Newbury Park, Ca.: Sage, 91-109.

Collinson, D.L. and Hearn, J. (1990) 'Unities and Differences between Men and Masculinities (2) The Fragmentation of Management and the Management Fragmentation', Paper at British Sociological Association Conference 'Social Divisions and Social Change', University of Surrey. Mimeo. University of St. Andrews.

Collinson, D.L. and Knights, D. (1986) 'Men Only: Theories and Practices of Job Segregation in Insurance', in D. Knights and H. Willmott (eds.) Gender and the Labour Process, Aldershot: Gower, 140-178.

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

Connell, R.W. (1985) 'Theorizing Gender', Sociology, 19, 2, 260-272.

Connell, R.W. (1987) Gender and Power, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Crompton, R. and Sanderson, K. (1986) 'Credentials and Careers: Some Implications of the Increase in Professional Qualifications among Women', Sociology, 20, 1, 25-42.

Crozier, M. (1964) The Bureaucratic Phenomenon, London: Tavistock.

Czarniawska-Joerges, B. (1990) In the Eyes of the Innocent. Students on Organizational Power, Stockholm: Regeringskansliets Offsetcentral.

Czarniawska-Joerges, B. (1991) 'Gender, power, organizations: an interruptive interpretation' Paper at 'Towards a New Theory of Organizations' Conference, Keele University, Mimeo, Lund University.

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

Deal, T.E. and Kennedy, A.A. (1982) Corporate Culture: The Rites and Rituals of Corporate Life, Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Delphy, C. (1970) The Main Enemy: A Materialist Analysis of Women's Oppression, London: W.R.R.C.

Di Tomaso, N. (1988) Ensuring Minority Success in Corporate Management, New York: Plenum.

Donnell, S.M. and Hall, J. (1980) 'Men and Women as Managers: A Significant Case of No Significant Difference', Organizational Dynamics, 8, 60-77.

Drucker, P. (1979) The Practice of Management, London: Heinemann.

Edwards, R. (1979) Contested Terrain: The Transformation of the Workplace in the Twentieth Century, London: Heinemann

Ferguson, K.E. (1984) The Feminist Case against Bureaucracy, Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Ferguson, K.E. (1987) 'Work, Text, and Act in Discourses of Organization', Women and Politics, 7, 2, 1-21.

Fiedler, F.E. (1967) A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness, New York: McGraw Hill.

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

Friedman, S. and Sarah, E. (1982) On the Problem of Men, London: Women's Press.

Game, A. (1989) 'Research and Writing: Secretaries and Bosses', Journal of Pragmatics, 13, 343-61.

Gordon, F.E. and Strober, M.H. (eds.) Bringing Women Into Management, New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hanmer, J. (1990) 'Men, Power and the Exploitation of Women' in J. Hearn and D.H.J. Morgan (eds.) Men, Masculinities and Social Theory, London and Boston: Unwin Hyman, 23-42.

Hartman, H. (1979) 'The Unhappy Marriage and Marxism and Feminism: Towards a More Progressive Union', Capital and Class, 8, 2, 1-33.

Hearn, J. (1987) The Gender of Oppression: Men, Masculinity and the Critique of Marxism, Brighton: Wheatsheaf. New York: St. Martin's

Hearn, J. (ed.) (1989a) 'Men, masculinities and leadership: changing patterns and new initiatives', Special Issue. Equal Opportunities International, 8, 1.

Hearn, J. (1989b) 'Reviewing men and masculinities - or mostly boys' own papers', Theory, Culture & Society, 6, 4, 665-689.

Hearn, J. (1991) 'Men and Gender-Divided Organisations - or Patriarchies, Sexualities, Masculinities and Managements' Paper at Men and Work Life Seminar, University of Tampere, Finland. Mimeo. University of Bradford, U.K. Forthcoming in Conference Proceedings 1992.

Hearn, J. (1992a) 'Changing Men and Changing Managements: a review of issues and actions', Women in Management Review and Abstracts, 7.

Hearn, J. (1992b) Men in the Public Eye. The Construction and Deconstruction of Public Men and Public Patriarchies, New York and London: Unwin Hyman/Routledge.

Hearn, J. and Collinson, D.L. (1990) 'Unities and Differences between Men and Masculinities. (1) The Categories of Men and the Case of Sociology', Paper at British Sociological Association Conference 'Social Divisions and Social Change', University of Surrey, Mimeo. University of Bradford.

Hearn, J. and Morgan, D.H.J. (eds.) (1990) Men, Masculinities and Social Theory, London and Boston: Unwin Hyman.

Hearn, J. and Parkin, W. (1983) 'Gender and Organizations: a selective review and a critique of a neglected area' Organization Studies, 4, 3, 219-242.

