Organizational Behaviour Reassessed

The Impact of Gender

edited by

Elisabeth Wilson

SAGE Publications
London • Thousand Oaks • New Delhi

10 Power

Lorraine Green, Wendy Parkin, Jeff Hearn

This chapter analyses the engendered and genderized nature of organizational power, and how this relates centrally to the way organizations are perceived, experienced, managed and theorized. Key concepts which will be analysed include gender, sex and power, men and masculinities and their relevance for organizations; the difficulties and controversies associated with attempting to differentiate gender and sexuality; the importance of, and interconnections between, public and private spheres; internal networks and organizational dynamics; and organizational values, beliefs and identities. Following the exploration of these key concepts, a short illustrative case study dealing with residential child care organizations will be presented.

Continuing omissions in contemporary organizational literature

Most classic organizational texts and key organizational textbooks written, failed to analyse the significance of gender or the relationships between sex, gender, organizations and power, in any explicit manner (see Hearn and Parkin, 1992; Mills and Tancred, 1992; Acker and Van Houten, 1992). The nature of masculinist, genderic power was, however, evidenced within most of these texts by assumptions that organizations were inhabited only by men, or that it was not necessary to differentiate between men and women in examining organizations and the distribution of organizational positions (Hearn and Parkin, 1992). Organizations also tended to be presented not only as agendered but also as undifferentiated with regard to race, culture and even class (Hearn et al., 1989; Mills and Tancred, 1992; Mulholland, 1996a) with the exception of some Marxist/class-based approaches (for example, Clegg and Dunkerley, 1977, 1980). Therefore only a very partial view of organizations was given, even though it was presented as if it was a whole, objective and unbiased evaluation.

In many contemporary organizational behaviour and work psychology texts, gender is increasingly referred to, although not always (see Dawson, 1997). It is, however, often included in a very brief, piecemeal, ad-hoc, marginalized and unanalytic manner. For example, Charles Handy, a high profile organizational theorist who omitted any mention of gender or women in his early work, apologizes for this omission in later revised editions (e.g. Handy, 1993: 9) and claims to redress it but does not. In *Understanding Organizations* (1993) most of the extracts and exemplars Handy cites are from

male writers who ignore gender or only refer to men. Regarding motivation and work he poses questions, such as whether biological sex makes a difference, whether men and women decide priorities differently or whether men are dominated by sexuality and aggression (p. 29), but then these issues are left unanalysed. Handy (1993) also remains unapologetic about his predominant use of the male rather than a female or ungendered pronoun in his book because he states it still represents how most organizations operate. Such examples demonstrate not only how little understanding of gender and power still exists, but how small the commitment is to try and challenge the current status quo.

Men in the driving seat: men, masculinity and structural power in organizations

The denial of gender and its relationship with power, in current and past studies of organizations and organizational textbooks seems strange, given that statistics indicate that men hold the majority of formal positions of power in most organizations. Drawing from published statistics, Collinson and Hearn (1996) note that fewer than 5 per cent of managers were female in the UK and the US and that in many other countries it was around 2 per cent. For example, 5 per cent of the UK Institute of Directors and less than 1 per cent of senior executives were women (Hansard Society, 1990). This picture is replicated again and again by numerous other studies such as Equal Opportunities Commission's Annual Reports and research by Colgan and Ledwith (1996). Where women are located within middle management positions, they tend to be 'hived off' into specific, 'niche' areas where they have little strategic power (Crompton and Sanderson, 1990) and are deprived of the wide range of managerial experiences, mentoring and training vital for future promotion (Calas and Smircich, 1993; Collinson and Hearn, 1996; Ohlott et al., 1991).

The proportion of women in the labour market does not explain their under-representation at senior occupational levels, as in the mid-1990s women constituted 47 per cent of the UK employed labour force (Sly, 1993). Even when comparing men and women with equal qualifications, men quickly forge ahead into more and more senior positions (McGuire, 1992; Institute of Management, 1994; Colgan and Ledwith, 1996). While some women clearly do embrace the ideal of a managerial career, this does not necessarily lead to more egalitarian power relationships either in the home or within organizations. In a study of countries within the European Union where affirmative action policies are in place, the number of women in top positions was negligible and the number of women in managerial positions was actually decreasing, although the number of managerial positions was increasing overall (Woodward, 1996). Affirmative or positive action is a radical approach to equal opportunities involving the application of different policies or

processes to specific, often disadvantaged groups, such as black people and women, to transform inequalities in condition at the beginning to equalities at the end, that is, equality of outcome or result (Bagilhole, 1997).

Men and women tend to be segregated in different kinds of jobs within the same organization or within different types of organizations (Cockburn, 1983; Woodward, 1996). Women are often concentrated in types of jobs or occupations associated with tending to others, which are often societally and organizationally perceived as having little value, such as those in the catering, servicing and welfare sectors (Hearn, 1982; Adkins, 1992; Davies, 1992). Conversely men are more likely to inhabit higher status jobs where physical strength or technical or instrumental skills are seen to be needed, such as manual labour jobs, computing and engineering, or jobs where they are expected to manage and oversee others (Collinson and Hearn, 1996; Colgan and Ledwith, 1996; Cheng, 1996b).

Women are generally paid less for doing the same job as a man or for doing work that is different but could be regarded as having equal value (Zimmeck, 1992; Cockburn, 1983, 1991). Additionally, even in welfare work such as social work, where women predominate in the lower positions, men still are overwhelmingly over-represented in the higher managerial positions (Howe, 1986; Hugman, 1991; Grimwood and Popplestone, 1993).

Defining the relationships between gender, sex and power

Power

In examining the pivotal and primary importance of gender and its relationship to power in organizations, some initial exploration is needed of what is meant by the terms sex, gender and power. Power is a multifaceted concept that is difficult to define. There is much contestation around whether power is a possession or a resource that can be imposed hierarchically (Lukes, 1986; Clegg, 1988; Hindess, 1996) or whether it is an immeasurable circulatory, capillary and relational phenomenon, enshrined in discourse and only observable in its exercise (Foucault, 1977, 1979; Clegg, 1988; Hindess, 1996).

To simplify the complex arguments around power, four modes or dimensions of power will be briefly described. Power has thus been traditionally construed as a capacity and the ability to dominate or influence others through reward or punishment (Weber, 1958; Dahl, 1957; Wrong, 1979). The second face of power sees some people's interests as never reaching the formal level of decision making or agenda setting (Bachrach and Baratz, 1970). The third dimension of power views people's 'real interests' as being distorted by ideological conditioning devices (Lukes, 1974). Post-structuralist conceptions of power see individuals as constituted by their discursive environments and

therefore argue it is impossible to see whether there are 'real', 'objective' interests waiting to be defined (Barbalet, 1987; Foucault, 1977, 1979).

In analysing organizational theory textbooks, power tends to be treated as either one or two dimensional. Weber's concept of organizational rational-legal power is often cited as important, (that is, power that is derived from one's official position in the organizational hierarchy) (Buchanan and Huczynski, 1985; Mullins, 1996), even when criticisms of Weber are mentioned, such as his insufficient attention to informal networks of power. Many organizational theory textbooks also utilize French and Raven's (1968) reward, coercive, legitimate, referent and expert power bases, (Buchanan and Huczynski, 1997; Mullins, 1996; Sims et al., 1993) although rarely are the concepts of gender and power interlinked. Sims et al. (1993) is a rare exception here. Lukes's (1974) third dimension of power via ideological conditioning and the fourth, discursive and circulatory notion of power, are noticeable by their omission. In both the third and fourth dimensions of power individuals may collude with or even actively seek positions or activities that others may see as disadvantaging them.

The discursive and gendered nature of power is, however, evident in the way some organizational theory commentators describe power per se. Buchanan and Huczynski (1985), for example, illustrate reward power by reference to a mother offering a child a reward, coercive power by the father's ability to punish a child, and then describe the other three forms of power only by using male pronouns. The link between gender and power is evident here as men and women's personality characteristics are 'naturalized' and essentialized. Men are implicitly presented as naturally authoritarian and coercive and women as maternal and co-operative. By using solely male pronouns to illustrate power, Buchanan and Huczynski also implicitly inferiorize and diminish the importance of women in organizations.

