A Thousand Miles from Kind: Men, Masculinities and Modern Institutions

Raewyn Connell
University of Sydney

Understanding institutions is vital for understanding masculinities. The connection is acknowledged in popular culture, and explored in a body of recent social-science research on gendered institutions and organizational masculinities. Some leading examples of this research are discussed. Key findings include the pervasiveness of gender processes in organizational life, the diversity of organizational masculinities, and the significance of links between institutions. Difficulties in this research are discussed, including a tendency to stereotyping, the limits of discursive gender theory, and the unexamined assumptions of theory constructed in the global North. It is now necessary to move to a world level of analysis, and some of the prospects and problems of understanding masculinity in globalized institutions are explored.

Keywords: masculinities, institutions, gender theory, globalization

> They just sat there and looked back at me.... They had the calm weathered faces of healthy men in hard condition. They had the eyes they always have, cloudy and grey like freezing water. The firm set mouth, the hard little wrinkles at the corners of the eyes, the hard hollow meaningless stare, not quite cruel and a thousand miles from kind. The dull ready-made clothes, worn without style, with a sort of contempt; the look of men who are poor and yet proud of their power, watching always for ways to make it felt.... (Chandler, 1955, p. 175-176)

The theme of "masculinities and institutions" may seem a quiet one, compared with other topics associated with masculinity, like violence, technology, gender-bending or epidemics. We don't seem to hear much small-arms fire or smell much grease-

Raewyn Connell, University Chair, University of Sydney.

The following article is the keynote address for 16th annual conference of American Men's Studies Association, "Masculinities and Institutions: Mapping the Connections," Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem, NC, 4 April 2008.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Raewyn Connell, Faculty of Education and Social Work A35, University of Sydney, NSW 2006, Australia. Electronic mail: r.connell@edfac.usyd.edu.au

The Journal of Men's Studies, Vol. 16, No. 3, Fall 2008, 237-252.
© 2008 by the Men's Studies Press, LLC. All rights reserved. http://www.mensstudies.com
jms.1603.237/$12.00 DOI: 10.3149/jms.1603.237

paint here. We seem instead to be making a morning-coffee call on the man without qualities, the organization man, the man in the grey flannel suit.

Yet the theme is important, and as I will argue, it does involve the small-arms and the greasepaint, as well as the grey flannel suit. Studying institutions is a vital step in the general understanding of men and masculinities, and for that matter women and femininities.

It is a step we need to take, in order to get beyond the psychological essentialism, the categorical thinking—the "boys in a box" rhetoric—that besets media discussion of the problems of gender, and regrettably some academic work as well. Reckoning with institutions is also, I will argue, crucial for getting beyond the limits of the most influential contemporary school of gender theory.

To understand the world we live in, its routine life and its gigantic problems—for understanding the most banal sitcom on U.S. television, the horrifying conflict in Darfur, the process of global warming—we must examine the institutions enmeshed in producing them, and the way those institutions work. Institutions like the transnational corporation, the sociotechnical system of televised entertainment, the Chinese and Sudanese state, the knowledge-producing machinery of modern science, must be our concern.

All those institutions are gendered. All have internal gender regimes, all function in a wider context (now of course a global context) of gender relations, all produce gender effects. If we want to change the way they function—to prevent war and genocide, to slow down global warming, to pursue social justice, or even to make a small increase in public understanding of what is going on—we must address those gender issues.

In this paper I reflect on how our knowledge of "masculinities and institutions" has grown, what broad conclusions in the field we can regard as well established, what difficulties have appeared in this body of knowledge, and what new directions are emerging. I will end with thoughts on two promising lines of analysis, one concerned with neoliberal globalization, and one concerned with men who make institutions work for gender equality.

In the social sciences, the term "institution" has two main meanings. In the narrower sense, as when we talk about a school or a bank as an institution, it means much the same as "organization." In the broader sense, as when we talk about the institution of marriage or property, it means a deeply-rooted pattern of practice that gives a general form to the life of a society. I will sometimes refer to this second meaning, but my main focus will be on the first, as I examine research on gender in organizational life.