Hearn, J. and Parkin, W. (1987) 'Sex at Work'. The Power and Paradox of Organisation Sexuality, Brighton: Wheatsheaf; New York: St. Martins.

Hearn, J. and Parkin, W. (1988) 'Women, Men and Leadership: A Critical Review of Assumptions, Practices and Change in the Industrialized Nations' in N.J. Adler and D. Izraeli (eds.) Women in Management Worldwide, New York: M.E. Sharpe.

Hearn, J. and Parkin, W. (1992) 'Women, Men, Management and Leadership: a Critical Review of Contexts, Assumptions, Practices and Change in the Industrialized Nations' in N. Adler and D. Izraeli (eds.) Women in Management Worldwide, 2nd edition. New York: M.E. Sharpe.

Hearn, J., Sheppard, D., Tancred-Sheriff, P. and Burrell, G. (eds.) (1989) The Sexuality of Organization, London and Newbury Park, Ca.: Sage.

Helgeson, S. (1990) The Female Advantage: Women's Ways of Leadership, New York: Doubleday.

Henriques, J., Hollway, W., Urwin, C., Venn, C., Walkerdine, V. Changing the Subject, London: Metheun.

Hess, B.H. and Ferree, M.M. (eds.) (1987) Analyzing Gender, Newbury Park, Ca.: Sage.

Hollander, E.P. and Offerman, L.R. (1990) 'Power and Leadership in Organizations', American Psychologist, 45, 2, 179-189.

Hollway, W. (1991) Work Psychology and Organizational Behaviour, London: Sage.

Hyman, R. (1987) 'Strategy or Structure? Capital, Labour and Control', Work, Employment and Society, 1, 1, 25-55.

Jacobson, S.W. and Jacques, R. (1990) 'Of knowers, knowing, and the known: a gender framework for revisioning organizational and management scholarship', Paper at Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, San Francisco, Ca.

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

Kelly, J. (1985) 'Management's Redesign of Work: Labour Process, Labour Markets and Produce Markets' in D. Knights, H. Willmott and D. Collinson (eds.) Job Redesign, Aldershot: Gower, 197-226.

Kessler, S.J. and McKenna, W.M. (1978) Gender. An Ethnomethodological Approach, Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Kimmel, M.S. and Messner, M.A. (1989) Men's Lives, New York: Macmillan.

Knights, D. and Willmott, H. (1987) 'Organizational Culture as Management Strategy', International Studies of Management and Organization, 17, 3, 40-63.

Kondo, D.K. (1990) Crafting Selves. Power, Gender, and Discourses of Identity in a Japanese Workplace, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kreitner, R. (1989) Management, Boston: Houghton Miflin.

LaNuez, D. and Jermier, J. (1990) 'Sabotage by Managers and Technocrats: The Quiet Revolution at Work', paper presented at 8th Aston/UMIST Conference on the Organization and Control of the Labour Process, Aston, March.

Lawrence, P.R. and Lorsch, J.W. (1967) Organization and Environment, Cambridge, Ma: Harvard University Press.

Lawson, T. (1981) 'Paternalism and Labour Market Segmentation Theory' in F.W. Wilkinson (ed.) The Dynamics of Labour Market Segmentation, London: Academic Press.

Legge, K. (1978) Power, Innovation and Problem Solving in Personnel Management, Maidenhead: McGraw Hill.

Legge, K. (1987) 'Women in Personnel Management: Uphill Climb or Downhill Slide?', in A. Spencer and D. Podmore (eds.) In a Man's World, London: Routledge, 33-60.

Lorber, J. and Farrell, S.A. (eds.) (1990) The Social Construction of Gender, Newbury Park: Sage.

Lown, J. (1983) 'Not so much a Factory, More a Form of Patriarchy: Gender and Class During Industrialisation', in E. Gamarnikow, D.H.J. Morgan, J. Purvis and D.E. Taylorson (eds.) Gender, Class and Work, London: Heinemann

MacKinnon, C.A. (1982) 'Marxism, Feminism, Signs.

Martin, J. (1990a) 'Deconstructing Organizational Taboos : The Suppression of Gender Conflict in Organizations', Organizational Science, 1, 4, 339-359.

Martin, J. (1990b) 'Re-reading Weber: Searching for Feminist Alternatives to Bureaucracy', Paper at Academy of Management, San Francisco, Mimeo, Stanford University.

Mills, A. (1991) 'Organizational Discourse and the Gendering of Identity', paper delivered at Conference 'Towards a New Theory of Organizations', University of Keele, April.

Mills, A. and Chiaramonte, P. (1991) 'Organization as Gendered Communication' Canadian Journal of Communication, 16.4.

