Study on the Role of Men in Gender Equality

Background and Discussion Papers for Workshop 2: How Can Men Do Gender Equal Work?

Contract ref. no. VC/2010/0592
October 2011

Study on the Role of Men in Gender Equality: Background and Discussion Papers for Workshop 2: How Can Men Do Gender Equal Work?

Prepared for European Commission, DG Justice - Unit D1 Gender equality
Contract ref. no. VC/2010/0592

Prepared by:
Marc Gärtner, Dissens Institute, Berlin/Germany
Jeff Hearn, University of Lingköping/Sweden and Hanken School of Economics, Helsinki/Finland
Majda Hrzeniak, Peace Institute, Ljubljana/Slovenia

Coordinated by:
Marc Gärtner, Dissens Institute, Berlin/Germany, role-of-men@dissens.de

The consortiums legal representative

Ferdinand Lechner
Co-Director L&R Social Research OG
A-1060 Wien, Liniengasse 2A/1

Berlin, October 2011

1. Background paper

Men and Masculinities at the Workplace – A Critical Review[1]

David L. Collinson and Jeff Hearn

A neglected phenomenon

Many studies of work, organizations and management, as well as those on related areas such as leadership, industrial relations, the state, politics, and so on, have long assumed that their subject is both male and neutral. Men have often been studied without realizing this was the case, or men have been studied without attending to the gendering of the men in question in any critical detail. In great swathes of studies and researches – in business studies, management theory, international business, industrial economics, marketing, and so on – there is not even the beginnings of recognition of the relevance of these things. While most mainstream fields on organizations and management continue to be neglectful, there are now a small number of critical textbooks that do address workplace gender relations (for example, Fulop and Linstead, 2000).

Emphasizing the importance of paid work as a central source of men's identity, status and power, feminist organizational studies (e.g. Pringle, 1989; Cockburn, 1991) have demonstrated how 'most organizations are saturated with masculine values' (Burton, 1991: 3). They have critically analysed the continued centrality of the masculine model of lifetime, full-time, continuous employment and revealed the embeddedness of masculine values and assumptions in organizational structures, cultures and practices. For many men, employment provides interrelated economic resources and symbolic benefits that mutually reinforce their position of power, authority and discretion both at 'work' and at 'home'. Men have been shown to exercise workplace control over women in many ways, for example, through job segregation, sex discrimination, 'the breadwinner wage'/pay inequities and sexual harassment.

Initially, most critical empirical research on men and masculinities in organizations concentrated on those in subordinate positions generally and manual workers in particular. A number of UK studies revealed how workplace power relations can be crucially shaped by masculinities. Willis (1977) described how working class lads construct counter-cultures that 'celebrate' masculinity and 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 little chance of escape. Cockburn's (1983) study of printers illustrated how skilled manual work could be defined by men as their exclusive province (also see Tolson, 1977; Gray, 1987). Collinson (1992, 2000) showed how male manual workers construct organizational counter-cultures and working class masculine

[1] Revised version taken from: David L. Collinson and Jeff Hearn, Men and Masculinities in Work, Organizations and Management , in Michael Kimmel, Jeff Hearn and R.W. Connell The Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities, Thousand Oaks, Ca.: Sage, 2005, 289-310.

identities based on the negation of 'others' such as management, office workers and women.

Together, these studies revealed the symbolic and material significance for (male) manual workers of specific forms of masculine practices and identity work for making sense of their (relatively subordinated) lives. They graphically demonstrate that informal shop-floor interaction between men manual workers is often deeply masculine, being highly aggressive, sexist and derogatory, humorous yet insulting, playful but degrading (Ackroyd and Thompson, 1999). New members can be 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 (Hearn, 1985; Collinson, 1988). Such studies of working class life are usefully read alongside others focusing on men's family relations, including those that highlight the impact of uncertain employment and unemployment on women and children (for example, Clarke and Popay, 1998; Waddington et al., 1998). Equally, these working class masculinities are increasingly vulnerable to challenge and change with global economic restructuring and other transformations (Blum, 2000).

Multiplicity and hegemonic masculinity

The concept of 'multiple masculinities' (Carrigan et al., 1985) has become one of the most influential terms in analysing men at work and in organizations and management over the past few years. It has been used to represent the various ways that specific forms of masculinity may be constructed and persist in relation both to femininity and other forms of masculinity. Masculinity or masculinities can be understood as those combinations of signs that say and show someone is a man. Difference and the social construction of difference (such as that which differentiates men and masculinities according to religion, age, size, class, sexuality, ethnicity, occupation, and so on) is an important basis through which gendered asymmetrical power between men and between men and women is often constructed and reproduced.

An important distinction has been made between hegemonic, complicit and subordinated masculinities (Connell 2001). It has been argued that some masculinities (for example white, middle class, middle-aged, heterosexual/homophobic, Anglo-Saxon, Christian, western, able-bodied) often dominate others (for example, working class and gay masculinities). These former masculinities tend to predominate, at least at the level of ideology, in powerful organizational positions such as middle and senior management, while other masculinities (for example, black, working class, homosexual masculinities) are relatively subordinated. On the other hand, the UK Gay and Lesbian Census (ID Research, 2001) found that while 15% of lesbians and gay men in the workplace who responded believe their sexuality has hindered their job prospects, a surprisingly large number - 43% - have managerial roles. These figures are not fully representative, as they do not take account of individuals who are not 'out' in the workplace.

Critical writers have argued that these material and symbolic multiplicities and differences are very important in explaining the reproduction and shifting nature of gendered power asymmetries. As Connell (1995) argues, masculinities are not fixed, but may shift over time and place. They are historically, culturally and temporally contingent. This focus on multiple masculinities (Carrigan et al., 1985; Connell, 2000) has been particu-

larly helpful in naming and examining the shifting nature of (asymmetrical) power relations not only between men and women, but also between men, in organizational workplaces and management. It also begins to recognize that gendered power relations can simultaneously both change (in character) yet remain broadly the same (in structure).

The multiplicity and diversity of masculinities is also partly shaped by the different forms and locations of workplaces - the sites of work and of masculinity (Collinson and Hearn 1996b). These sites are likely to vary, for example, according to occupation, industry, culture, class and type of organization. Accordingly, the dominant masculinities evident in small and family run businesses may be significantly different from those that pervade large multinational corporations. Multiple masculinities are likely to interconnect with multiple sites such as the home, the shopfloor, the office and the outlet or branch. Barrett's (2001) study of US male navy officers illustrates how multiple masculinities can co-exist in the same organization. He found that aviators emphasized their masculinity in terms of risk-taking, surface warfare officers prioritized their endurance, while supply officers prided themselves on their technical rationality. But Barrett's study also identifies some of the similarities that characterize these multiple masculinities. He shows how the Navy reproduces a dominant masculinity taking multiple forms that value physical toughness, perseverance, aggressiveness, a rugged heterosexuality, unemotional logic and a stoic refusal to complain. This military culture of masculinity constructs itself in opposition to that which it is not, namely women and gay men, who are deemed to be physically weak and unable to do what (heterosexual) men do. They serve as the differentiated others, against which heterosexual men construct, project and display a gendered identity. Barrett shows how Navy officers attach themselves to one of these hegemonic masculinities as a means of self-differentiation and elevation from colleagues.