Masculinities in Organizational Life

The idea that there is a connection between particular versions of masculinity and particular organizational settings is by no means new. At the start of this paper I quoted Raymond Chandler's famous description of a couple of Los Angeles homicide cops, as seen by the private eye Philip Marlowe. They are just letting him go after an interro-

gation, and he is uncertain of his ground—as they want him to be. The image of "hard" masculinity (the word is three times repeated) is unforgettable, and Chandler is a good enough sociologist to show the reason for its being there. The passage goes on:

> What would you expect them to be? Civilization had no meaning for them. All they saw of it was the failures, the dirt, the dregs, the aberrations and the disgust. (p. 176)

It is not hard to find literary accounts of other masculinities in their organizational contexts, though not often as brilliantly condensed as this. One thinks of the uncertain soldiers in Stephen Crane's *The Red Badge of Courage* and Heinrich Böll's *The Train Was on Time*, the flamboyant bankers in Christina Stead's *House of All Nations*, the crafty academics in Kingsley Amis' *Lucky Jim*, and so on.

We might say, then, that the connection between organizations and masculinities is a familiar piece of cultural knowledge. Nevertheless, it was massively ignored in organization theory and research until the impact of the Women's Liberation movement. It then leapt into view. One of the most interesting texts of that time was Michael Korda's *Male Chauvinism* (1973). This was a journalistic but intelligent and detailed account of the sexual politics of New York office life, especially detailing middle-class men's attempt to protect their prestige and power in the face of challenges from women.

During the 1970s, the feminist challenge was institutionalized, within organizational life in the USA and around the world, by an "equal opportunity" and human rights agenda including anti-discrimination rules and various support programmes for women and girls. Thus the practical challenge to men's privileges was kept up, and this kept generating problems about men and masculinity that called for research. In the 1980s, a significant body of organizational research on this issue began to appear, and it has kept flowing to the present.

I would like to recall several high points of this research, since the methods matter. Cynthia Cockburn's *Brothers*, which appeared in 1983, set a formidably high standard from the start. This was a perceptive ethnography of English compositors, i.e., printing workers, centered on the problem of how and why men had kept exclusive control of this occupation despite radical changes in technology and social context. It showed the interweaving of class-conscious solidarity and masculine self-image, the gendered rituals of membership, and the re-interpretation of technology along gender lines. Very importantly, it went beyond the present into the history of the industry, showing that masculine domination was in no sense "natural" but had been produced over the past century by the active exclusion of women printing workers.

Moving to the global periphery, we find another classic industrial ethnography, Dunbar Moodie's *Going for Gold* (1994). This is about the black miners in South Africa who won the fabulous wealth of the Witwatersrand. This study traces the history of the industry, showing the technical circumstances and industrial politics of working vast low-grade ore deposits, requiring a large workforce. It adds two more dimensions. One is the racial politics of colonialism involved in creating this workforce, the other is re-

lations between the workplace and the sexual and domestic lives of the workers. In these dimensions, revealed in the interviews by Vivienne Ndatshe, the study uncovers three remarkable dynamics of masculinity. One is the creation of "mine marriages" between men in the migrant workers' compounds. The second is the "women with masculinity" who run the rural homesteads in the absence of their husbands and embody a traditional concept of masculinity as responsible and caring homestead management. The third is the mineworkers' turn, in the proletarianization of the 1970s and 1980s, toward a conception of manhood as individual toughness and dominance, adopting a breadwinner model and losing the older reciprocity with women.

The problem of gender reciprocity is also a central theme in Yuko Ogasawara's *Office Ladies and Salaried Men* (1998), a lovely participant-observation and interview study of life in a Japanese bank in the 1990s. In this institution there is a near-absolute gender division of labour, with the men on a management career ladder, and women performing non-career service roles. Vastly better paid, embodying the archetypal "salaryman" version of middle-class masculinity, the men would seem to have near-absolute power. But Ogasawara shows this is not the case. The men are subject to constant criticism among the women, and depend on them for services vital to their own advancement. Therefore they curry favour, for instance in gift-giving rituals, and are generally restrained in dealing with women subordinates—raw authority does not play well.