In this chapter not only concepts of coercive or influential, top-down, gendered power will be used but the concepts of three dimensional and discursive gendered power will be drawn upon. Thus genderic, organizational power can be conceptualized, not only as the ability of men to physically prevent women from entering into organizations on an equal basis and being accorded advancement on merit within organizations, through both covert and overt material means, but also in terms of the part discourses and communication play in dissuading women from resisting or wanting to resist that situation. It will also be shown that ideologies, discourses and material relations merge and influence each other in a self-perpetuating fashion.

Gender

In some organizational texts the terms sex and gender are used interchangeably as if they were one and the same, or the term sex is used to denote gender. However, here, (as in chapter one) sex is seen to be a biological

category which defines individuals as males or females according to physiological and chromosomal criteria. Gender is seen as a socially constructed phenomenon whereby certain personality or other social characteristics are connoted as masculine or feminine and are inaccurately assumed to be 'naturally' related to the possession of a male or female body.

However this bi-polar socially constructed view of gender often implicitly suggests masculinity and femininity to be static, unidimensional and diametrically opposed ways of being or acting. It also does not deal satisfactorily with the dynamics of social change or with structural, discursive or practice-based aspects of gender. Such a view is in itself artificially homogenizing, ethnocentric and Eurocentric. It does not acknowledge the existence of plural, multiple masculinities or femininities that may depend on historical and social context, culture and racialization (Eichler, 1980; Carrigan et al., 1985; Connell, 1987, 1995; Hamada, 1996). Additionally it fails to demonstrate how femininities may be performed by males and masculinities by females, or that one person can be androgynous in the same or different cultural contexts (Cheng, 1996a; Hamada, 1996, Bem, 1974; 1981).

Both Daly (1973) and Hollway (1996) have emphasized how masculinity is constructed both generally and occupationally by the positioning of women as the undesirable and deficient 'other'. Masculine characteristics have thus tended to be exalted not necessarily because they are commendable in themselves but because they are oppositional to and are construed in direct aversion to feminine characteristics (Chodorow, 1978; Dinnerstein, 1987).

Various commentators have recently explored the proliferation of, differential hegemony of, and competition between, different types of organizational masculinities. In a Japanese company situated in the US, where power was globally held by a distant multi-national Japanese organization, American managers resented and represented Japanese styles of working as 'feminine', because they were more co-operative and gave less power to the individual managers to wield over subordinates (Hamada, 1996). The American managers felt deprived of power, having to do their own administration and not having individual secretaries to do this and additionally resented having to put on overalls and regularly fraternize and co-operate with the shopfloor workers. This seeming shift to more egalitarian styles at lower levels of management was actually autocratically imposed from the top which remains patriarchal. Hamada's findings therefore link closely with Hearn's argument (1982, 1992) that society is becoming more publicly patriarchal than privately patriarchal or fratriarchal, in that the power of individual men is becoming transubstantiated into the male dominated body of the corporations, the state, the professions and the law.

Cheng (1996a) researching 200 almost equal numbers of male and female students on organizational behaviour courses in the US, conducted a study where the students were asked to assess and choose the 'ideal' student manager. No Asian/American or Asian candidates were chosen, 23 out of the 25 selected were Euro/American men and two were Euro/American women. Using Bem's 1974 Sex Role Inventory (BSRI), Cheng showed how characteristics associated with being a good manager were directly related to characteristics deemed masculine on the BSRI. These included assertion, aggression, athleticism, the ability to make decisions easily, competitiveness, self reliance, independence and a strong and individualistic personality – all part of hegemonic Western masculinity. The Asian males were labelled as unsuitable 'nerds' and too feminine to be good managers because they were seen as too polite, deferential, passive and not tough enough. Qualities they did show such as understanding, tolerance and teamwork were not assessed positively because they were discordant with BSRI masculine ascribed characteristics. Notwithstanding the critique of the BSRI (Eichler, 1980), Cheng illustrates that it is not biological sex alone that dictates occupational elevation but also performative gender (Butler, 1990, 1993), in this case hegemonic masculinity.

In terms of Western organizations the ideal of a good manager often embodies the notion of hegemonic masculinity, therefore coinciding with stereotypical notions of masculinity as competitive, aggressive, competent, autonomous, tough psychologically and physically, goal oriented and non-emotional (Hoch, 1982; Carrigan et al., 1985; Connell, 1987). Suggestions of the emergence of the caring, sharing 'new man' who is not dominated by an obsession with work or status seem not to be sustained in reality (Mintel, 1994). Hegemonic masculinity is the culturally dominant and most powerful form of masculinity. Other forms of masculinity such as complicit masculinities which aspire to and collude with hegemonic masculinity and subordinated masculinities such as homosexual and some Asian masculinities are less powerful and femininities are even less valued (Connell, 1995; Pilcher, 1998).

In addition, men in lower occupational positions, although subordinated by other men, often continue to misogynize, harass and devalue women located in equal or lower, or sometimes even higher organizational positions (Gutek, 1989; Cockburn, 1983, 1991). It therefore cannot be presumed that marginalized men, even those that may be seen as feminized in the context of the dominant culture (for example, Hamada, 1996) do not reinforce gendered hegemony through their masculinities or are devalued in the same way as women. Although it might be argued that women can correspondingly perform 'hegemonic masculinity' and that some who perform this attain high level occupational positions (Collinson and Hearn, 1996; Colgan and Ledwith, 1996), it is only very few women who reach the highest echelons of organizations. This suggests it is not only the formal doing of gender (Butler, 1990; Gherardi, 1996) but the culturally assumed biological sex of the performer, more precisely the ascribed presence or absence of being male, that is generally important.

The most salient issue in the sex/gender debate is not that there are different types of masculinities and femininities that are seen as 'natural' and appropriate in different contexts and cultures but that the dominant forms of masculinities associated predominately with male biological sex and hegemony

(and construed in aversion to femininity) are those that dictate how organizations are run (Collinson and Hearn, 1996; Hamada, 1996; Cheng, 1996b).

Gendered sexuality or sexualized gender in organizations?

The difficulty of separating gender and sexuality has been much debated in recent organizational analysis. The concept of 'organization sexuality' also became an analytical field in itself in the late 1980s (Hearn and Parkin, 1987, 1995; Hearn et al., 1989). A specific focus on sexuality has since been criticized on the grounds it dilutes the analytical importance of gender (Witz and Savage, 1992). However, far from obscuring the paramount importance of gender in organizations, the concept of organization sexuality shows how inextricable and interlinked the categories of sexuality and gender are. Sexualities are thus often subsumed under, and are core, if not defining qualities, of gendered identities. For example, hegemonic masculinity is often defined by its hierarchically heterosexist masculinist nature. Femininities and alternative masculinities are often subordinated and derogated because they are seen to be linked to women and passive and receptive female sexuality (Reynaud, 1983; Hearn, 1987), which is negatively connoted (Addelston and Stirratt, 1996). Some commentators have even gone as far to suggest that it is the sexing or sexualizing of gender, in particular the sexing of females that actually defines the female gender (MacKinnon, 1982) or leads to their domination through compulsory heterosexuality (Rich, 1983). Others query the binary division and demarcation of male and female, questioning the uncritical acceptance of there being two distinct biological sexes (Laqueur, 1990; Butler, 1990, 1993).

It is therefore difficult to argue that the concept of 'organization sexuality' (Hearn and Parkin, 1987, 1995) obscures or eclipses the central importance of gender, for if gender is not only sexed and sexualized, but sexuality is also gendered, then it may be very difficult to separate out the two concepts, particularly if they are organizationally institutionalized.

The dominance of male-defined, hierarchical heterosexuality is embedded in metaphorical and literal gendered language and action within organizations. In business organizations there is talk of 'penetrating' markets (Collinson and Hearn, 1996); in military organizations recruits and cadets are encouraged to be more 'masculine' or derided by superiors calling them 'poufs' or women (Addelstone and Stirratt, 1996). Both of these terms make an analogy to a 'weak' and passive feminine sexuality and presence. And litigators, the majority of whom are male, use a language of gamesmanship and winning. Good, that is, manly, litigators are seen to 'destroy', 'control' or 'rape' the witnesses, whereas those who do not are seen as 'sissy' or 'feminized' (Pierce, 1996). Thus the language of male control within organizations is often relayed

in terms of commodified male sexual conquest (Reynaud, 1983; Evans, 1993). Language is further discussed in Newell (in this volume).