Masculine management and androcentric workplace cultures

Management and top positions are shaped by men's leadership, and a culture of hegemonic masculinity (Connell 1995, 1998). Many organizations are gendered bureaucracies in which the male norm is dominant and masculine practices of resistance to female leadership persist (for example, Woodward, 1996).[2] In the light of changing forms and practices of management worldwide, interrelations of men, masculinities and management in contemporary organizations are likely to become even more important. The tradition of male dominated business might get challenged by the increasing number and ratio of women in top positions. For 2010, the European Commission (2011) shows Norway with 39% female board members of the largest quoted companies, after the country had in-

[2] The European Commission, central focus of Woodward's (1991) study, however serves as a good example what equality policies are able to achieve, when a specific policy is implemented: In 1995, 44.3% of the employees were women, with 10.7% in middle and only 4% in senior management. By 2009, these numbers have changed dramatically: The overall number of women rose up to 53.5%, in the middle management to 23.3%, in senior management to 21.4%. According to the "Communication to the Commission on the strategy on equal opportunities for women and men within the European Commission (2010 – 2014)" the gap on all levels shall be diminished considerably by 2014. Still, vertical segregation is highly visible. Moreover, continuous long-term trends to equality are not only a question of numbers and quotas; the "means of action" (work flexibility, equal opportunities practices and equal opportunities management) can probably only be successful if the gender cultures at the workplace change (cf.: Puchert/Höyng 1998, Puchert et al. 2005) in order to make it pro-equal, anti-sexist and care-positive (see more in the following discussion paper by Gärtner, Hearn, Hrzeniak, pp 18-27).

stalled a quota. In the EU-27, however, women make up only 12% of board members with Sweden and Finland on top, with 26%, followed by Latvia (23%), Slovakia (22%) and Romania (21%) (ibid). These figures illustrate that, despite improvements, men are still dominant, and women are still exceptions. This applies even more if we look at the company presidents in Europe, where we find a men's share of 97% (ibid).

The underlying structure of gendered 'glass ceilings' and barriers top position can be seen in an androcentric culture of labour in general, and of workplaces in particular. Androcentrism can be understood as a 'men only' homosocial[3] management form (Lipman-Blumen 1976), causing sexist resistances against women's careers (Cockburn 1991). Moreover, it is a notion that goes beyond men's domination and glass ceilings, structuring 'productivity' and labour around a simplified traditional masculine model, separated from emotionality, families, and reproductive care in general.

Connell (2001) has spelt out the form of transnational business masculinity that, he argues, is increasingly hegemonic and is directly connected to the patterns of world trade and communication that are dominated by the North. This is a dominant masculinity marked by egocentrism, highly precarious and conditional forms of loyalty and a declining sense of responsibility (also see Hearn, 1996).
While various masculinities frequently shape managerial practices, managerial practices can also impact on the emergence of specific masculinities. For example, pervasive and dominant managerial masculinities might take the form of different workplace control practices such as authoritarianism, careerism, paternalism and entrepreneurialism (Collinson and Hearn, 1994, 1996b). Kerfoot and Knights (1993) contend that paternalism and strategic management are concrete manifestations of historically shifting forms of masculinity. Arguing that these managerial approaches both reflect and reinforce 'discourses of masculinism', they suggest that 'paternalistic masculinity' and 'competitive masculinity' have the effect of privileging men *vis-à-vis* women, ranking some men above others, and maintaining as dominant certain forms and practices of masculinity. Managerial masculinities might thus be understood as form(s) of (different) hegemonic masculinities.

Kanter (1977) used the term 'homosocial reproduction' to describe the processes by which senior male managers selected other male managers in ways that reproduced an all male managerial elite. Typically, men were appointed to managerial positions because they were perceived to be more reliable, committed and predictable, free from conflicting loyalties between home and work. While Kanter's study usefully describes how elitist practices can characterize management, the gendered nature of these persistent interrelations and networks need to be taken into account more (see also Pringle, 1989; Acker, 1991; Witz and Savage, 1992). In organizations where the manager is also the owner, power relations can be especially asymmetrical and gendered. The ways in which the ownership of many businesses is still passed on from one generation to the next constitutes a vivid example of 'patriarchy in action'. For in the majority of these cases it is the son who inherits the firm from his father, thus ensuring the reproduction of patriarchal authority, both in the workplace and at home. Highlighting the gendered nature of the so-called 'self-made man', Reed (1996) contrasts the lives of David Syme (1827-1908), the

[3] We refer to homosociality in the following discussion paper, defining it, according to Lipman-Blumen (1976), as men's preference for men rather than women and women's company, organizations' tendencies to reproduce more of the same in terms of gender, but also ethnicity or organizational tradition (Essed & Goldberg, 2002).

nineteenth century, Scottish-born Australian publisher of *The Age* newspaper, and Rupert Murdoch, the contemporary Australian-born international media entrepreneur. While Syme conformed to the Weberian image of the sober, self-made modern capitalist who adopted a paternalistic and dutiful approach to management, Murdoch's style is adventurist and more akin to pre-modern forms of capitalism and management. Studies of entrepreneurialism also reveal the interdependence between men's organizational power and the family. For example, Mulholland (1996) conducted research on seventy of the richest entrepreneurial families in a Midlands county of England. She found that, while men consistently claimed the credit for their business success, in practice their capital accumulation was highly dependent on the hidden household (and workplace) services provided by wives/women. Other studies report similar dynamics where men's careers are constructed through the invisible support of women as secretaries and wives (for example, Finch, 1984; Grey, 1994; Reis, 2002).

There is a growing interest in leadership development as the 'solution' to many contemporary organizational problems (Deal and Kennedy, 2000). In many countries, the personality and habitude of the company leaders (especially 'heroic', 'strategic' and 'visionary' ones) are still often seen as the key to organizational success in both the private and public sectors. Although organizations and corporate culture had been discussed as a complex social phenomenon for a long time (cf. Weber 1922/72; Roethlisberger et al. 1939, Mayntz 1963), also covering gender as a key aspect (Acker 1974, Kanter 1977/93), 1980's discourses focused on the leaders' 'charisma'. Psychologists, (for example, Schein, 1985), and management consultants (for example, Peters and Waterman, 1982) emphasized corporate leaders' responsibility for 'managing meaning' (Morgan, 1997) and establishing strong organizational cultures (Deal and Kennedy, 1982). Writers such as Peters and Austin (1985) presented long taxonomies of prescriptions on how to be a visionary leader who, above all else, can and must manage and manipulate organizational culture. Such charismatic leadership styles are deeply masculine in their implicit assumptions and images (Hearn and Parkin, 1988), The popular emphasis on the power and impact of individual 'great men', especially CEOs, stands in contrast to the broader research-based, though virtually always ungendered, focus on upper echelon management and management teams (Weisbach and Hermalin, 2000; Hay Group, 2001; Goines, 2002; Surowieki, 2002).[4]
In our own work we have examined the ways that (men) managers can routinely discriminate against women in selection (Hearn and Collinson, 1998; also Martin, 1996, 2001) and can mismanage cases of sexuality and sexual harassment (Collinson and Collinson, 1989, 1992, 1996).

Men between labour and care

In addition, we have considered the ways that men managers as (working) fathers can frequently 'distance' themselves from children and family responsibilities (Collinson and

[4] 'Charismatic leadership' is socially associated with masculinity and also with the 'power and impact of individual 'great men' The charisma concept is a 'masculine' one without revealing its masculine connotation. 'Heroic', 'strategic' and 'visionary' – in our culture these words can be regarded as deeply masculinised notions. Of course this does not mean they are masculine in an essentialist sense, nor that there is no 'female' charisma or charismatic women. But the way management and leadership are culturally pre-formed and gendered makes it harder for women (or men who seem to lack these 'heroic' or other qualities) to participate, to get acknowledged and to compete in these arenas.

Hearn, 1994, 2000a). Within organizations, such 'distancing' strategies are often seen as evidence of commitment to the company. Yet, these kinds of pressures can significantly reinforce stresses, gendered stresses, within families, with their own gendered power relations (Collinson and Collinson 1997).