These are three among the high points—I could have chosen others—in a substantial research literature. We now have a small library of studies of gender formation in masculine occupational groups: police, firemen, managers, engineers, steelworkers, forestry workers, and so on (e.g., Donaldson 1991, Hall et al., 2007). We also have many studies of gender arrangements in varied workplaces and other institutions, in which the position of men and the norms of masculinity come into focus; some of these are, but some are not, heavily masculinized. They include studies of schools, the navy, factories, prisons, farms, hospitals, and others (e.g., Corman et al., 1993; Mac an Ghaill, 1994). These are now well-established and productive research genres, mostly using a combination of field observation and focussed interviewing. Some very effectively use historical and statistical techniques as well to develop a picture of an industry and its workforce, and thus place the processes of gender formation in a macro-social setting.

It is important, especially for English-speaking people in the global metropole, to know that this is a world-wide research effort. Such studies are by no means confined to North America and Europe. Among the most important studies of managerial masculinities are those that examine the rise, development and crisis of the "salaryman" model, including its deployment abroad as Japanese corporations went multinational (Dasgupta, 2003, Taga, 2004). Military masculinities have been studied in a number of countries, where the military play rather different cultural roles. An excellent example is military service in Turkey, where since the days of Kemal Atatürk the army has played a nation-building, secularizing, and authoritarian role that brings it into tension with popular culture. The familiar processes of masculinity formation in military induction here take on a particularly combative shape (Sinclair-Webb, 2000).

Research on prison masculinities is certainly active in the United States, which has the biggest prison system in the world, but is also found elsewhere. A recent study in South Africa has traced a stark gender polarization among the men of the well-developed prison gangs. Not one but two gender hierarchies are produced, one among the violent power-holders among the prisoners, the other among the "wyfies," their feminized sexual partners (Gear, 2005). Research on factories is also international. A recent study of auto component plants in Argentina deconstructs the ideology of "machismo" among factory workers, shows the interplay among four images of masculinity and the way they operate to constrain women's economic access. Disturbingly, this study argues that the images are shared by the women in the factories too (Stobbe, 2005).

Most of this literature is empirical investigation framed by general concepts drawn from theories of gender, or from sources such as Foucault. However there is also conceptual thinking specifically about gender in organizations.

Like other fields of social science, this has evolved over time. In the earlier days of equal opportunity campaigns, studies like Rosabeth Kanter's much-cited *Men and Women of the Corporation* (1977/1993) relied on categorical thinking about gender, and a concept of social process that did not go much beyond role theory and attitude change. Over the next decade and a half, however, a much more sophisticated analysis emerged. The 1992 collection edited by Albert Mills and Peta Tancred, *Gendering Organizational Analysis*, brought together research and new thinking from Canada, Australia, Britain and the USA. At this point the analysis of gendered organizations was firmly established.

A British school of organization studies, influenced by labour process research and structuralist ideas of gender, is well represented by the important collection *Men as Managers, Managers as Men* (1996), edited by two leading researchers in the field, David Collinson and Jeff Hearn. This approach has been carried forward in the journal *Gender, Work & Organization*; over time, it has come to be more influenced by post-structuralist ideas on the importance of discourse. Despite this, one of the most important concepts to emerge recently is a materialist one. Miriam Glucksmann's (2000) argument that gender divisions in the workplace must be analyzed within the "total social organization of labour," which sees home, workplace and other sites not as separate spheres but as part of a societal totality.

U.S. thinking about gender and organizations has been more influenced by the ethnomethodological conception of gender as an ongoing "accomplishment" in social life. Joan Acker's (1990) justly famous paper offering a "gendered theory of organisations" established the basic case for seeing organizations as inherently, not accidentally, gendered, and proposed a framework for analysis. Patricia Yancey Martin (2006) over many publications has refined this approach, merging it with a sophisticated theory of gender as social practice.

One of the advantages of such an approach is that it gives a way of thinking about how organizational gender regimes are repaired after being breached. In this vein Silvia Gherardi and Barbara Poggio (2001), with an Italian case study, offer an account of the organizational "dance" after the advent of women in a male-dominated organiza-

tion; both the men and women work to accommodate the new situation, tending to restore the symbolic dichotomy of gender despite many practical compromises.