At the same time that the metaphorical language of sex and conquest is generically and hegemonically employed in institutionalized business and occupational language, women within organizations are actually sexually commodified by men, who ironically present themselves as non-sexual beings, whilst using conquest sexual imagery and metaphor, conducting relationships at work and sexually harassing women in the workplace (Hearn and Parkin, 1987, 1995; Hearn et al., 1989). Gutek (1989) writes of how men use their sexuality more than women and in more diverse and exploitative ways, but how paradoxically male sexuality is made invisible whilst at the same time female sexuality is illuminated and problematized.

Sexual harassment has also been of great issue in some organizational analysis, having been traditionally defined as ranging from unwanted, repeated, sexual innuendoes, jokes, touching or overtures to forcible rape, which is predominantly male/female perpetrated both by superiors and co-workers (Schneider, 1985; Wise and Stanley, 1987; Sims et al., 1993). The situation is, however, complicated as consensual sexual banter is often common in working environments and used by both sexes to break the monotony of the job (Cockburn, 1983; Sims et al., 1993). It may therefore depend on a multiplicity of different factors including the work context and individual personalities as to whether certain behaviour is perceived as harassment by either the potential perpetrator or potential victim.

This ambiguity around what constitutes sexual harassment has often led to 'victims' suffering in silence and often complaints are not taken seriously if the behaviour is perceived as a joke on the man's behalf (Sims et al., 1993). Sexual harassment also has a number of consequences, ranging from women feeling ashamed and humiliated, to them losing their confidence, becoming physically or mentally ill or going off sick or leaving their jobs (Schneider, 1985). 'Sexual' harassment may also not be directly sexual and this has led to some commentators, suggesting substituting the term with '(hetero)sexist harassment'. Epstein (1994), for example, cites many instances of men touching women or talking to women, in a way they perceived as demeaning and infantilizing, but because the behaviour was not perceived of as sexual, these women found they had little recourse to official complaints procedures.

Public/private dichotomies and disjunctions

The importance of private sphere gender ideology has a great impact on how men and women are perceived and treated within organizations. While historically and contemporarily many distinctions have been made between public and private spheres, the intrinsic interrelationships between them have often been left untheorized (Pateman, 1989). The public sphere has been unequivocally associated with the world of men, masculinity, technology,

work, politics and organizations (Hearn, 1992), whereas the private sphere has been conceptualized as the world of the family and associated with women, child care, domesticity, sexuality and femininity (Pateman, 1989; Parkin, 1989).

Public/private sphere dichotomies can also be linked to the notion of the male breadwinner. This has played an emotive part in dictating men's salaries and trade union campaigning (Crompton, 1986); it has often been argued that men are working for a family wage, rather than a wage just to support themselves, whereas women are working for supplementary 'pin money' (Reed, 1996). Furthermore the male career ideal has been constructed taking into account not only the notion of a sole male breadwinner, but also the assumption of a complementary, unpaid female servicer in the home. The male career ideal is therefore dependent on the female 'servicer' wife role, even though these roles are often ideologically reversed and thus obscured, with the female seen as dependent on the male rather than vice versa (Crompton, 1986; Crompton and Jones, 1986). The facts that some men are single, many families are by necessity dual-income, and an increasing number of families are lone parent, female-headed families are still often not added into this simple equation. Rarely are private sphere costs, for example, supporting husbands practically and psychologically, and child care, accounted for in terms of the emotional cost or their potential monetary worth (Oakley, 1972, 1974, 1985; Waring, 1988; French, 1995; Mulholland, 1996a; 1996b).

A range of forces from direct controls in both home and work to educational structures and discourses of maternalism may help to explain why women take the majority of the responsibility with child care and support their husbands' careers but are not supported in the same way by their husbands. Discourses of maternalism are propounded and naturalized by lay, media and 'expert' voices, placing the onus for child care on women not men, and blaming women exclusively for any problems they may have with their children (Russell, 1983; French, 1985; Kaplan, 1986).

When women enter the labour market they are concentrated in particular areas, mainly those of the service and caring industries, or within industries where their role is equated with their assumed private sphere role. For example, both Kanter (1977, 1993) and Pringle (1988) saw secretaries as undervalued and doing more than performing an administrative support role. Kanter (1977) spoke of them as 'office wives', performing non-occupational and emotional labour for their bosses and Pringle saw them as embedded in familial and sexual discourses.

Similarly, when women are concentrated in the caring professions often there is little support for them or the room to make mistakes because their roles are assumed to be inherently vocational (Menzies, 1977; Davies, 1992). Whilst women's servicing and caring locations in organizations are often essentialized or judged to be a 'free choice', this is not always the case. Wilkes's (1995) study of women and caring careers distinguished between 'being caring' and

'doing caring' and many of her respondents had chosen a caring profession because it would be seen as an acceptable 'female' career choice.

Internal networks and organizational dynamics

Kanter (1977), drawing on Weberian views about bureaucracy, delineated the 'sexed' way in which corporations and organizations operated in order to reproduce a majority of men in positions of power. She attributed these unequal differentials and opportunity structures existing within organizations solely to the possession of power, thus suggesting women would behave similarly to men if they were located within seats of power. Her analysis has since been critiqued on the grounds that she denies specifically gendered modes of behaviour and suggests that power differentials obliterate or wipe out sex and gender (Witz and Savage, 1992; Collinson and Hearn, 1995), thus ignoring the implications of social constructionist views of gender.

Kanter (1977, 1993) also talked about metaphorical male 'organizational homosexuality' in terms of how men attempted to reproduce their dominant power relations by only mixing with and sharing the same occupational space and privilege with those males they deemed similar in image and behaviour, thus cloning themselves in their own image. Witz and Savage (1992) regard her use of the term male 'homosexuality' as 'clumsy' and replace it with the term male 'homosociability' because of the assumed homo-erotic connotations associated with 'homosexuality'. However, Roper (1996) reclaims and argues for the validity and use of the term 'homosexual' as well as 'homosocial' in terms of male managerial same-sex relations, bonding and reproduction. Roper maintains, echoing Sedgwick (1985), that male bonding involves often unconscious homo-erotic elements and cites examples of how some men emulate and subtly eroticize the verbal language, bodily gestures and styles of dress of other men managers that they admire.

Martin's research (1996) shows how homosocial male networks not only preclude women from high status jobs by sex segregation and selecting in their own image but also actively seek to discredit women whilst elevating men. Martin cites the example of a group of men in a chemistry department decrying a competent but not brilliant woman being awarded a chemistry prize, but simultaneously supporting a man in their department whose work they knew was flawed on the spurious grounds that he was charismatic. Martin also discusses how in selection processes some men will immediately find criticisms of women candidates but look for positive aspects about male candidates. She also documents a tendency for some men to maliciously and unjustifiably publicly criticize females in senior positions, for which they themselves had applied.

Long working hours tend to be equated with managerial jobs but groups of predominantly male managers have also been shown to deliberately and artificially extend the hours of meetings and then criticize or marginalize

women who cannot stay because of child care commitments (Bittman, 1991; Watson, 1994; French, 1995). Many top level jobs are also organized around long and antisocial hours that preclude women with children unless they have the resources, willingness and organizational capacity to employ round the clock childminders or have a partner prepared to take on work and care. In many societies there appears to be a tendency for high level positions to be occupied mainly by married men with children while those women who do reach such posts tend to be single, divorced and childless (Popplestone, 1980; Alban Metcalfe, 1984; Davidson and Cooper, 1984; Howe, 1986; Woodward, 1996).

Collinson and Hearn (1995) also showed that Kanter's (1977) conception of male homosociability in terms of exclusion of women from top jobs was still relevant. They showed that men tended to recruit, promote and privilege male candidates, whilst at the same time often mismanaging sexual harassment cases and being sexual harassers themselves (Collinson and Collinson, 1996).