The potential development of men's non-oppressive, even profeminist management and leadership has also been explored (Hearn, 1989, 1992a, 1994). In that context, past decades' research on changes among men, and particularly the phenomenon of 'caring masculinities', has to be considered (Puchert et al. 2005; Langvasbråten, and Teigen 2006). Labour market conditions, but also changes in men's attitudes and sometimes behaviours question traditional masculinity concepts. While 'being the breadwinner' is, in many social contexts, not the only 'way to be a man' anymore, structural obstacles remain or change only slowly. A survey undertaken in 2002-2004 revealed that most men who worked part-time or took parental leave met some forms of exclusion or devaluation based on gender and masculinity constructions:
'Men showing a 'lack of availability' and career-focus face not only a glass ceiling (usually described as a female career obstacle), but, because of their life choice, also effemination. In general, the effemination of men is a cultural pattern of reproduction of masculine normality, shaped in the direction of hegemonic masculinity. But it also works through the economic sanctions or social devaluation. The appearance of diverse strategies of men in our sample seems to show that the cultural pattern loses relevance, at least in particular milieus and perhaps in general; there are even social groups where 'un-male' strategies of men (caring, emotionality) are more accepted than traditional masculinity. 'Misplacement' can be described as a sort of temporary effemination.' (Gärtner 2005: 186; Scambor et al. 2005).
Recent research in Germany showed that this gender-based devaluation can be decreased by measures on a political and a company level. In many companies and departments, male carers, part-timers as well as men on parental leave, got normalised after the introduction of a parental leave system broadly addressing men (Gärtner 2012). Many obstacles and forms of indirect exclusion, stemming from the structure of work, however remain: part-timers are sometimes excluded from normal, day-to-day communication, and career paths are seen as contradicting to work-family balance. Also, men who return back from parental leave often feel under pressure to re-balance what is seen as a negative working time account (ibid.).
More long-term research has to be undertaken in these areas. The examples show, however, that the context of hegemonic masculinity and an androcentric workplace structure is still a major obstacle, against more egalitarian forms of masculinity, as well as gender equality at the workplace in general.

In sum, the term 'multiple masculinities' has emerged as an important concept that helps to demonstrate the pervasive, diverse and shifting character of men's hegemonic power, culture and identity in contemporary organizations. Certain masculinities usually predominate and are privileged in organizations and management but they can also take different forms at different times in different organizations and within different strata of the organization. The term 'multiple masculinities' helps to illustrate how organizational and gendered power relations can shift in detail whilst simultaneously remaining asymmetrical in overall structure. It begins to address the ways that men's power, cultures and identities can change yet remain ascendant in contemporary organizations. This is an important, apparent paradox. On the one hand, gender relations are changing, women and men are apparently changing. Yet on the other hand, there is an intractability and tenacity in

men's dominant organizational position. Indeed one of the key issues to address is the paradoxical and contradictory ways in which asymmetrical power relations simultaneously change, yet remain broadly similar. Analyses need to address the flexible, shifting and often ambiguous nature of gendered power relations in general and men's power, cultures and identities in particular.

Bibliography

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

Ackroyd, S. and Thompson, P. (1999). *Organizational Misbehaviour.* London: Sage

Alvesson M. and Due Billing, Y (1997). *Understanding Gender and Organizations.* London: Sage.

Alvesson, M. and Willmott, H. (1996). *Making Sense of Management*. London: Sage.

Baigent, D. (2001). *Gender Relations, Masculinities and the Fire Service*. Doctoral Thesis. Cambridge: Anglia Polytechnic University.

Barrett, F. (2001). The organizational construction of hegemonic masculinity: the case of the U.S. Navy. In S. Whitehead and F. Barrett (eds), *The Masculinities Reader* (pp. 77- 99), Cambridge: Polity.

Beams, M. (1979). One woman's work is another woman's daughter: a contribution to the sociology of childbirth. *Women's Studies International Quarterly*, 2, 57-67.

Berle, A.A. and Means, G.C. (1932). *The Modern Corporation and Private Property*. New York: Macmillan.

Bird, S. (1996). Welcome to the men's club: homosociality and the maintenance of hegemonic masculinity. *Gender and Society*, 10, 120-32.

Blum, J.A. (2000). Degradation without deskilling: twenty-five years in the San Francisco shipyards. In M. Burawoy, Blum, J.A., George, S., Gille, Z., Gowan, T., Haney, L., Klawiter, M., Lopez, S.H., Riain, S.O., Thayer, M. *Global Ethnography* (pp. 106-36), Berkeley, Ca.: University of California Press.

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.

Brettell, C. and Sargent, C. (eds) (1993). *Gender in Cross-Cultural Perspective*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Burrell, G. (1997). *Pandemonium: Towards a Retro-Organization Theory*. London: Sage.

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

Carrigan, T., Connell, R.W. and Lee, J. (1985) Toward a new sociology of masculinity. *Theory and Society*, 14(5), 551-604.

Chandler, A.D. (1977). *The Visible Hand: The Managerial Revolution in American Business,* Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Clarke, S. and Popay, J. (1998). 'I'm just a bloke who's had kids': men and women on parenthood' In J. Popay, J. Hearn and J. Edwards (eds), *Men, Gender Divisions and Welfare* (pp. 196-230), London: Routledge.

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.

Collier, R. (1998). 'Nutty professors', 'men in suits' and 'new entrepreneurs': corporeality, subjectivity and change in the law school and legal practice. Social & Legal Studies. 7(1), 27-53.

Collinson, D.L. (1988). Engineering humour: masculinity, joking and conflict in shop floor relations. Organization Studies. 9(2), 181-99.

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

Collinson, D.L. (1998). 'Shift-ing lives': work-home pressures in the North Sea oil Industry. Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 35(3), 301-24.

Collinson, D.L. (2000). Strategies of resistance: power, knowledge and subjectivity in the workplace. In K. Grint (ed), Work and Society: A Reader (pp. 163-98), Cambridge: Polity.

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 (pp. 91-109), London and Newbury Park, Ca.: Sage.

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

Collinson, M. and Collinson, D.L. (1996). It's only Dick: the sexual harassment of women managers in insurance. *Work, Employment and Society*, 10(1), 29-56.

Collinson, D.L. and Collinson, M. (1997). Delayering managers: time-space surveillance and its gendered effects. *Organization,* 4(3), 373-405.

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. (1995). Men managing leadership?: *Men and Women of the Corporation* revisited. *International Review of Women and Leadership*, 1(2), 1-24.

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

Collinson, D.L. and Hearn, J. (1996b). ''Men' at 'work': multiple masculinities in multiple workplaces. In M. Mac an Ghaill (ed), *Understanding Masculinities: Social Relations and Cultural Areas* (pp. 61- 76). Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Collinson, D.L. and Hearn. J. (2000a). Naming men as men: implications for work, organization and management. In S. Whitehead and F. Barrett (eds), *The Masculinities Reader* (pp. 144-69), Cambridge: Polity.

Collinson, D.L. and Hearn. J. (2000b). Critical studies on men, masculinities and managements. In M. Davidson and R. Burke (eds), *Women in Management, Current Research Issues*, *Volume II* (pp. 263-78), London: Sage.

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

Coltrane, S. (1996). *Family Man: Fatherhood, Housework and Gender Equity*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Coltrane, S. (1998). *Gender and Families*. Thousand Oaks, Ca.: Pine Forge Press.

Communication to the Commission on the strategy on equal opportunities for women and men within the European Commission (2010 – 2014), Brussels 2010.

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

Connell, R.W. (1998). Globalization and masculinities. *Men and Masculinities*, 1(1), 3-23.

Connell, R.W. (2000). *The Men and the Boys*. Cambridge: Polity.

Connell, R. W. (2001). Masculinity politics on a world scale. In S. Whitehead and F. Barrett (eds) *The Masculinities Reader* (pp. 369-374), Cambridge: Polity.

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

Davidson, M. and Burke, R. (eds) (2000). *Women in Management, Current Research Issues*, *Volume II,* London: Sage,

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

Deal, T.E. and Kennedy, A.A. (2000). *The New Corporate Cultures.* London: Texere.

Donaldson, M. (1993). What is hegemonic masculinity? *Theory and Society*, 22(5), 643-657.

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

Eagly, A.H. and Johannesen-Schmidt, M.C. (2001). The leadership styles of women and men. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(4), 781-97.

Eichler, M. (1980). *The Double Standard: a Feminist Critique of Feminist Social Science*. London: Croom Helm.

European Commission (2011): Women and men in decision-making: Largest quoted companies (first quarter 2011), http://ec.europa.eu/justice/gender-equality/gender-decision-making/database/business-finance/quoted-companies/index_en.htm (accessed: October 4, 2011).

EPWN Board Women Monitor 2010 (http://www.europeanpwn.net/files/europeanpwn_boardmonitor_2010.pdf, accessed: October 4, 2011).

Ezzamel, M. and Hoskin, K. (2002). Retheorizing accounting, writing and money with evidence from Mesopotamia and Ancient Egypt. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 13, 333-367.

Feldberg, R.L. and Glenn, E.N. (1979). Male and female: job versus gender models in the sociology of work. *Social Problems*, 26(5), 524-38.