Mintzberg, H. (1973) The Nature of Managerial Work, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Mintzberg, H. (1975) The Manager's Job: Folklore and Fact, Harvard Business Review, July/August.

Mintzberg, H. (1983) Power in and Around Organisations, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Mintzberg, H. (1989) Mintzberg on Management, New York: MacMillan.

Morgan, D.H.J. (1992) Discovering Men, London and New York: Unwin Hyman/ Routledge.

Morgan, G. (1986) Images of Organization, London: Sage.

Mumby, D.K. and Putnam, L.L. (1990) 'Bounded Rationality as an Organizational Construct: a Feminist Critique', Paper at Annual Meeting of Academy of Management, San Francisco, Ca.

Nord, W. and Jermier, J. (1991) 'Critical Social Science for Managers', in M. Alvesson and H. Willmott (eds.) Critical Theory of Management Science, London: Sage.

Norris, G.M. (1978) 'Industrial Paternalist Capitalism and Local Labour Markets', Sociology, 12, 469-489.

Oakley, A. (1985) Sex, Gender and Society, Aldershot: Gower.

O'Brien, M. (1981) The Politics of Reproduction, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Offe, C. (1976) Industry and Inequality, London: Edward Arnold.

Peters, T.J. and Austin, N. (1985) A Passion for Excellence, New York: Random House.

Peters, T.J. and Waterman, R.H. (1982) In Search of Excellent: Lessons from America's Best Run Companies, New York: Harper and Row.

Phillips, A. and Taylor, B. (1990) 'Sex and Skill: Notes Towards a Feminist Economics', Feminist Review, 6, 79-83.

Pollert, A. (1981) Girls, Wives, Factory Lives, London: Macmillan.

Powell, G.N. (1988) Women and Men in Management, Newbury, Ca.: Sage.

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

Reed, M. (1989) The Sociology of Management, London: Harvester, Wheatsheaf.

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

Roper, M.R. (1989) Masculinity and the Evolution of Management Cultures in British Industry 1945-85, Doctoral Thesis, University of Essex.

Roper, M.R. (1991) 'Yesterday's Model: Product Fetishism and the British Company Men 1945-85' in M.R. Roper and J. Tosh (eds.) Manful Assertions, Masculinities in Britain since 1800, London and New York: Routledge, 190-211.

Rosener, J. (1990) 'Ways Women Lead', Harvard Business Review, 68, 6, 119-125.

Rothwell, S. (1983) 'Is Management a Masculine Role?' Paper presented at the Journal of Management Studies Conference, Manchester Business School.

Schein, E. (1985) Organizational Culture and Leadership, San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Scott, J.W. (1986) 'Gender: a Useful Category of Historical Analysis' American Historical Review, 91, 5, 1053-1075.

Sebestyen, A. (1982) 'Sexual assumptions in the Women's movement' in S. Friedman and E. Sarah (eds.) On the Problem of Men, London: Women's Press.

Segal, L. (1990) Slow Motion: Changing Men, Changing Masculinities, London: Virago.

Sheriff, P. and Campbell, E.J. (1981) 'La Place des Femmes: un Dossier sur la Sociologie des Organisations' Sociologie et Societes, 13, 113-30.

Stanley, L. (1984) 'Should 'Sex' really be 'Gender' - or 'Gender' really be 'Sex'' in R.J. Anderson and W.W. Sharrock (eds.) Applied Sociological Perspectives, London: Allen & Unwin, 1-19.

Stewart, R. (1986) The Reality of Management, London: Heinemann.

Storey, J. (1983) 'The Means of Management Control', Sociology, 19, 2, 193-211.

Taylor, F.W. (1947) Scientific Management, New York: Harper and Row.

Thompson, P. (1983) The Nature of Work, London: Macmillan.

Thompson, P. and McHugh, D. (1990), Work Organizations, London: Macmillan.

Torrington, D., Hitner, T. and Knights, D. (1982) Management and the Multi-Racial Workforce, Aldershot: Gower.

Vroom, V.H. and Yetton, P.W. (1973) Leadership and Decision-Making, Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

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

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

Weber, M. (1968) Economy and Society, New York: Bedminster Press.

Weedon, C. (1987) Feminist Practice and Poststructuralist Theory, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Westwood, S. (1984) All Day Every Day: Factory, Family, Women's Lives, London: Pluto Press.

White, S.R. (1986) 'Foucault's Challenge to Critical Theory', American Political Science Review, 80, 2, 419-431.

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

Willmott, H. (1984) 'Images and Ideals of Management Work', Journal of Management Studies, 21, 3, 349-368.

Witz, A. (1986) 'Patriarchy and the Labour Market: Occupational Control Strategies and the Medical Division of Labour', in D. Knights and H. Willmott (eds.) Gender and the Labour Process, Aldershot: Gower, 14-35.