A number of studies have highlighted men's domination of assessment, selection and promotion processes (Collinson et al., 1990; Alimo-Metcalfe, 1993, 1994; Martin, 1996). Zuboff (1988) also showed how male managers protected their status and attempted to consolidate their power by mystifying their knowledge and exaggerating their abilities rather than by sharing knowledge. This may be because of a combination not only of fragile gender identity (Collinson, 1992; Hollway, 1996) but also because the nature of the managerial task is in itself not objective, but is ambiguous with clear prediction of events not always possible (MacIntyre, 1981). Josefowitz (1988) also showed how women were marginalized in meetings because men would refuse to hear or ignore the contribution they were trying to make or attribute it to a male participant (see also Case, 1994).

Women in senior management or jobs traditionally viewed as male jobs have also had to contend with a great deal of male hostility and misogyny because men have felt they are taking their jobs (Gutek, 1989). One senior female manager spoke of being subject to a great deal of vitriolic anger and intimidation by a male subordinate at the end of his contract because he could not find a job and was unjustifiably blaming her for it (Martin, 1996). A further gender subtext in this scenario became clear when he said to her that if he did not find a job soon his wife was 'threatening' to get one.

Women in traditionally working class, physically tough 'male' jobs also report being subject to unrelenting sexual harassment, ridicule and discrimination from some of their male colleagues who continually express unjustified and uncorroborated doubt about their competence (Cockburn, 1983, 1991; Gutek, 1989). This behaviour may be related to the 'they are taking our jobs' argument as well as the fact that men in jobs where they are controlled by and subordinate to other men create an image of masculine toughness and bravado and being physically superior to their managers to compensate for this masculine 'mutilation' (Cockburn, 1983, 1991). However, if women are

demonstrating they are capable of doing such 'physically tough' jobs the view that women and male managers are weak, is no longer sustainable.

Organizational beliefs, values and identities

Hegemonic masculinity performed by women is in itself a contradiction in terms. By performing hegemonic masculinity women invalidate their femininity and identity as women (Martin, 1996) and are looked on suspiciously as if they were impostors, women emulating men, 'pseudo men' or organizational 'drag kings', rather than 'real men'. There is also a concerted effort by men to inhibit women's attempts at performing hegemonic masculinity and/or attaining top jobs, often by criticizing their appearance or behaviour as unfeminine, or by attempting to draw them into conversation about private sphere or familial issues when the women concerned are trying to talk about work (Martin, 1996). Women also often find the aggressive and competitive interactional style they are expected to convey in certain jobs such as engineering as uncomfortable and list this as the reason they did not like the job rather than the actual content or technical demands of the jobs themselves (Burris, 1996).

Men and women are metaphorically endowed or imbued with certain naturalized characteristics; this plays a large part in how organizations perceive and treat men and women. Men are often projected as being rational, controlled automatons who have no subjectivities or vulnerabilities and can therefore make straightforward, objective decisions which are untainted or uncorrupted by the messiness of feelings (Kerfoot and Knights, 1996). Women, on the other hand, are perceived as emotional and closer to nature then men and therefore as unsuitable for positions where they have to make important 'objective' managerial decisions.

Men therefore tend to control, devalue and dominate women, through their positioning of them as being constructed by sexual and related emotional qualities (MacKinnon, 1982; Hearn, 1987; Hearn and Parkin, 1987, 1995; Hearn et al., 1989). Women thus tend to be pigeonholed in certain stereotypical boxes such as that of a sex object or a mother figure or those who do not fit either side of these poles are often relegated to the ranks of man-haters or lesbians, regardless of sexual identity or actual behaviour (Pringle, 1988; French, 1995; Brooks-Gordon, 1995). 'Organization sexuality' is very important here, emphasizing time and time again women are only identified by their perceived and projected sexual and related reproductive qualities. This is compounded by the view that women are likely to have children and may therefore leave the job or be out of the labour market so that they will be defined as too expensive to train up and put in positions of importance (Cockburn, 1991).

While there are certainly dangers in essentializing gendered behaviour, Gilligan's research (1982) presents an interesting alternative approach. From a

moral developmental perspective she looks at how girls and boys from a very young age are encouraged to think about, perceive and attempt to solve problems in divergent ways. Gilligan argues women are therefore more likely to look at a problem in a wider and more holistic way than men and consider the consequences both longitudinally and in terms of a much wider range of actions. Men in contrast have a tendency not only to formulate problems in a linear and parochial manner but to try and respond to those problems in a short term and limited way. This may be because by objectifying women and by splitting and denying parts of themselves in order to conform to stereotypical definitions of hegemonic masculinity men also objectify themselves and are unable to see the subjectivity inherent in their view of the world (MacKinnon, 1982; Hollway, 1996).

Such processes do not occur in abstract but through the specific arrangement of work in time and space. Many men define their masculine identities largely in terms of different forms of occupational identity and work. Workaholism has reached epidemic proportions with many men showing little resentment and sometimes an active commitment to working long hours which give little time for life outside work (French, 1995). Some commentators have suggested that men use work as a haven as they flee from the private and emotional sphere to the public sphere, where they define goals as technical and instrumental and are serviced and have their needs provided for in an artificial, sanitized environment. For example, masculinity is often perceived of as disembodied and self-estranged requiring constant affirmation through conquest. Seidler (1994) locates this within a western rationalist, Cartesian culture where men use their bodies as machines and learn to control, silence and deny their feelings because expressing feelings invalidates their claims of reason and patriarchal power. This then leads to a compulsive urge in organizations to control self and others which becomes the only means of relating to others (Kerfoot and Knights, 1996).

Such processes can be disadvantageous to organizational performance, as the pursuit of organizational goals may be subordinated to individual searches for status, self identity and conquest. Jackall (1988) in his study of mainly male managers, graphically exemplifies this when he demonstrates how most managers were dishonest, competitive, self-serving and exploitative, regardless of organizational goals, and few showed concern about ethical goals and standards. Men's frequent proving of and striving to prove their masculinity and the need to be seen as strong and self-reliant however does not only affect work standards at higher levels of organizational hierarchies but also at lower levels where there may be efforts to conceal mistakes to protect masculine identity. Martin (1996) gives the example of a male lineworker at a telephone company refusing for days to ask for help with a problem he could not solve, yet ironically ridiculing a woman who sought help after only half a day.

Women are dominantly constructed by men as being emotional within a negative context of irrationality yet the behaviour of men in organizations is also emotional (Hearn, 1993). Men, when in positions of control, organize and

control emotions yet are seen to be unemotional in themselves (Hearn, 1982; Hochschild, 1993). This suggests certain types of male emotions are seen as acceptable, particularly those not involving vulnerability, yet these emotions are often not seen as emotions. Male aggression and anger continue to be considered desirable in managerial jobs but are not labelled as emotional behaviour.

Women are saturated with emotion through genderic power discourses and thus labelled as unfit for certain jobs that require rationality. In many jobs they are also required as part of the job to 'dramaturgically' perform emotional and/or sexual labour. Hochschild's (1983) classic study of flight attendants showed how women were expected to look sexually glamorous and be alluring to male passengers as well as servicing them with manufactured charm on their flights. Similarly Adkins' (1992) research on women in the tourist industry found men just had to appear to be smart whereas women were instructed to dress in a sexually 'provocative' manner (for example, off the shoulder dresses, stockings and short skirts). The women were also expected to deal with the sexual advances of the males in a way that did not cause them to complain, for example, by laughing them off. In this particular way they were being paid not just for their physical and mental abilities and labour but for being sexually objectified and commodified fetishistic objects (Evans, 1993).

Case study: social work organizations and residential child care settings

This case study will illustrate and give substance to some of the arguments that have been outlined above, showing that although the relations between gender and power is complex, shifting and multifaceted, men in the main 'hold' and wield power in the particular case study organizations, both at lower and higher levels of occupational hierarchies. This disadvantages and subordinates women both individually and as a class, whilst simultaneously advantaging men (Cockburn, 1991; Mills and Tancred, 1992; Collinson and Hearn, 1996). It often also works against the attainment of organizational goals (Jackall, 1988; Messerschmidt, 1996).