Some Broad Conclusions about Men, Masculinities and Organizations

Though the fine grain of research is often highly illuminating, it is also worth noticing what broad conclusions are established by a whole literature.

In the first place, this body of research has documented the extent to which masculinities are embedded in organizational life. Traditional organization theory may have missed them; but when you go looking with the tools of social science, gender regimes can be found, and mapped, in organizations across the board. They are complex structures involving gender divisions of labour, gender relations of power, gender patterns of emotional relations, and gendered culture. (For my own documentation of this in the public sector in Australia, see Connell, 2006.) Such gender regimes always define places for men and patterns of masculinity.

The research shows organizational masculinities being constructed and defended by such processes as the exclusion of women—informally in the British white-collar work studied by Collinson et al. (1990), formally in cases like the Turkish military. An intriguing study of masculinities on a "futures" trading floor in the USA shows an oscillation between an implied masculinity, in the trading process itself, and an open (and highly sexist) thematisation of gender difference in moments of leisure among the traders (Levin, 2004). Without even being named as gender, a socially-defined masculinity may be built in to the very concept of management or organizational rationality (Kerfoot & Knights, 1996). Everyday organizational life, and the criteria for good performance at work, may define masculine embodiment. We see this on the factory floor where working-class masculinity is defined in labour that over time destroys the body (Donaldson, 1991). We see another embodiment in offices where middle-class masculinity is defined through strong codes of dress, speech, and deportment (Dasgupta, 2003).

Having recognized the organizational production of masculinity, it is tempting to settle for rather stereotyped pictures of what is produced. It is important, then, to note a second broad conclusion: organizational gender is not homogeneous. Different masculinities are produced in different organizational contexts, including different units and levels of the same organization.

This was classically shown for the U.S. Navy by Frank Barrett (1996), who documented the different inflexions of hegemonic masculinity that were found among naval pilots, navigation officers, and supply officers. Mac an Ghaill's (1994) ethnography of a British school describes different patterns of masculinity among groups of high school teachers. Thinking of the military, it is even possible to say that some organizations work by means of relations between different forms of masculinity. The general requires a capacity for sober means-end calculation and willingness to send other people to die; the front-line soldier requires a certain ability *not* to calculate rationally, and solidarity with fellow-grunts. The army requires both.

Part of the variegation of organizations is the different intensity of gender formation processes in different organizational domains. Barrie Thorne (1993) showed how everyday life in a school alternates between situations where gender is strongly marked (e.g., segregated play) and situations where boundaries are crossed or gender is muted (e.g., a teacher addressing a mixed class in gender-neutral terms). I have suggested that we can see some areas of school life for boys as a "masculinity vortex," where masculinity is strongly thematised and may become coercive—competitive sport, for instance, or the school disciplinary mechanisms (Connell, 2000). We might see prisons in the same light (Sabo et al., 2001).

A third broad conclusion is the significance of links between institutions, especially between economic institutions and families. In her very illuminating study of women in high-technology corporations, *Managing Like a Man*, Judy Wajcman (1998) shows (like all serious research in the field, and contrary to the claims of pop psychology) that men and women operate in similar ways as managers. But they are in different situations, for one basic reason:

> It is at the interface between home and work that gender differences are most stark.... The problem was summed up by one woman saying: "We all need a wife but they only come in one sex."... [F]or all the company initiatives designed to promote equal opportunities, the managerial career is still largely dependent upon the services of a wife at home. (p. 132)

The link between home and workplace has become a field of public debate in its own right, under the rubric of "work/life balance." Corporations and governments adopt "family-friendly" policies to promote better balance. Whether these policies are having much impact is open to question (Pocock, 2003). Certainly, in the study of managerial masculinities my colleagues and I are currently doing, Wajcman's conclusions still appear to hold. Most of the men we have interviewed work about a ten-hour day, are focussed on the demands and responsibilities of their work, and rely on having a wife to look after the children and keep the household going. Those managers who want to pursue emotionally-engaged fatherhood—and there are some—face real difficulties in making it work (Connell, forthcoming).