Feldman, D. and Klich, N. (1991). Impression management and career strategies. In R. Giacalone and P. Rosenfeld (eds), *Applied Impression Management* (pp. 67-80), Newbury Park, Ca.: Sage.

Finch, J. (1984). *Married to The Job: Wives' Incorporation in Men's Work,* London: Allen and Unwin.

Fineman, S (ed) (1993). *Emotion in Organizations.* London: Sage.

Fulop, L. and Linstead, S. (2000). *Management: A Critical Text.* London: Macmillan

Gärtner, M. (2012): '…aber die Arbeit muss ja gemacht werden'. Eine empirische Studie zu den betrieblichen Bedingungen männlicher Familienvereinbarkeit, Leverkusen: Budrich (in print).

Gärtner, M. (2005) Men are Gendered, not Standard. Scientific and Political Implications of the Results, , in Pucher, R; Gärtner, M.,; Höyng, S. (eds.): Work Changes Gender. Men and Equality in the Transition of Labour Forms Leverkusen: Budrich, pp.175-192.

Geneen, H.S. (1985). *Managing*. London: Collins.

Gibbings, S. (1990). *The Tie: Trends and Traditions*. London: Studio Editions.

Glucksmann, M. (1995). Why 'work'? Gender and the 'total social organization of labour'. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 2(2), 63-75.

Goffman, E. (1961). *Encounters*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Goines, J.T. (2002). Management teams' experience, working relationships and turnover: implications on performance. Paper at Midwest Academy of Mangement 45th Conference, Indianapolis April 18-20. Available at: www.cobweb.creighton.edu/MAM/papers/Goines.doc

Gooch, J. (1974). *The Plans of War: The General Staff and British Military Strategy c. 1900-1916*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Gray, S. (1987). Sharing the shopfloor. In M. Kaufman (ed), *Beyond Patriarchy* (pp. 216-34). Oxford University Press.

Grey, C. (1994) Career as a project of the self and labour process discipline. *Sociology*, 28(2), 479-98.

Hay Group (2001). *Top Teams: Why Some Work and Some Do Not*. Philadelphia and London: Hay Group. Available at: www.haygroup.co.uk/downloads/TopTeamsBooklet.pdf

Hearn, J. (1983). *Birth and Afterbirth: a Materialist Account*. London: Achilles Heel.

Hearn, J. (1985). Men's sexuality at work. In A. Metcalf and M. Humphries (eds), *The Sexuality of Men* (pp. 110-28), London: Pluto.

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

Hearn, J. (ed) (1989). Men, Masculinities and Leadership: Changing Patterns and New Initiatives', Special Issue, *Equal Opportunities International*, 8(1).

Hearn, J. (1992a). Changing men and changing managements: a review of issues and actions. *Women in Management Review and Abstracts*, 7(1), 3-8.

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

Hearn, J. (1993). Emotive Subjects: Organizational Men, Organizational Masculinities and the (De)construction of Emotions. In S. Fineman (ed) *Emotion in Organizations* (pp. 148-66), London and Newbury Park, Ca.: Sage.

Hearn, J. (1994). Changing men and changing managements: social change, social research and social action. In M.J. Davidson and R. Burke (eds), *Women in Management - Current Research Issues* (192-209), London: Paul Chapman.

Hearn, J. (1996). Is masculinity dead? a critique of the concept of masculinity/masculinities. In M. Mac an Ghaill (ed), *Understanding Masculinities. Social Relations and Cultural Arenas* (pp. 202-17), Buckingham: Open University Press.

Hearn, J. and Collinson, D.L. (1994). Theorizing unities and differences between men and between masculinities' in H. Brod and M. Kaufman (eds.) *Theorizing Masculinities* (pp. 97-118), Newbury Park, Ca. and London: Sage.

Hearn, J. and Collinson, D.L. (1998). Men, masculinities, managements and organisational culture. *Zeitschrift Fur Personal Forschung*, 12(1), 210-22.

Hearn, J., A. Kovalainen, A. and Tallberg, T. (2002). *Gender Divisions and Gender Policies in Top Finnish Corporations*. Research Report 57. Helsinki: Swedish School of Economics and Business Administration.

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* (pp. 17-40), New York: M.E. Sharpe.

Hearn, J. and Parkin, W. (1995*) 'Sex' at 'Work': The Power and Paradox of Organisation Sexuality*. Revised and updated. Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall/Harvester Wheatsheaf; New York: St. Martin's.

Hearn, J. and Parkin, W. (2001). *Gender, Sexuality and Violence in Organizations: the Unspoken Forces of Organization Violations*. London: Sage.

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

Hochschild, A. R. (1983). *The Managed Heart. Commercialization of Human Feeling*. Berkeley, Ca: University of California Press.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values*. London: Sage.

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

Hollway, W. (1996). Masters and men. In D.L. Collinson and J. Hearn (eds), *Men as Managers, Managers as Men* (pp. 25-42), London: Sage.

Hoskin, K. and Macve, R. (1988). The genesis of accountability: the West Point Connections. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 13(1) 37-73.

Hoskin, K. and Macve, R. (1994). Reappraising the genesis of managerialism: a re-examination of the role of accounting at the Springfield Armory, 1815-1845. *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal*, 7(2), 2-29.

Howell, D. and Willis, R. (eds) (1980). *Societies at Peace*. New York: Routledge.

Iacocca. L. (1984). *Iacocca: an Autobiography*. New York: Bantam.

ID Research (2001). *Gay & Lesbian Census*. London: ID Research. Available at: http://www.idresearch.co.uk/Gay%20Census%20Overview.pdf

Institute of Management / Remuneration Economics (1998). *UK National Management Survey*. London: Institute of Management.

Kanter, R. M. (1993). *Men and Women of the Corporation*, New York: Basic Books.

Kerfoot, D. (2001). The organization of intimacy: managerialism, masculinity and the masculine subject. In S. Whitehead and F. Barrett (eds), *The Masculinities Reader* (pp. 233-52), Cambridge: Polity.

Kerfoot, D. and Knights, D. (1993). Management, masculinity and manipulation: from paternalism to corporate strategy in financial services in Britain. *Journal of Management Studies*, 30(4) 659-79.

Kerfoot, D. and Knights, D. (1996). 'The best is yet to come?' The quest for embodiment in managerial work. In D.L. Collinson and J. Hearn (eds), *Men as Managers, Managers as Men* (pp. 78-98), London: Sage.

Kerfoot, D. and Knights, D. (1998). Managing masculinity in contemporary organizational life: a 'man'agerial project. *Organization*, 5(1), 7-26.

Kimmel, M.S. (2001). Masculinity as homophobia: fear, shame, and silence in the construction of gender identity. In S. Whitehead and F. Barrett (eds), *The Masculinities Reader* (pp. 266-87), Cambridge: Polity.

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

Korten, D. (1996). *When Corporations Rule the World*. London: Earthscan Publications.

Korten, D. (1998). Taming the giants. Available at wysiwyg://191/http://www.geocities.com/RainForest/3621/KORTEN.HTM

Langvasbråten, T./ Teigen, M. (2006): FOCUS – Fostering Caring Masculinities. European Dimension Report, The Equality and Anti-Discrimination Ombud, Norway, Oslo.

Lupton, B. (2002). *'What Kind of Man are You?' Masculinity, Social-Class and Men who Work in Female-Concentrated Occupations*. Doctoral Thesis. Manchester: Manchester Metro University.

Lynch, K. (1989). Solidary labour: its nature and marginalisation. *Sociological Review*, 37(1), 1-14.

Maier, M. and Messerschmidt, J. (1998). Commonalities, conflicts and contradictions in organizational masculinities: exploring the gendered genesis of the Challenger Disaster. *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 35(3), 325-44.

MacInnes, J. (1998). *The End of Masculinity*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

MacInnes, J. (2001). The crisis of masculinity and the politics of identity. In S. Whitehead and F. Barrett (eds) *The Masculinities Reader* (pp. 311-29), Cambridge: Polity.

McMahon, A. (1993). Male readings of feminist theory: the psychologization of sexual politics in the masculinity literature. *Theory and Society*, 22, 675-95.