Women sometimes contributed both actively and passively to their diminished occupational power as well as finding it very difficult to resist or challenge the power of men within organizations. This occurred most noticeably through their acceptance and internalization of discourses that position women within an essentialized and naturalized femininity, even when they are located within the public world of work.

The material for this case study was drawn from research conducted between 1994 and 1996 in and about residential child care organizations (children's homes). Although the research was concerned primarily with issues of gender, sexuality and sexual abuse within the settings, information about the wider context of organizations was gained both from within residential child care and

from interviews with external managers and workers not directly located within children's homes. Two settings were ethnographically researched, and the research methods used within the ethnography included formal interviews, participant observation and documentary analysis. A large number of other interviews were also conducted outside the ethnographic fieldwork with managers, residential workers, ex-residents and other agency workers. Overall information was gained about past and present practices in over a hundred different settings covering many different social work organizations and local authorities. Quotations used are from the research interviews.

Children's homes are short-term or long-term 'last resort' residential settings where children, predominantly teenagers, are placed by local authorities. They are placed there because of behavioural problems and/or past abuse and because they are unable to be cared for by their families of origin, foster parents or in any other environment (Aymer, 1992; Madge, 1994). There is little forward planning or child and parental involvement regarding these placements (Roach, 1991), and the majority of staff within these homes are untrained (Utting, 1991; Warner 1992). There has also been a stream of inquiries about and media exposés of the physical, sexual and psychological abuse of children in these settings over the last ten years (Levy and Kahan, 1991; Wardhaugh and Wilding, 1993; Berridge and Brodie, 1996).

Gender, power and management

Although women numerically predominated within these organizations, they were disproportionately concentrated either within the lower echelons of social work (Abbott and Wallace, 1990; Grimwood and Popplestone, 1993), as residential workers, ancillary workers and secretaries. Where women did hold managerial positions these tended to be at lower levels, as in managers of specific units and they had little overall power within the organizations (Crompton and Sanderson, 1990). Women were disproportionately located within positions where they were concerned with caring for or servicing others (mainly men or children), for example, basic grade residential workers caring on a day to day basis for children in care, or secretaries to managers, roles accordant with their sexual, domestic or maternal presumed location within the private sphere (Pateman, 1989; Seidler, 1989).

At higher managerial levels outside the residential care settings much of the data suggested the ongoing and immediate presence of male homosociability. Women tended to be excluded from higher positions not only by tokenistic or ineffective equal opportunities and selection processes, but within managerial circles by the sexually discriminatory and exclusionary behaviour of their male colleagues.

> I was a lone female in an all male management group and I found that quite difficult because of 'men speak' if you like. ... They would talk about things that I was excluded from. There would be men jokes that weren't exactly crude but bordering on that. They might swear a lot or say things I found particularly uncomfortable. Sometimes I would just end up by telling them to shut up (female manager).

In the quote above the female manager is already isolated by being a lone female manager but is isolated further from the managerial group by the use of sexist, sexual language which offends her to the extent she chooses to self exclude as well as being simultaneously excluded (see also French, 1995).

Examples given of discrimination included harassment through gendered bullying, and being marginalized and treated as less important than equivalent, male colleagues. In meetings this was visible when women managers were expected to make the tea, were frequently interrupted or not listened to, or were not given important information which was given to equivalent male colleagues. In the following quotation it is shown not only how male managers subtly and manipulatively discriminate against female managers but also how that discrimination is so hard to challenge because it is rationalized and embedded within the organizational culture. The discrimination in this instance is also filtered through another female manager so it would be difficult for those women targeted to identify it as discrimination.

> If two units had similar problems and one was ran by a woman and one by a man I would get more resources from my [male] manager for the one ran by a man and less for the woman. It was very difficult to argue with him and if I tried to push it any further he would come up with all sorts of excuses, the subtext of which were based in reality but I don't think they were genuine reasons (female manager).

Examples of male homosociability and collusion with abuse included men being unprepared to intervene when other men harassed women and ignoring the situation, or alternatively men in power trivializing the issue or blaming or punishing the women if they complained.

> One case included a series of physical/sexual assaults on one young woman and the male manager had a history of sexually harassing women and everyone in the building knew about it but the women had been too frightened to complain before. Other men came to me afterwards and said 'I'm disgusted by his behaviour. He's been doing this for years. It's about time something was done about it'. So I said 'what have you done about it?' They'd known for years and done nothing (equal opportunities worker).

Some relationships were consensual but exploitative and in such situations, older men in positions of power, used their position and mismanaged organizational resources to gain sexual advantage. However it would almost always be the female subordinates that would be subject to punishment in consensual situations, not the male managers, as recognized in previous research (see Schneider, 1985; Hearn et al., 1989).

> Last year the manager was having an affair with a young night care assistant and he used to bring in wine for them to drink. And he would send her on courses the older female staff who had been there for years were not allowed to go on. Eventually somehow her husband found out and he and his sister later wrote to the principal officer to complain. The principal officer was a great friend of the managers so he got off with it and she lost her job. I couldn't believe it! I thought it was his first affair but it's happening again with the new, female night care assistant he appointed (residential worker).

There is a very clear message here internalized by the respondent that it is not advisable to complain because if you are a female in a subordinate position then you will lose your job, even though she is aware this situation is abusive and unfair.

Female workers located in children's homes were often constructed by male managers as sexual and liable to overexcite adolescent boys if the women did not fit a maternal type image. They would therefore try to persuade them to adopt a maternal and 'non sexual' look. However in contrast secretaries working for the managers were encouraged to wear short skirts, high heels and stockings, clothing which could be perceived as commodified and fetishistic sexual clothing (Evans, 1993). Both male workers and male managers were almost never perceived as sexual in appearance and they appeared to evade dealing with sexuality in any formal capacity. The male residential workers were never seen as sexualized or potentially alluring to the teenage girls in their care even if they were only wearing shorts. The male managers often power dressed in uniform grey suits that superficially desexualized and disembodied them despite the fact some harassed females or mismanaged sexual harassment cases. Sexuality was also not an issue managers would address formally (through policies, training, procedures) with regard to children's homes, although many of the children had been sexually abused, were very sexually active and were adolescents, for whom sexuality was a major personal developmental concern (Moore and Rosenthal, 1993).

Managerial ineffectiveness reinforced by male homosociability and collusion was also demonstrated by the hierarchical and distanced manner in which external managers worked. They communicated normally dictatorially through memo or telephone conversations with internal managers and had little real contact with the residential settings and those who lived and worked in them. This had the result when children were being sexually or physically abused in such settings external managers were rarely aware, particularly since abuse was sometimes conducted by the internal managers themselves. This hierarchical distancing also had the effect of both workers and children feeling alienated and objectified. This corresponds closely with Kerfoot and Knights' (1996) concept of managerial disembodiment and objectification through the inferiorization of the 'other' (Hollway, 1996).

> Often the children are just black and white writing on a piece of paper and not real people when it omes to meetings. The managers don't see the children's emotions and what's important to them. They just need to satisfy certain legal requirements and then they go on to the next child so they can get the meeting over and done with as soon as possible (residential worker).

Managers overtly concerned with their own personal careers (Jackall, 1988) and associated organizational reputation also had a tendency to cover up, and minimize the extent of abuse of children within these settings, sometimes over many years. External managers were also unlikely to publicly admit to problems or difficulties even if they were not of their own doing. This again pays heed to a gendered fear of being judged incompetent (Martin, 1996).

> A guy who had done temping in residential care spoke to the newspapers about the girls in one home being picked up by their pimps at 9.a.m and dropped back at the children's home early in the morning. The managers played that down, saying they have solved the problem but they haven't, they've just moved the girls out to another area (HIV/AIDS worker).

> The first unit I was in the manager used pin-down (violent restraint) type methods and the kids got frightened to death so they either didn't step out of line or they did a runner. In other units children might be expressing their feelings in the only way they could – by for example putting a table through the window. The managers wouldn't see that, they'd just see the children as disruptive and as costing them a lot of money. So the first unit with the dictatorial manager was costing less money and seemed to have fewer problems so it became the role model for all the other units despite noises being made about how it was run (residential worker).