A fourth general finding concerns the politics of change in organizational gender regimes. In the last generation, states and corporations have come under sustained pressure to act for gender equity. Men—across an astonishing range of groups and situations around the world—have felt under challenge from women (Connell, 2005). The research on organizational life through this period has found a spectrum of responses among men.

There has not been (as categorical models of gender might suggest) a unified opposition to change from men. Some outright resistance there certainly has been—for instance, the organized opposition to the ordination of women or gay men in some contemporary churches, an international phenomenon. Factional exclusion and sexual harassment are among the tactics of resistance found by Suzanne Franzway (1999) in

labour unions. The slow pace of change in organizational gender regimes noted by many scholars can in part be attributed to simple resistance on the part of those men who have the power to inhibit reform (Cockburn, 1991; Hale, 1996).

But it is also true that equal-opportunity measures have been brought in by reform coalitions that include men, and are sometimes led by men. For instance, union leaders in Canada and Australia have been vital in supporting women's entry to such heavily masculinized work as steelmaking and construction (Burgmann & Burgmann, 1998; Corman et al., 1993). In many situations, equal opportunity and family-friendly policies now have significant levels of support among men, as we certainly found in public-sector organizations in Australia (Connell, 2007a). Top-level corporate and public-sector managers nowadays do not present themselves as heavy-handed patriarchs. They may (and often do) marginalize gender reform, but they rarely oppose it openly, at least in the Anglophone world.

It seems likely that the political process around equal opportunity measures is one of the forces for change in organizational masculinity. It is now a required skill in management to get along with female colleagues and subordinates. Managers often describe their jobs using terms like "guidance," "communication," "negotiation," "solving problems," rather than issuing orders and exercising control. Of course there are exceptions, some with great power; the names of Trump and Murdoch spring to mind. And some women managers also get reputations for toughness and aggression—"managing like a man" *can* mean taking on attributes of a dominating masculinity. But the more common response seems to be a kind of gender re-negotiation in which both male and female managers give some ground (for research pointing this way, see Brewis, 1999, Gherardi & Poggio, 2001).

Difficulties

I now want to address some problems that seem to have emerged in, or about, research relevant to our theme.

The first concerns a disconnection. We now have rich ethnographies and discursive analyses from many countries and types of organization. But our good descriptions of organizational masculinities are not well linked to the dynamics of change in the organizational world. That is to say, our descriptions of masculinities tend to be static. Even when the descriptions are formulated in ways that emphasise "fluidity," as post-structuralist research often does, we do not usually see the process that has produced the fluidity out of an organizational history. Paradoxically, the fluidity is represented as a fixed condition.

This is a problem encountered in the literature on hegemonic masculinity. The concept was formulated to try to grasp the dynamics of patriarchal gender systems. It proposed a mechanism by which their contradictions were brought under control and gender inequality stabilized—a solution involving consent from the dominated that was never final and in time would be contested. There has been a strong tendency in the literature, instead, to read "hegemonic masculinity" as a static character type, i.e.,

to psychologise the idea and ignore the whole question of gender dynamics (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005).

Of course we need to "fix" the process of history in order to describe a pattern of masculinity at all. That is legitimately done in superb studies such as Morrell's (2001) account of the white boys' schools of colonial Natal. I do not think there is anything fundamentally wrong with our research tools in this field—but I do think they are often used in a way that limits their power. A great virtue of Morrell's study is that it places its historical ethnography of masculinity in the wider context of settler colonialism, family formation and late-Victorian gender order, racial hierarchy and black resistance, and the creation of a local rural capitalism in the context of British imperialism. That is to say, Morrell shows how the institutional construction of a particular masculinity makes sense in a complex, society-wide dynamic of change.

The second problem I want to consider is that the currently most influential approach to gender analysis simply cannot do the kind of job Morrell has done. Deconstructionist and discursive gender analysis, deriving from the thought of French post-structuralists such as Foucault, and mediated particularly through Judith Butler's (1999) *Gender Trouble*, are now having a large influence in research on organizational gender as well as a huge influence in other fields.