Marshall, J. (1995). *Women Managers Moving On*, London: Routledge.

Martin, J. (1990). Deconstructing organizational taboos: the suppression of gender conflict in organizations', *Organizational Science*, 1(4), 339-59.

Martin, P.Y. (1996). Gendering and evaluating dynamics: men, masculinities and managements. In D.L. Collinson and J. Hearn (eds), *Men as Managers, Managers as Men* (pp. 186-209), London: Sage.

Martin, P.Y. (2001). 'Mobilizing masculinities': women's experiences of men at work. *Organization*, 8 (4), 587-618.

Marx, K. and Engels, F. (1970) *The German Ideology*. London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Mauksch, H.O. (1973). Ideology, interaction and patient care in hospitals. *Social Science and Medicine*, 7, 817-30.

Messerschmidt, J. (1996). Managing to kill: masculinities and the Space Shuttle Challenger Explosion. In C. Cheng (ed), *Masculinities in Organizations* (pp. 29-53). Thousand Oaks, Ca.: Sage.

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

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

Morgan, D.H.J. (1996). The gender of bureaucracy. In D.L. Collinson and J. Hearn (eds), *Men as Managers, Managers as Men* (pp. 29-53), London: Sage.

Morgan, G. (1997). *Images of Organization.* London: Sage.

Mulholland, K. (1996). Entrepreneurialism, masculinities and the self-made man. In D.L. Collinson and J. Hearn (eds), *Men as Managers, Managers as Men* (pp. 123-49), London: Sage.

Murdock (1936-7). Comparative data on the division of labor by sex. *Social Forces*, 15(4), 551-3.

Nordberg, M. (2002). Constructing masculinity in women's worlds: men working as pre-school teachers and hairdressers. *NORA: the Nordic Journal of Women's Studies*, 10(1), 26-37.

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

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

O'Brien, M. (1986). *Reproducing the World*. Boulder, Col: Westview.

Pahl, R. (1995). *After Success: Fin-de-Siecle Anxiety and Identity*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Pease, B. and Pringle, K. (2001). Introduction: studying men's practices and gender relations in a global context. In B. Pease and K. Pringle (eds), *A Man's World: Changing Men's Practices ina Globalized World* (pp. 1-17), London: Zed.

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

Peters, T.J. and Waterman, R.H. (1982). *In Search of Excellence.* New York: Harper and Row.

Pierce, J. (1996). Rambo litigators: emotional labour in a male dominated organization. In C. Cheng (ed), *Masculinities in Organizations* (pp. 1-28), Thousand Oaks, Ca.: Sage.

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

Powell, G. (1993) *Women and Men in Management*. Newbury Park, Ca.: Sage.

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

Puchert, R./ Gärtner, M./ Höyng S. (Hg. 2005): Work Changes Gender. Men and Equality in the Transition of Labour Forms, Opladen.

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

Reed, R. (1996). Entrepreneurialism and paternalism in Australian management: A gender critique of the self-made man. In D.L. Collinson and J. Hearn (eds), *Men as Managers, Managers as Men* (pp. 99-122), London: Sage.

Reis, C. (2002). *The Private and Public Lives of Men Managers in a European Transnational Company*. Doctoral Thesis. London: The Institute of Education, University of London.

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

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* (pp. 190-211), London and New York: Routledge.

Roper, M.R. (1994). *Masculinity and the British Organization Man since 1945*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Roper, M.R. (1996). Seduction and succession: circuits of homosocial desire in management' in D.L. Collinson and J. Hearn (eds), *Men as Managers, Managers as Men* (pp. 210-26), London: Sage.

Rosenfeld, R. and Wilson, D. (1999). *Managing Organizations.* Prentice Hall.

Sanday, P.R. (1981). *Female Power and Male Dominance: On the Origins of Sexual Inequality*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Scambor, C./Schwerma, K./Abril, P. (2005): Towards a New Positioning of Men, in: Puchert, R./ Gärtner, M./ Höyng S. (Hg.): Work Changes Gender. Men and Equality in the Transition of Labour Forms, Opladen, 117–167.

Scase, R. and Goffee, R. (1989). *Reluctant Managers*. London: Unwin Hyman.

Sheppard, D (1989). Organizations, power and sexuality: the image and self-image of women managers. In J. Hearn, D. Sheppard, P. Tancred-Sheriff and G. Burrell (eds), *The Sexuality of Organization* (pp. 139-58), Sage, London: Sage.

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

Surowieki, J. (2002). Did Iacocca ruin American business? *The Guardian*, July 23.

Tolson, A. (1977). *The Limits of Masculinity.* London: Routledge.

UN Human Development Report (1996). New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press for the United Nations Development Programme.

Vinnicombe (2000). The position of women in management in Europe. In In M. Davidson and R. Burke (eds), *Women in Management, Current Research Issues*, *Volume II* (pp. 9-25), London: Sage.

Veikkola, E.-S., Hänninen-Salmelin, E. and Sinkkonen, S. (1997). Is the forecast for wind or calm? In E.-S. Veikkola (ed), *Women and Men at the Top: A Study of Women and Men at the Top* (pp. 82-7), Gender Statistics 1997:1. Helsinki: Statistics Finland.

Waddington, D., Critcher, C, and Dicks, B. (1998). 'All jumbled up': employed women with unemployed husbands. In J. Popay, J. Hearn and J. Edwards (eds), *Men, Gender Divisions and Welfare* (pp. 231-56), London: Routledge.

Wajcman, J. (1998). *Managing Like a Man*. Cambridge: Polity.

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

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

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

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

Weinsbach, M.S. and Hermalin, B.E. (2000). *Boards of Directors as an Endogenously Determined Institution: a Survey of the Economic Literature*. NBER Working Paper 8161. Cambridge: National Bureau of Economic Research.
Available at: http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=233111

Westwood, S. (1984). *All Day, Every Day: Factory and Family in the Making of Women's Lives.* London: Pluto Press.

Wetherell, M. and Edley, N. (1999). Negotiating hegemonic masculinity: imaginary positions and psycho-discursive practices. *Feminism & Psychology*, 9(3), 335-56.

Whitehead, S. (2001). Man: the invisible gendered subject? In S. Whitehead and F. Barrett (eds) *The Masculinities Reader* (pp. 351-68), Cambridge: Polity.

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

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

Witz, A. and Savage, M. (1992). The gender of organizations. In M. Savage and A. Witz (eds.) *Gender and Bureaucracy* (pp. 3-62), Oxford: Blackwell.
Woodward, A.E. (1996). Multinational masculinities and European bureaucracies. In D.L. Collinson and J. Hearn (eds), *Men as Managers, Managers as Men* (pp. 167-85), London: Sage.

2. Discussion paper

How Can Men Do Gender Equal Work?

Marc Gärtner, Jeff Hearn, and Majda Hrženjak

The topic of gender (in)equality and work, even if we reduce it to the topic of men at work, appears very complex. It represents a node in which the spheres of public, private and those in between (informal work, undeclared work, family enterprises) intersect, influence and co-constitute each other. Labour market and workplaces represent an arena of construction, putting in force and carrying out relations of dominance and subordination. These relations, in turn, spread their effects beyond labour market and the individual's position at the labour market into other domains of society. This happens through the organization of time and space, the redistribution of resources, the access to present and future social security rights, life prospective, opportunities for education and career as well as space available for intimacy and care and, last but not least, through personal self-esteem and (dis)empowerment.

The following discussion paper seeks to present our perspective on main problems and resources of solution. It focuses on three basic levels: first, a macro (labour market) level perspective, second, a meso-(organizational) level perspective, and, third, questions of more specific interventions.

1. Labour and Gender (In)equality: Segregation and Change

Though ideologically labour market is presented as a place which opens up opportunities for overcoming societal inequalities, very often it still appears as a mechanism of freezing and reproducing structural and symbolical inequalities, not only between men and women, but also along the dimensions of race, ethnicity, class, age, health, sexual orientation, marital status etc. Considering all this, we can say that the organization of labour is part of both the problem and the solution for many societal problems, including gender (in)equality.