The employment by managers of predominantly female, untrained residential workers based on a mistaken essentialized organizational/societal assumption that caring for children is a woman's vocation, often led to very poor care for these children. In conjunction with little support and implicit managerial condoning of controlling, rather than caring and therapeutic staff practices, these settings often became highly, institutionalized and repressive (Goffman, 1969; Parkin and Green, 1997a, 1997b). The staff did not have the resources, knowledge or support to deal appropriately with children in their care and turned to punitive, stigmatizing and containing methods to try and deal with their difficulties. An institutionalized climate was also conducive to a range of abuses, including sexual abuse, perpetrated by both staff, adults and young people from within and outside the settings.

Grassroots residential workers, gender and power

Male residential workers located in positions commonly associated with maternalism and the caring role often reconstructed their role to preserve their constructions of masculinity and differentiate themselves from the female staff.

This was done in a way that would also elevate their occupational status and increase promotional opportunities.

> A classic example of men putting the women down was if the female members of staff had been having any problems they would think the women couldn't handle it and say there should be a male on duty at all times. And it was about if any of the lads get violent the women can't handle it (residential worker).

Sometimes women also colluded with their perceived dependent situation by calling on the men when situations with the children became potentially volatile. The women were therefore continually cast back into an inferior and maternal role by their equivalent male co-workers.

> It was an all male resident group and most of the staff were men. Me and this other female member of staff offered to teach the lads to cook one day and the male staff wouldn't have it because they saw that as 'women's work'. And the women staff were always expected to do all the cooking. We'd get back after being out somewhere and the male worker would plonk themselves in front of the TV and say to the kids I was going to make them chips or cups of cocoa (residential worker).

Women workers were additionally gender-stereotyped by being seen to be a calming influence in general while men were simultaneously seen as wild but ironically able to physically control situations.

> The place was riot torn and it was 'Get the lads in' and it became a male dominated place. And after the place was calm again I wanted the femaleness of it to come out as well. It's not just the riot shield boys are here, it's let's get it calm again and how do you do that - you get some females in (male manager).

Women in higher organizational positions than men were also often resented.

> I can think of one person in particular who thinks women should be staying at home. He keeps quiet about that because he's shouted at every time he says it. He also has a problem with female staff who are more experienced than him. If he has done something and it could have been done differently and more efficiently and a female tries to tell him that he doesn't like it very much (residential worker).

However some women firmly located themselves within and identified positively with maternal and domestic discourses of femininity and womanhood and would not have perceived themselves as being oppressed in any way.

> They were sewing the curtains, were always in the kitchen and that sort of thing and were happy doing that. Also when male members of staff were sleeping in these women would get in early or before their shift and make the men breakfast and take it up to the sleeping in room (residential worker).

These discourses of maternalism and essentialized femininity also reflected on how the children in the homes were treated. Even abused girls requiring care were seen as appropriate to look after younger children or to be a calming influence on their male peers and their needs remained unconsidered.

> There was a view it was a good thing to put little children with older girls because it drew on their maternal responsibility - fascinating thinking. And it was really good for the kids because they got this extra mothering from the girls and it was really good for the teenage girls because it steadied them up (residential manager).

> The cottages (in the residential settings) were originally single sex but we had horrendous problems as the boys were really wild. So we split them up, two girls and six boys in each unit to calm things (residential worker).

Women were also subject to sexual objectification and harassment by male co-workers and male subordinates but the harassment was often subtle and not perceived as such at the time or just seen as a habitual part of the job.

> This care assistant asked me out and I refused but he carried on asking me out. I felt sometimes that if he was feeling vindictive about it or I hadn't spent another time with him, he could rally the staff on my shift, pick up on something that had happened, and cause a real furore. So I'd spend a lot of time calming them all down (deputy internal manager).

Often the women would self organize to try and prevent a particular member of
staff being harassed but rarely would the harassment be challenged or complained about.

> It wasn't overt as such, but he would always put her on shift when he was on and he would keep giving her lifts everywhere she didn't want. So we organised it so we swapped shifts and arranged to give her lifts home before he asked (residential worker).

> He would keep on brushing against you and coming up really close, too close and making sexual jokes. So we warned all the new staff and tried to avoid being alone with him as much as possible (residential worker).

This case study clearly illustrates how different types of masculinities and femininities can organizationally co-exist within the same organization. Many men, however mould their masculine identities to position themselves hierarchically above women, whom they both covertly and overtly project into subordinate maternaliszd and sexualized roles. Some women in the organization, notably some in the lower echelons, clearly positively identified

with and unequivocally embraced such discourses. However, for others who attempted to subvert such discourses, both overt and insidious means of control were available to try and prevent this. The predominantly male managers also seemed more concerned with career and personal reputations than ethical standards and wider organizational goals and were homosocial in their self organization.

Conclusion

This chapter has demonstrated that gender and its relationship with who holds and exercises power in organizations are vital in understanding how organizations are perceived, experienced, managed and theorized. Notions of hegemonic masculinity guide and dictate how most Western organizations operate and many men in organizations appear to collude with and be complicit with such hegemony, deriding, discriminating against and harassing men who perform alternative subordinated masculinities as well as women and femininities. Some non-Western organizations operate differently by not according individual men a great deal of personal organizational power but their locus of power, although distant and condensed, is still inherently patriarchal and male-dominated.

Women are frequently pigeonholed into objectified and subordinate maternal or sexual roles and it is not uncommon for women to collude with such positioning. Attempts to subvert the masculinist status quo are frequently unsuccessful, with men attempting to re-feminize, sexualize and maternalize 'careerist' women in order to devalue their work competence and construct them through private sphere ideology, or institutionalized, structural discrimination. This devaluation and diminution of women in the workplace is affected not only overtly and structurally through discriminatory selection, mentoring and training processes, a concentration of homosocial men at the top of organizational hierarchies, generalized sexist or sexual harassment and differential treatment, but additionally by much more subtle and often unrecognized forms of indoctrination and conditioning. Such male homosociability not only keeps women out of key organizational roles, but also polices and controls the behaviour of other men. Thus through overt threats, insidious controls and discursive entrapments, as outlined, the relationships between gender and power in organizations is continually reproduced.

References

Abbott, P. and Wallace, C. (eds) (1990) *The Sociology of the Caring Professions.* London: Falmer.

Acker, J. and Van Houten, D. (1992) 'Differential recruitment and control: the sex structuring of organizations', in Mills, A.J. and Tancred, P. (eds) *Gendering Organizational Analysis.* London: Sage. pp. 15-30.

Addelston, J. and Stirratt, M. (1996) 'The last bastion of masculinity: gender politics at the citadel', in Cheng, C. (ed.) *Masculinities in Organizations.* Thousand Oaks, California: Sage. pp. 54-76.

Adkins, L. (1992) 'Sexual work and the employment of women in service industries', in Savage, M. and Witz, A. (eds) *Gender and Bureaucracy.* Oxford: Blackwell. pp. 207-28.

Alban Metcalfe, B. (1984) 'Current career concerns of female and male managers: an analysis of free response comments to a national survey', *Equal Opportunities International*, 3: 11-18.

Alimo-Metcalfe, B. (1993) 'Women in management: organizational socialization and assessment practices that prevent career advancement', *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 1 (2): 68-83.

Alimo-Metcalfe, B. (1994) 'Gender bias in the selection and assessment of women in management', in Davidson, M.J. and Burke, R.J. (eds) *Women in Management: Current Research Issues.* London: Paul Chapman. pp. 93-109.

Aymer, C. (1992) 'Women in residential work: dilemmas and ambiguities', in Langan, M. and Day, L. (eds) *Women, Oppression and Social Work.* London: Routledge. pp. 186-200.

Bachrach, P. and Baratz, M. (1970) *Understanding Poverty: Theory and Practice.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Bagilhole, B. (1997) *Equal Opportunities and Social Policy: Issues of Gender, Race and Disability.* New York: Longman.