The idea of the "performative" character of gender (which does not mean performance as on a stage, but the bringing into being of gender in the process of enactment, as in "performative utterances") is mainly applied to speech acts. It has led to a strong emphasis on discursive constructions of gender—indeed, in some of this literature gender is *defined* as discourse. It has also led to an emphasis on the fluidity, instability or provisional character of gender identities, as different discourses intersect and people move between them.

As a critique of old-style essentialism, and as a way of emphasising the complexity of gender arrangements and the possibility of change, this has been all to the good. It has usefully highlighted sexuality, and the ways in which discourses take hold of the body. As a critique of the heterosexual assumptions of most past discussions of gender, it has been powerful.

But there are very serious limits to what discursive and deconstructionist gender analysis can do. This approach gives little grip on the political economy of gender, that is to say, the gender structuring of production, consumption and social reproduction processes, which now has to be analyzed in global terms (Bezanson & Luxton 2006; Peterson, 2003). Deconstructionist gender analysis tends to individualize politics, representing opposition to hierarchy mainly as acts of rejection or subversion, rather than group mobilization. And it gives no grip on the structure of organizations—as distinct from discourses about them—or the way organizations operate and change. The focus on gender performativity treats the production of gender as instantaneous, of the moment, rather than treating it as a deeply-sedimented historical process. It misses what Karel Kosík (1976) called the "ontoformativity" of social practice, the way in which practice brings a social order into existence over time—i.e., the downstream consequences of gender enactments.

The third problem I want to mention concerns the political geography of knowledge about our topic. I have emphasised that the research relevant to this issue is now worldwide. But the theory this research uses is not. With a very few exceptions, it is theory produced in the global metropole—western Europe and the USA. In organizational gender research we cite Foucault, Bourdieu, and Weber, we cite feminist theorists from de Beauvoir to Butler, we cite organization researchers such as Acker, Martin, Collinson—and we usually don't stop for a moment to think what corner of the world they come from, and what the scope of applicability of their ideas might be.

We presume, that is to say, a homogeneous modernity in which theory can be framed in universal terms. This does not attract attention, because it is the default assumption in contemporary social science. As I point out in *Southern Theory* (Connell, 2007b), the result is that the social thought of the societies in which the great majority of the world's people live, is completely sidelined. It doesn't enter the "mainstream" discussion at all.

There are extremely complex issues here; among them, the fact that intellectuals of the majority world are themselves strongly influenced by the metropole. After 500 years of colonialism, and the enormous growth of world trade, telecommunication and migration, we cannot think of the contemporary world as a mosaic of separate cultures. But we also cannot think of the world just as an extension of the EU and USA. An approach to a problem such as "masculinities and institutions" that draws its inspiration and its concepts only from the metropole will not only miss a vast amount of experience, it will also be impoverished in intellectual terms.

Moving into Global Space

In his grim analysis of the organizational background to the 1986 "Challenger" space shuttle disaster, James Messerschmidt (1997) distinguishes between two organizational cultures—engineering and management—present in the corporation by which the flawed recommendation to launch was made. The managers who made the fatal decision, in pursuit of corporate goals and their own credibility in both class and gender terms, had become more comfortable about taking risks with the weaknesses in the equipment pointed out by the engineers:

> That is, MTI managers conflate[d] masculine practices with profit-making practices. Accordingly, risk taking was normalized among MTI management, permitting these men to draw on previously formed risk-taking behavior as a resource for doing a specific type of hegemonic masculinity. (p. 100)

The conflation of profit-seeking with a certain type of hegemonic masculinity that Messerschmidt identifies here is, I think, a key to understanding masculinities in the modern corporate world. We are not just talking about hierarchies or formal organizations, we are talking specifically about *capitalist* institutions, centred on the accumulation of profit. This is built-in to a capitalist economy, and it is made a reality in

organizational life through accounting and budgeting practices. Modern corporations are heavily dependent on ICT no matter what industry they are in, because computer networks allow their accounting to be done quickly and on a large scale.