'Traditional' problems of gender (in)equality at work are pay gap, vertical and horizontal segregation of the labour market, lacks in work and family balancing mechanisms, sexual harassment at work and glass ceilings. These problems are framed by an andocentric logic and structure of labour organizations, and they remain persistent even almost 20 years after Beijing and after many more decades of feminist and recently even of mainstream policy endeavours for gender equality, though some important improvements can also be detected.

Contemporary developments in research on gender and work opened up some new perspectives on these 'traditional' problems of gender inequality at labour market by pointing to the importance of differences not only between women and men, but also among women and among men. Furthermore, focusing on men as a gendered and internally differentiated social group, brought to light new understandings into how macro structural

power relations, often expressed as 'neutral' are rooted in the androcentric meso (organizational) structures and influence identity constructions of men. These may in turn produce specific dangers, risks and costs at work, along with their benefits and privileges. To view, indeed to problematise, gender (in)equality at work in this way is not a matter of adding 'the male perspective' to an existing notion of gender equality. Rather, it means fundamentally rethinking what gender equality is, who defines its framing, and how this translates to practical actions (Hearn, 2006).

In many research studies on men at work recurring themes include men's occupational, working and wage advantages over women, the persistence of gender segregation at work, many men's close associations with paid work, as well as a frequent focus on men in nontraditional occupations. There has, however, been a general lack of attention to men as managers, policy-makers, owners and other power holders. Most obviously, there is the continuing dominance of men in management, especially at the very top and more highly paid levels. Although there have been some increased entry of women into the paid labour market in many countries, the European labour market is still characterised by both vertical (hierarchies) and horizontal (branches, professions, activities) segregation. Both forms tend to go together and play into each other, but at the same time, there has been a historical change from vertical to horizontal gender segregation, which has to be studied more exactly. The extent to which these main trends and historical tendencies applies clearly varies in different countries, but significantly some of the greatest levels of (horizontal) gender segregation by labour market sector are to be found in countries with high levels of gender equality, such as Finland, Sweden and Norway.[5] This complicates any simple analysis of men's relations to the labour market at the national and regional levels.

Uneven forms of male participation in the labour market create uneven conditions for gender equality and women's participation, not at least in relation to work/family variations. In working life, as in families, gender equality and men's participation in care and non-traditional work differ, not just due to regional variation or gender and welfare regimes, but also due to organizational developments, work cultures and other forces that are not sufficiently understood today (for example, Work Changes Gender (Puchert et al. 2005) found a tendency towards *more* gender-equality active organizations in passive, traditional institutional contexts in central and southern Europe). Hierarchical and social class differences are important and intertwined with gender issues. A realistic view of competition between men and women and of hierarchies and power relations is a necessity in the analysis, even if working life is not a zero sum game. Recognizing change processes and identifying win-win potentials require understanding of actual trends, intersections, interests and conflicts, for example, gender differences that are associated with different education levels and – possibly – gender equality as a 'middle class' project.

Two key examples of (un)equal labour market gender segregation are: horizontal segregation in terms of men in female-populated occupations; and vertical segregation in terms of women and men promotion in management. On the first example, men in female-populated occupations, major questions include: 'Which are the benefits and opportuni-

[5] Pringle, Keith , Hearn, Jeff et al. (2006) *Men and Masculinities in Europe*, Whiting & Birch, London, 2006; Hearn, Jeff, Pringle, Keith, with members of CROME (2006) *European Perspectives on Men and Masculinities: National and Transnational Approaches*, Palgrave Macmillan, London.

ties for men taking up nontraditional jobs? What are the benefits for companies, for the economy as a whole? What can policy makers and other stakeholders do to encourage men into female-dominated job areas, to dismantle gender stereotyping in education, training and career advice? Which are the barriers that men face when they try to choose a "female-dominated" path in education and career? Which are the barriers for men in numerically female-dominated, or rather female- populated employment areas, such as social care jobs?' The question of men in female-populated occupations can be highlighted by the example of the field of child care and early childhood education. Since caring professions became feminised over a long time (and also, in many countries, devaluated in terms of prestige and payment), gender stereotypes and traditional models of masculinity are huge challenges in this field. These issues have been explored as a vehicle for change in various countries, for example, Germany.[6]

The second example, women and men promotion in management raises even more fundamental issues. There has been very extensive research and policy development on the promotion of more women into management positions. However, more women in management means less men in management, unless there is a major expansion in management positions, something that is, however, resisted by both governments and private sector employers. Reducing gender segregation and men's domination of management and especially top management is a key element in change towards more gender equal working life. This entails consideration of how to develop meaningful employment for men without automatically assuming it is men who will become the greater part of management and management teams.

All of these issues are clearly complicated, and indeed in many respects exacerbated, by the financial crisis. They also intersect with the current, and potentially even greater, ecological crisis. These urgent matters can be both seen in relation to dominant forms and discourses of masculinity, and represent challenges to those dominant forms. These entanglements operate at macro labour market levels and at the level of the workplace and gendered work cultures that operative, ranging from competitive to caring to laissez-faire.

2. Gender (In)equality in the Workplace: Management, Availability, and Job Ascriptions

Despite huge historical changes in masculinity and men's practices, yet there is also stubborn persistence in some aspects of them, including within organizations and workplaces. As Collinson and Hearn argue in the preceding background paper, the most obvious of these is men's domination at the top of organizations, including business and government. Masculinities are shaped within specific, sometimes changing, workplace contexts, with orientations towards functionality, competition, success and/or domination. Vice versa, organizations are formed in an androcentric way, a masculine form, which is often dominant and exclusive against those who are not regarded as 'fitting in': women, homosexuals, those who are not daring etc. As Bourdieu puts it, 'Male habitus is constructed and completed only in connection with the space reserved for men' (Bourdieu 1997: 203), which moreover applies for managerial positions. Although

[6] In 2008/09, the German Federal Ministry of Family supported a survey on 'Men in Institutions of Child Care Service', and currently supports the 'Coordination for Men in kindergardens (Play Schools)', both conducted/located at Catholic University, Berlin.

management is often, indeed usually, presented as if it is a gender-neutral activity, it remains strongly dominated by men. Assumptions of gender-neutrality in management have been strongly challenged by feminist and feminist-influenced studies, showing how management often excludes women, and especially black and minority ethnic women.
Changing men's relations to management involves support of women and women's initiatives in management. If the current gendered form of management is to change, and if there are to be more women in management, there will be fewer men there. Getting the question of fewer men in management and boards onto workplace policy agendas, or at least onto the table for discussion, seems to be difficult. Targets, both nationally and individually, can be set for changes of this sort. This can include discussion of what constitutes a minimum acceptable mass of women in management, and a maximum acceptable mass of men in management. There is clear progress in the reduction in men's domination of company boards in Norway, notably without much resistance from en's side (Huse & Solberg, 2005; Storvik & Teigen 2010[7]). This is remarkable, because the Norwegian example suggests that it is possible to politically build up and environment of gender equality step by step: from politics (with a considerable high share of women from the early 1980s on), to public administration (which already showed women in 45% of top management positions in 2008) to the current and obviously successful strategy in the private sector. However, beyond promoting women, workplace equality involves a range of structural measures like flexible work (both in terms of time and space), family-friendly and care leave policies.

However, if these strategies only target women, men committed or obliged to caring work remain in the 'blind spot' in their workplaces. They are just not addressed by reconciliation policies, which in many cases are policies 'by women for women', for example family or women's representatives (Holter et al. 2005). [8] There seems to be, however, positive developments in including men into reconciliation issues, moving from north to south: after the Nordic countries as time/care pioneers, German trade unions, together with politicians and fathers' initiatives, linked the care topic to men and successfully initiated productive discourses (Petterson 2003, Döge 2004, Ver.di 2006)[9]. At least parts of the traditional, androcentric work culture are challenged by issues of male work-family reconciliation: carers become more visible, and the male norm of working long hours and expanded availability is questioned not only by female, but also by male critique (Gärtner 2012). Thus, tackling andocentric workplace cultures aims both at leading positions (also for women) and a care positive workplaces (also for men).

The issue of quota as a mean for women's promotion is now being debated in Europe, often combined with arguments of human resources and women's advances in educa-

---

[7] Storvik, Aagoth, Mari Teigen: Women on board : the Norwegian experience. Berlin : Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, International Policy Analysis, 2010.