Barbalet, J.M. (1987) 'Power, structural resources and agency', *Perspectives in Social Theory*, 8: 1-24.

Bem, S.L. (1974) 'The measurement of psychological androgyny', *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 42 (2): 152-62.

Bem, S.L. (1981) 'Gender schema theory: a cognitive account of sex-typing', *Psychological Review*, 88 (4): 354-64.

Berridge, D. and Brodie, I. (1996) 'Residential care in England and Wales: the inquiries and after', in Hill, M. and Allgate, J. (eds) *Child Welfare Services, Developments in Law, Policy, Practice and Research*, London, Jessica Kingsley. pp. 180-96.

Bittman, M. (1991) *Juggling Time: How Australian Use Time.* Canberra: Office of the Status of Women.

Brooks-Gordon, B. (1995) 'Struggling in the city: the subordination of women traders in the London oil broking market and their coping strategies', paper presented to the British Psychological Society's Psychology of Women Section Conference, Leeds University, 9 July 1995.

Buchanan, D. and Huczynski, J. (1985) *Organizational Behaviour: an Introductory Text.* London: Prentice Hall.

Buchanan, D. and Huczynski, J. (1997) *Organizational Behaviour: An Introductory Text.* 3rd Edition. London: Prentice Hall.

Burris, B. (1996) 'Technocracy, patriarchy and management', in Collinson, D.L. and Hearn, J. (eds) *Men as Managers, Managers as Men: Critical Perspectives on Men, Masculinities and Management.* London: Sage. pp. 61-77.

Butler, J. (1990) *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity.* New York: Routledge.

Bûtler, J. (1993) *Bodies that Matter: On the Discursive Limits of Sex.* London: Routledge.

Calás, M. and Smircich, L. (1993) 'Dangerous liaisons: the "feminine-in-management" meets "globalization"', *Business Horizons,* 36 (2): 71-81.

Carrigan, T., Connell, R.W. and Lee, J. (1985) 'Towards a new sociology of masculinity', *Theory and Society,* 14 (5): 551-604.

Case, S.S. (1994) 'Gender differences in communication and behaviour in organizations', in Davidson, M.J. and Burke, R.J. (eds) *Women in Management: Current Research Issues.* London: Paul Chapman. pp. 144-67.

Cheng, C. (1996a) '"We choose not to compete": the "merit" discourse in the selection process and asian and asian american men and their masculinity', in Cheng, C. (ed.) *Masculinities in Organizations.* Thousand Oaks, Ca: Sage. pp. 177-200.

Cheng, C. (ed.) (1996b) *Masculinities in Organizations.* Thousand Oaks, Ca: Sage.

Chodorow, N. (1978) *The Reproduction of Mothering: Psychoanalysis and the Sociology of Gender.* London and Berkeley, Ca: University of California.

Clegg, S.R. (1988) *Frameworks of Power.* London: Sage.

Clegg, S. and Dunkerley, D. (1980) *Organization, Class and Control.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Clegg, S. and Dunkerley, D. (eds) (1977) *Critical Issues in Organization Theory.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Cockburn, C. (1983) *Brothers: Male Dominance and Technological Change.* London: Pluto Press.

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

Colgan, S. and Ledwith, S. (eds) (1996) *Women In Organizations: Challenging Gender Politics.* Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Collinson, D.L. (1992) *Managing the Shopfloor.* Berlin: de Gruyter.

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) (1996) *Men as Managers, Managers as Men: Critical Perspectives on Men, Masculinities and Management.* London: Sage.

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

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.

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

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

Crompton, R. (1986) 'Women and the service class', in Crompton, R. and Mann, M. (eds) *Gender and Stratification.* Cambridge: Polity. pp. 119-36.

Crompton, R. and Jones, G. (1986) *A White Collar Proletariat? Deskilling and Gender in Clerical Work.* Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Crompton, R. and Sanderson, K. (1990) *Gendered Jobs and Social Change.* London: Unwin Hyman.

Dahl, R.A. (1957) 'The concept of power', *Behavioral Science,* July, 2: 201-5.

Daly, M. (1973) *Beyond God the Father.* London: Women's Press.

Davidson, M. And Cooper, C. (1984) 'Occupational stress in female managers: a comparative study', *Journal of Management Studies,* 21 (2): 185-205.

Davies, C. (1992) 'Gender, history and management style in nursing: towards a theoretical synthesis', in Savage, M. and Witz, A. (eds) *Gender and Bureaucracy.* Oxford: Blackwell. pp. 229-52.

Dawson, S. (1997) *Analysing Organizations.* 3rd Edition. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Dinnerstein (1987) *The Rockng of the Cradle and the Ruling of the World.* London: Women's Press.

Eichler, M. (1980) *The Double Standard.* New York: St. Martins.

Epstein, D. (1994) 'Keeping them in their place: (hetero)sexist harassment, gender and the enforcement of heterosexuality', paper presented to BSA Conference, Sexualities in Social Context, University of Central Lancashire, March.

Evans, D.T. (1993) *Sexual Citizenship: The Material Construction of Sexualities.* London: Routledge.

Foucault, M. (1977) *Discipline and Punish.* London: Allen Lane.

Foucault, M. (1979) *A History of Sexuality: Volume One.* London: Allen Lane.

French, K. (1995) 'Men and locations of power: why move over?', in Itzin, C. and Newman, J. (eds) *Gender, Culture and Organizational Change: Putting Theory into Practice.* London and New York: Routledge. pp. 54-67.

French, M. (1985) *Beyond Power: On Men, Women and Morals.* London: Abacus.

French, J.R.P. and Raven, B. (1968) 'The bases for social power' in Cartwright (ed) *Studies in Social Power.* Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press.

Gherardi, S. (1996) 'Gendered organizational cultures: narratives of women travellers in a male world', *Gender, Work and Organization,* 3 (4): 187-201.

Gilligan, C. (1982) *In a Different Voice.* Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Goffman, E. (1969) *Asylums.* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Gramsci, A. (1981) *Selections from the Prison Notebooks.* London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Grimwood, C. and Popplestone, R. (1993) *Women, Management and Care.* Basingstoke: BASW/Macmillan.

Gutek, B. (1989) 'Sexuality in the workplace: key issues in social research and organizational practice', in Hearn, J. Sheppard, D. L., Tancred-Sheriff, P. and Burrell, G. (eds) *The Sexuality of Organization.* London: Sage. pp. 56-70.

Hamada, T. (1996) 'Unwrapping Euro-American masculinity in a Japanese multinational corporation', in Cheng, C. (ed.) *Masculinities in Organizations.* Thousand Oaks, Ca: Sage. pp. 160-76.

Handy, C. (1993) *Understanding Organizations.* 4th Edition. London: Penguin.

Hansard Society (1990) *Women at the Top.* London: The Hansard Society.

Hearn, J. (1982) 'Notes on patriarchy, professionalisation and the semi-professions', *Sociology,* 16 (2): 184-202.

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

Hearn, J. and Parkin, W. (1987) *Sex at Work: the Power and Paradox of Organization Sexuality.* Brighton: Wheatsheaf and New York: St. Martins.

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

Hearn, J. and Parkin, W. (1992) 'Gender and organizations: a selective review and critique of a neglected area', in Mills, A.J. and Tancred, P. (eds) *Gendering Organizational Analysis*. London: Sage (first published 1983). pp. 46-66.

Hearn, J. (1993) 'Emotive subjects: organizational men, organizational masculinities and the (de)construction of emotions', in Fineman, S. (ed.) *Emotion in Organizations*. London: Sage. pp. 148-66.

Hearn, J. and Parkin W. (1995) *Sex at Work: The Power and Paradox of Organization Sexuality*. Revised edition. Brighton: Wheatsheaf and New York: St. Martins.

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

Hindess, B. (1996) *Discourses of Power: From Hobbes to Foucault*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Hoch, P. (1982) *White Hero, Black Beast*. London: Pluto Press.

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

Hochschild, A. (1993) 'Preface', in Fineman, S. (ed.) *Emotion in Organizations*. London: Sage.