But the conditions for the accumulation of profit change over time. Therefore the masculinity that was effective for this purpose in, say, the second half of the nineteenth century is not likely to work well at the beginning of the twenty-first. In a now-forgotten but very perceptive paper, Michael Winter and Ellen Robert (1980) argued that the form of male dominance in society changed in the conditions of late capitalism, with masculinity increasingly shaped around the norms of technical or instrumental reason. Since their contribution was made, capitalism has moved sharply away from the model of administered, rational order, toward de-regulated markets and global competitition. We are now in an era of neoliberalism.

Neoliberalism is usually analyzed at the level of macro-economic policy, as the retreat of the state and unleashing of corporate power—though the state remains active in securing the conditions for the accumulation of profit (Duménil & Lévy, 2004, Harvey, 2005). Neoliberalism, however, also works at the level of organizational life, even at the level of personal life, re-shaping our understanding of the social agent. The individual is increasingly understood as a *market* agent, pursuing advantage in competition with others. This trend makes particularly relevant Michael Meuser's (2007) theoretical analysis of the "homosocial construction of masculinity" through competition.

In corporations, neoliberalism tends to produce a fractal geometry; that is to say, a situation where the same pattern is reproduced at successive scales. Each unit is treated (as far as possible) as a profit-maximizing entity in its own right; and even the people are treated as small enterprises. I want to quote from an interview in our current study of corporate masculinities, to show the effects of this at the level of the work group. The setting is an ICT systems unit in the Australian subsidiary of a multinational finance company. Simon, the interviewee, is a young middle manager. Some ethnographies of computer workers suggest a lot of independence. On Simon's floor of the building, there is constant supervision, but of a particular kind:

> We actually start off with a team huddle every morning. Prior to that there is some paperwork the team needs to update by 8.30 every morning. So we produce some KPIs [key performance indicators], or statistics for the performance of everyone in the team for the day before. (*So everyone knows everyone else's performance levels?*) Yeah, pretty much. It is all there in a spreadsheet for people to see, whether your colleague next to you did only 50% of what they set out to do yesterday, or how many hours they spent doing things. (Unpublished interview from Connell, forthcoming)

Here the organizational arrangements construct individual competition and mutual surveillance as a condition of the labour itself. This is not, of course, the only way

such labour can be organized. But it is very typical of neoliberal organizations, with their apparatus of "performance management," goals, indicators, and incentives.

Neoliberalism has advanced in tandem with the process of economic globalization. One of the crucial—though least theorized—elements of globalization is the creation of new institutions in transnational spaces. The transnational corporation itself, the international state (e.g., the UNO, the EU), global commodity and finance markets, and global communications systems, have all been under construction. All have gender regimes and are sites for the making of masculinities.

Some time ago I suggested that we might be seeing in these sites the creation of a new hegemonic masculinity, which I dubbed "transnational business masculinity," uprooted from the old contexts of national gender orders (Connell, 1998). We are beginning to accumulate some evidence from studies of transnational organizations, and so far the data are not in favour of my hypothesis. Alison Woodward (1996) had already suggested that a very conservative version of masculinity was normative in the corridors of the Commission of the European Union in Brussels. Janne Tienari and colleagues (2005), looking at the formation of a multinational finance corporation by cross-border mergers in the Nordic region, concluded that management masculinity was "constructed according to the core family and male-breadwinner model"—contradicting Scandinavian norms of gender equality. Some examples of the hypothesised form of masculinity can be found (Connell & Wood, 2005), and Charlotte Hooper (2000) has documented cultural shifts in business imagery that seem related. But on the balance of evidence at this point, we cannot conclude that neoliberal globalization has shifted the hegemonic form of corporate masculinity in new directions.

The processes of neoliberal globalization, of course, have effects beyond the executive suite. With the destruction of welfare states and the development strategy of import replacement industrialization in the global periphery, there has been a great rise in economic insecurity for working-class families, and particularly high rates of unemployment for working-class youth. In third-world cities there has been a *de*-institutionalization of economic life that has left very large numbers of young men in precarious conditions.