[8] Another major problem lies in the outsourcing of domestic and care work which is increasingly getting a way of solving work and family conflicts in dual-career middle class households and can be sometime provided by companies as a direct support to women and men managers. This is a way of transferring domestic labour from the woman's responsibility in the family to "other" women, usually migrant women, hard-to employ women, older women, long-term unemployed women, young women seeking for their first job, working poor (Hrženjak 2007). Thus, work and care balance strategies and measures should be carefully and sensitively designed in order not to reproduce old and create new gender inequalities.

[9] Pettersson, Gisela: Auch Männer haben ein Vereinbarkeitsproblem – oder familienfreundliche Personalpolitik (auch) für Väter? Dokumentation der ver.di-Fachtagung "Gesundheit und Geschlecht". ver.di-Genderpolitik, April 2003.

tion[10], sometimes with emphasizing 'women are different' (Storvik & Teigen 2010) as a promoting perspective. That may work less effective for men, since 'carers are different (regardless of their gender)' cannot build on the same diversity and innovation level. There are, however, examples of organizations that allow male carers, too, a broader range of flexibility and reconciliation options; this is, in some cases, due to human resources strategies (Gärtner 2012). There are two main strategies in this context that may work together:

- A *do ut des* strategy on individual levels: 'The individual carer is a high performer. If we do not enable his reconciliation, he might leave us; if we do, he might reward us loyally with continuous high performance.'
- A company presentation strategy: 'If we enable care, we are more attractive both for clients and for potential employees.' (ibid.)

In both ways, reconciliation and equality are set as a business case, which help organizations to implement strategies according to their own benefits. This allows to accept and justify necessary costs for equality – and to avoid the costs of inequality. But it may take more than those incentives and initiatives that enable organizations to develop these strategies (like sensitivity trainings on gender and reconciliation, courses on care and career, the implementation of work life balance modules, or the institutionalisation of reconciliation policies in human resources departments). The Norwegian quota debate showed that a legal framework, political pressure and financial incentives (e.g. to avoid fines) can turn out to be quite effective.

Beyond the vertical issues and care hostility discussed above, workplace equality is being undermined by a third dimension causing divergence that is horizontal (occupational and sectoral) segregation.

Despite impressive advances of women in education and employment rate and successful challenging of gender norms by feminism gender-based employment segregation remains pervasive in occupations and sectors which has implications for wage inequality, undervaluation of female work and discrimination. For a long time, these phenomena have been interpreted mostly under the perspective of female labour market activity and employment structure[11], while men's role and patterns have been examined only later. Puchert et al. (2005) point out that, four 'essentially male occupations'[12] in Europe are armed forces, extraction and building trade occupations, metal and machinery occupations, and drivers and mobile plant operators. These sectors seem to be linked to hegemonic aspects of masculinity like physical strength, virility, or mastery of technology. In terms of the quality of workplaces, men are somewhat less »protected« against health risks being over-represented in industrial occupations, also part-time and long hours work clearly differentiate women's and men's workplaces making men less satisfied with work-

---

[10] The European Commission, has called on European publicly listed companies to sign the '*The Women on the Board Pledge for Europe*', which, besides aiming at equality, makes the argument to 'recruit more female talent' (http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/reding/womenpledge/index_en.htm).

[11] Yet in 2009, Bettio & Verashchagina rightly emphasise, 'that occupational segregation often confines women to lower value added, lower-paid jobs. On the one hand, different jobs have different value added for employers depending on the location of the job in the production structure, not on the productivity or training of the worker. For example, labour-intensive jobs tend to yield less value added per hour worked and have often been feminised.'(ibid)

[12] According Deutsch & Silber (2003), 'male occupations' are those with more than 90% male workers. Notably, the authors did not find "female occupations" with more than 90% female workers.

life balance than women. There is a marked divide between the public and the private sector, with about 40% women in public administration working flexible hours or being able to count on forms of time-banking – more than 10 points above the male figure (Bettio and Verashchagina 2009). On the long run, occupational gender segregation can result in labour shortages in specific male and female dominated occupations (for instance in care and computing).

Men's low presence in caring professions is now extensively discussed.[13] These professions are estimated to be underpaid, mostly compared with technical (and managerial) professions dominated by men. Moreover, by horizontal segregation, men and women are restricted to a relatively small set of potential activities. Fagan (2010) points out that, 'cultural, institutional and economic barriers which deter men from entering many female-dominated jobs'. Men, at least in some milieus and countries, can receive gender based devaluation from working in these professions. On the other hand, if men enter 'female connotated professions, 'they are frequently over-represented in the senior and managerial grades so that pronounced gender-based vertical segregation is observed even in female-dominated parts of the economy. (…) (M)en were expected to move up into authority positions, and refers to this process as the 'glass escalator' in contrast to the 'glass ceiling' which women often face. It is for this reason that moves to desegregate female-dominated job areas also brings the risk of negative effects on career progression for women employed in these areas.' (ibid.)

Vertical and horizontal segregation, plus working time models that are (in terms of working time or availability) clustered around forms of traditional masculinity, are characteristics of an androcentric labour and workplace culture, that endanger gender equality. We have summarized some of these characteristics, as well of inequality costs and benefits of a more equal workplace culture. Experiences, at least initiatives to improve these and tackle the androcentric work structure and culture, are discussed in the following section.

3. Gender Equality Initiatives: Changing Work, Organizations and Men

Women have been the driving force in developing gender equality policies. Policy debate on gender equality has developed primarily in terms of what women have to gain from greater gender equality. This has become the 'mainstream' of gender equality work. At the same time, men are also involved and implicated in gender equality policies and practices - in many ways, as: spouses, fathers, and other family members; colleagues and trade union members at work; managers and employers; policy-makers; active citizens in social organizations, and so on. Sometimes this has meant some men resisting moves to gender equality or seeing it only as 'women's business'.

Yet, the question remains, how men can contribute positively to gender equality, and what gender equality policies need to be developed to include men?

Much of what men do at work is *not* seen as related to gender equality or even as political or gendered activity at all. It is not seen as 'about gender' or about making gender relations more or less (un)equal. Much of men's practices, in public and in private, in work, negotiations, networking, lobbying, pressurizing and so on is not seen as gendered: they are generally done and perceived as if they were 'normal'. They are *not* usually *gender-*

[13] Ruth Simpson: Men in Caring Occupations, Doing Gender Differently (Palgrave: 2009), Krabel, Jens/Stuve, Olaf (Hg.) (2006): *Männer in "Frauenberufen" der Pflege und Erziehung*, Opladen: Verlag Barbara Budrich. Colette Fagan: Men and Gender Equality. Tackling gender segregated family roles and social care jobs, European Commission, 2010.

conscious activity: they 'just happen'. Men's practices producing and reproducing gender inequality are heavily embedded in social and economic relations - so that men's dominant or complicit practices may often easily be equated with what is considered and counts as the 'normal', usual, or even the official way of doing things.

There are several ways of understanding these kinds of androcentric logic of organizations and of practices of men. One is through the notion of homosociality (Lipman-Blumen, 1976): men's preference for men and men's company, rather than women and women's company. A particular challenge is to change men's relations with each other: how is that heterosexual men are often so homosocial, valuing and choosing men and men's company? Oddly, such (heterosexual) homosociality can sometimes go hand in hand with heterosexism and homophobia. Another way of understanding is cultural cloning – the tendency to reproduce more of the same - whether by gender, ethnicity or organizational tradition (Essed & Goldberg, 2002). This can be seen and taken-for-granted in many organizations and is important in reproducing gender (in)equality.

The androcentric logic, structure and culture in many workplaces needs to be open to explicit examination, discussion, critique and change. There are a wide range of relevant work-related policies and reforms. An obvious and well debated example is men in parental leave. There is now widespread evidence that gender inequality in couple arrangements often becomes 'boosted' with the foundation of a family. The 'pitfall of traditionalisation'[14] – with men tending to more, women to less labour, which comes to effect not later than the birth of the fist child – seems to culturally determine fathers to the professional and mothers to the family sphere. As Holter argues, a system of cultural norms (like devaluation of men who differ from hegemonic masculinity patterns), economic and workplace triggers and threats (e.g. tax incentives and care-hostile work environments) keeps collective gender traditional practices running. Considerable increases in parental leave in North Europe can be seen as a cultural change, with some employers no longer able to assume the constant presence of all men and their full dedication to labour during these times.