Hollway, W. (1996) 'Masters and men in the transition from factory hands to sentimental workers', in Collinson, D.L. and Hearn, J. (eds) *Men as Managers, Managers as Men: Critical Perspectives on Men, Masculinities and Management*. London: Sage. pp. 25-42.

Howe, D. (1986) 'The separation of women and their work in the personal social services', paper presented to 6th Annual Critical Social Policy Conference, The Future of Welfare: Visions and Strategies, Sheffield City Polytechnic, Sheffield, April.

Hugman, R. (1991) *Power in Caring Professions*. London: Macmillan.

Institute of Management (1994) *Management Development in the Millennium*. Corby: IM Books.

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

Josefowitz, N. (1988) 'Paths to power in high technology organizations', in Zimmerman, J. (ed.) *The Technological Woman*. New York: Praeger. pp. 191-200.

Kanter, R.M. (1977) *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York: Basic Books. (Also 2nd edition, 1993.)

Kaplan, P. J. (1986) 'Take the blame off mother', *Psychology Today*, 20 (10): 70-71.

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

Laqueur, T. (1990) *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud*. London: Harvard University Press.

Levy, A. and Kahan, B. (1991) *The Pindown Experience and Protection of Children*. Stafford: Staffordshire County Council.

Lukes, S. (1974) *Power: A Radical View*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Lukes, S. (ed.) (1986) *Power*. Oxford: Blackwell.

MacIntyre, A. (1981) *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory*. London: Duckworth.

MacKinnon, C.A. (1982) 'Feminism, marxism, method and the state: an agenda for theory', in Keohane, N. Rosaldo, M. and Gelpi, B. (eds) *Feminist Theory: a Critique of Ideology*. Brighton: Harvester. pp. 1-30.

MacKinnon, C.A. (1992) 'Sexuality', in Crowley, H. and Himmelweit, S. (eds) *Knowing Women: Feminism and Knowledge*. Cambridge: Polity Press in association with OUP. pp. 114-16.

Madge, N. (1994) *Children and Residential Care in Europe*. London: National Children's Bureau.

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

McGuire, S. (1992) *Best Companies for Women, Britain's Top Employers*. London: Pandora.

Menzies, I. (1977) *The Functioning of Social Systems as a Defence against Anxiety*. Greenwich: Search Publications.

Messerschmidt, J. (1996) 'Managing to kill: masculinities and the space shuttle Challenger explosion', in Cheng, C. (ed.) *Masculinities in Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, Ca: Sage. pp. 29-53.

Mills, A.J. and Tancred, P. (1992) (eds) *Gendering Organizational Analysis*. London: Sage.

Mintel, A. (1994) *Men 2000*. London: Mintel.

Moore and Rosenthal (1993) *Sexuality in Adolescense*. London: Routledge.

Mulholland, K. (1996a) 'Entrepreneurialism and the self made man', in Collinson, D.L. and Hearn, J. (eds) *Men as Managers, Managers as Men: Critical Perspectives on Men, Masculinities and Management*. London: Sage. pp. 123-49.

Mulholland, K. (1996b) 'Gender, power and property relations within entrepreneurial wealthy families', *Gender, Work and Organization*, 3 (2): 78-82.

Mullins, L. (1996) *Management and Organizational Behaviour*. 4th Edition. London: Pitman.

Oakley, A. (1972) *Sex, Gender and Society*. London: Temple Smith.

Oakley, A. (1974) *Housewife*. London: Allen Unwin.

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

Ohlott, P., Ruderman, M. and McCauley, C. (1991) 'Gender differences in managers developmental job experiences', *Academy of Management Journal*, 37 (1): 47-67.

Parkin, W. (1989) 'Private experiences in the public domain: sexuality and residential care organizations', in Hearn, J., Sheppard, D.L., Tancred-Sheriff, P. and Burrell, G. (eds) *The Sexuality of Organization*. London: Sage. pp. 110-24.

Parkin W. and Green, L. (1997a) 'Kickboxing the system: divisive cultures and counterproductive resistances in residential child care', paper for Annual BSA conference Power and Resistance, York.

Parkin W. and Green, L. (1997b) 'Cultures of abuse within residential child care', *Early Child Development and Care*, 133: 73-86.

Pateman, C. (1989) *The Disorder of Women*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Pierce, J. (1996) 'Rambo litigators: emotional labor in a male dominated occupation', in Cheng, C. (ed.) *Masculinities in Organizations*. California: Sage. pp. 1-28.

Pilcher, J. (1998) 'Hormones or hegemonic masculinity: explaining gender and inequalities', *Sociology Review*, 7 (3): 5-9.

Popplestone, R. (1980) 'Top jobs for women - are the cards stacked against them?', *Social Work Today*, 12 (4): 12-15.

Pringle, R, (1988) *Secretaries Talk: Sexuality, Power and Work*. London: Verso.

Reed, R. (1996) 'Entrepreneurialism and paternalism in Australian management: a gender critique of "self-made" man', in Collinson, D.L. and Hearn, J. (eds) *Men*

as Managers, Managers as Men: Critical Perspectives on Men, Masculinities and Management. London: Sage. pp. 99-122.
Reynaud, E. (1983) *Holy Virility: The Social Construction of Masculinity*. London: Pluto.
Rich, A. (1983) *Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence*. London: Onlywomen. p. 5.
Roach, D. (1991) 'The implications for residential care', *Children and Society*, 5 (1): 87-95.
Roper, M. (1996) 'Seduction and succession: circuits of homosocial desire in management', in Collinson, D.L. and Hearn, J. (eds) *Men as Managers, Managers as Men: Critical Perspectives on Men, Masculinities and Management*. London: Sage. pp. 210-26.
Russell, G. (1983) *The Changing Role of Fathers*. London: Open University Press.
Schneider, B. (1985) 'Approaches, assaults, attractions, affairs: policy implications of the sexualization of the workplace', *Population Research and Policy Review*, 4 (2): 93-113.
Sedgwick, E.K. (1985) *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire*. New York: Columbia University Press.
Seidler, V. (1989) *Rediscovering Masculinity: Reason, Language and Sexuality*. London: Routledge.
Seidler, V. (1994) *Unreasonable Men: Masculinity and Social Theory*. London: Routledge.
Sims, D., Fineman, S. and Gabriel, Y. (1993) *Organizing and Organizations*. London: Sage.
Sly, F. (1993) 'Women in the labour market', *Employment Gazette*, 101 (11): 483-92.
Utting, W. (1991) *Children in the Public Care*. London: HMSO.
Wardhaugh, J. and Wilding, P. (1993) 'Towards an explanation of the corruption of care', *Critical Social Policy Issue*, 37: 4-32.
Waring, M. (1988) *If Women Counted: a New Feminist Economics*. San Francisco: Harper Collins.
Warner, N. (1992) *Choosing With Care - The Report of the Committee of Inquiry into the Selection, Development and Managment of Staff in Children's Homes*, London: HMSO.
Watson, T. (1994) *In Search of Management: Culture, Chaos and Control In Managerial Work*. London: Routledge.
Weber, M. (1958) *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. New York: Charles Scribner and Sons.
Wilkes, J. (1995) 'The social construction of a caring career', in Burc, C. and Speed, B. (eds) *Gender, Power and Relationships*. London: Routledge. pp. 232-47.
Wise, S. and Stanley, L. (1987) *Georgie Porgie: Sexual Harassment in Everyday Life*. London: Pandora Press.
Witz, A. and Savage, M. (eds) (1992) *Gender and Bureaucracy*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Woodward, A. (1996) 'Multinational masculinities and European bureaucracies', in Collinson, D.L. and Hearn, J. (eds) *Men as Managers, Managers as Men: Critical Perspectives on Men, Masculinities and Management*. London: Sage. pp. 167-85.
Wrong, D. (1979) *Power: Its Forms, Bases and Uses*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Zimmeck, M. (1992) 'Marry in haste, repent at leisure: women, bureaucracy and the Post Office 1870-1920', in Savage, M. and Witz, A. (eds) *Gender and Bureaucracy*. Oxford: Blackwell. pp. 65-93.
Zuboff, S. (1988) *In the Age of the Smart Machine*. New York: Basic Books.