Indeed, in many countries and many industries there are still strongly traditional work patterns in this regard. It should not be forgotten that there is a range of other relevant policy measures, including flexibility in work and time use; job sharing; recognition of wider care responsibilities including of older parents; and more generally the integration of work/family issues into strategic human resources management and core thinking of organizations. There are urgent needs for employers to facilitate ways and means for men to reconcile work and domestic/family/personal life more positively. This includes attention to more job-sharing, voluntary reduced work time, flexible working hours, term time working, working from home, and similar initiatives. Key issues are the effects and benefits on such innovations on well-being, life satisfaction, health and other personal outcomes. This includes the effects for men themselves and effects for women and children, and also, more generally, economic and material effects on a societal and organizational level, which may flow from more gender-balanced domestic work and care sharing. Additionally, there are specific groups of men who may often require specific policy attention and support, for example, men with disabilities, older men, and migrant men.[15]

---

[14] Anneli Rüling, A. (2007): Jenseits der Traditionalisierungsfallen. Wie Eltern sich Familien- und Erwerbsarbeit teilen (Beyond the Pitfalls of Traditionalisation), Frankfurt.

[15] The Coalition on Men and Boys (2009): Man Made: Men, Masculinities and equality in public policy, London.

Regarding educational programmes to counter stereotypes in school and to positively encourage 'atypical' occupational choices among young boys and girls there have been possible to see some positive developments in which initiatives focused mainly on encouraging girls choices for technical occupations were widened to encourage also boys to enter female areas of work like teaching and caring (for instance, 'New pathways for boys' in Germany). However, structural conditions and power relations at the labour market, which construct female dominated professions as undervaluated, deprofessionalised, with low salaries and social esteem make motivating boys for female dominated professions a particular demanding task. Therefore, in parallel to the motivating campaigns in the field of education, effective measures at the labour market must be taken too, to address and oppose the undervaluation of female jobs, biases in job evaluation procedures, pay system and in other organizational practices concerning selection, recruitment, career ladders and job assignments. Some good practice example can be identified in upgrading and professionalisation of home-based care workers in Austria for instance.

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

Cooper and Lewis (1998; Cooper, 2000) have outlined key steps for a broad 'agenda of change', as follows: 'integrating work-family issues into core thinking and strategic planning in organizations'; 'more diversity in decision-making'; 'a rethinking of notions of time'; 'developing flexibility and autonomy'; 'redefining careers'; 'new approaches to management'; 'redefining success'; and 'public support and partnership with industry'. While these steps are by no means unproblematic, they do point to the growing understanding of the complex intersections of forms of home life, employment, organizational structure and process, management and gender relations. These interconnections have complex and equally important implications for men as for women.

Finally, to tackle the androcentric labour culture, men in workplaces, organizations and management need to be understood in gendered terms. Organizational power, structure and decision-making can all be reinterpreted in this context. Where appropriate, men can be challenged in terms of dominant forms of masculinity. Men managers, and indeed workers, need to look critically at themselves not only as workers or managers, but also through gendered eyes. This raises the question of how for many men in such positions, different forms of management and different ways of being men can be simultaneously reproduced – authoritarian, paternalist, careerist, personalist, entrepreneurial, and so on (Collinson & Hearn, 1994). In some work organizations there is some degree of regular change in management positions. In others, managerial positions are more permanent, and it may be very unlikely that many men will wish to move from management. If that is so, it can be considered how they might move 'temporarily', for example, by exchanges with women, shifts to specialized or lower positions on the same pay, external secondments, sabbaticals, and so on, as ways of opening up management positions for women.

***

Men's relation to gender equality is produced, reproduced and challenged both on labour markets and in organizations. Both are crucial for policy development, which applies at local, national and EU levels.

At all levels, there are key processes of both inertia and change. Inertia can arise from both overt gender resistances to moves towards gender equality, for example, by individual men or particular groups of men. It can also arise, more generally, from a lack of change in organizations and societies, especially in established ways that may not necessarily be perceived as gendered, for example, dominant ways of managing or assumptions of the normality of economic inequality.
Likewise, change arises from both what are clearly gender-specific processes and social processes that may not appear as such but which have strong gender dimensions. This is important in terms of, for example, economic crisis and financial austerity, which may be often seen and presented as gender-neutral, but is not in its effects.[16]

In the working groups, and the project generally, these issues and pressures to both change and inertia are pursued, through insights from research, good practice and policy development on how men can contribute to greater gender equality.

Bibliography

Bettio, F.,Verashchagina, A. (2009): Gender segregation in the labour market. Root causes, implications and policy responses in the EU, European Commission.

Bekkengen, L. (2002): Man får välja. Om föräldraskap och familjeledighet i arbetsliv och familjeliv, Malmö: Liber.

Bourdieu, P (1997): Die männliche Herrschaft, in: Dölling, I./Krais, B. (Hg.), Ein alltägliches Spiel. Geschlechterkonstruktion in der sozialen Praxis, Frankfurt a.M., 153-217.

Coalition on Men and Boys (2009): Man Made: Men, Masculinities and equality in public policy, London.

Deutsch, J/Silber, J. (2003): Comapring Segregation by Genderin the Labour Force Across Tem European Countries in the 1990s. Ramat Gan (unpublished paper).

Fagan, C.: Men and Gender Equality. Tackling gender segregated family roles and social care jobs, European Commission, 2010.

Gärtner, M. (2012): '…aber die Arbeit muss ja gemacht werden'. Eine empirische Studie zu den betrieblichen Bedingungen männlicher Familienvereinbarkeit, Leverkusen: Budrich (in print).

Holter, Ø. G., Riesenfeld, V./ Scambor, E. (2005): 'We don't have anything like that here!' Organisations, Men and Gender Equality, in: Puchert, R., Gärtner, M., Höyng S. (Hg.): Work Changes Gender. Men and Equality in the Transition of Labour Forms, Opladen.

Hearn, J.,Pringle, K., with members of CROME (2006) European Perspectives on Men and Masculinities: National and Transnational Approaches, Palgrave Macmillan, London.

Kuhl, M. (2011): Wem werden Konjunkturprogramme gerecht? Eine budgetorientierte Gender-Analyse der Konjunkturpakete I und II. Expertise im Auftrag des Arbeitsbereiches Frauen- und Geschlechterforschung der Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, Berlin.

Puchert, R./ Gärtner, M./ Höyng S. (Hg. 2005): Work Changes Gender. Men and Equality in the Transition of Labour Forms, Opladen.

Storvik, Aagoth, Mari Teigen: Women on board: the Norwegian experience. Berlin, Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, International Policy Analysis, 2010.

[16] Most actors in the field of economy and finances are traditionally and still, men; so are the ones who decide about crisis solutions, household measures, financial restructuring. For the side of the effects, Kuhl (2011) recently revealed that the German economic stimulus packages of 2008 and 2009 privileged men as a social group, and also fostered standard employment which is predominantly held by men.

Simpson, R.: Men in Caring Occupations, Doing Gender Differently (Palgrave: 2009),

Krabel, Jens, Stuve, Olaf (Hg.) (2006): *Männer in "Frauenberufen" der Pflege und Erziehung*, Opladen: Verlag Barbara Budrich.

Pettersson, G.: Auch Männer haben ein Vereinbarkeitsproblem – oder familienfreundliche Personalpolitik (auch) für Väter? Dokumentation der ver.di-Fachtagung "Gesundheit und Geschlecht". ver.di-Genderpolitik, April 2003.

Pringle, K. , Hearn, J.et al. (2006) Men and Masculinities in Europe, Whiting & Birch, London,

Rüling, A. (2007): Jenseits der Traditionalisierungsfallen. Wie Eltern sich Familien- und Erwerbsarbeit teilen (Beyond the Pitfalls of Traditionalization), Frankfurt.

Ver.di (2008): Die Vätermonate kommen! Forschungs- und Transfervorhaben in Betrieben und Branchen der ver.di, Endbericht, Berlin.