In the city of Algiers, for instance, they came to be known as *hittistes*— "those who prop up the wall." In the growing conflict of the early 1990s they were a crucial source of recruits for the extremely violent urban wing of the Islamist rising in Algeria. As Luis Martinez (2000) argues, an old tradition of entrepreneurship through violence could be re-deployed in the new conditions. With obvious differences of religion and culture, something similar may account for the remarkably high level of masculine violence that has persisted in neoliberal South Africa, since the end of Apartheid (Reid & Walker, 2005; Waetjen, 2004).

However, as the South African research also points out, a turn toward achieving masculinity through violence is not the only response that men make to dislocation and poverty. Tina Sideris (2005), for instance, documents a process of change among men in a rural district who have moved away from violence toward more egalitarian, caring relationships with wives and children. The involvement of groups of men in reform coalitions applies in poverty as well as in affluence.

In this rather more hopeful vein, I will end by mentioning the work of two men who, in different ways, changed institutions in the pursuit of gender equality.

Ali Shariati, a theologian and social scientist, was one of the key figures in the Islamic opposition to the Shah's authoritarian regime in Iran (Rahnema, 1998). Thrown out of his university job under pressure from the secret police, he became the director of an organization called Hosseiniyeh Ershad, a centre of Islamic studies in Tehran. Here, at the beginning of the 1970s, he articulated a radical and activist interpretation of Shi'ism in opposition to the conservative clerics. Many of them were hostile toward Shariati, and one of their charges against him was that he allowed women as well as men to attend his very popular lectures at Hosseiniyeh Ershad.

Since Western media present Islamic radicalism as mindless, primitive and misogynist, we should take particular note of intellectuals such as Shariati. His gender egalitarianism was limited in certain ways, but it was principled, and grounded in theory. He derived from the theological concept of *tawhid*, the absolute unity of God, a conception of the unity of the universe and of humankind. From this, he derived principles of race, class, and gender equality. Men and women, created with the same nature, have the same entitlement to respect; women too should participate in education and politics. Shariati regarded seclusion and the veil as derogatory, non-Islamic traditions.

The second story comes from India, and is told in Radhika Chopra's *Reframing Masculinities* (2007), an inspiring collection concerned with men's "supportive practices." The story concerns Prince Thangkhiew, a field worker for a non-government organization in the development field. Prince works in a remote and poor area of northeast India, and is largely concerned with micro-credit provision for village self-help groups, mainly of women.

The researcher Subhashim Goswami (2007) travelled with Prince to some of the villages, and watched him making connections with local women, men, and—very importantly—children. Prince's style is far from what neoliberal performance-management would require. It is personal, patient, often indirect, though also incredibly energetic, and may take years to produce its effects. Prince seems to have crossed gender boundaries remarkably, being mainly identified with the women in village politics (formally, but not always really, controlled by men). At the coal face, we might say, Prince has transformed the non-government organization into something that is directly accessible to local women and directly useful to them.

In the hills of Meghalaya we are, perhaps, more than a thousand miles from the hard hollow meaningless stare of the LAPD. Organizational life has its exits and its entrances, leading many ways. Some of them lead toward a more peaceful and equal world; in taking those paths, we transform the institutions too.

References

Acker, J. (1990). Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: a theory of gendered organizations. *Gender and Society, 4*, 139-158.

Barrett, F. J. (1996). The organizational construction of hegemonic masculinity: The case of the U.S. Navy. *Gender, Work & Organization, 3*, 129-143.

Bezanson, K., & Luxto, M. (Eds.). (2006). *Social reproduction: Feminist political economy challenges neo-liberalism*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Brewis, J. (1999). How does it feel? Women managers, embodiment and changing public sector cultures. In S. Whitehead & R. Moodley (Eds.), *Transforming managers: Gendering change in the public sector* (pp. 84-106). London: UCL Press.

Burgmann, M., & Burgmann, V. (1998). *Green bans, red union: Environmental activism and the New South Wales builders labourers' federation*. Sydney: UNSW Press.

Butler, J. (1999). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity* (2nd ed.). New Brunswick, NJ: Routledge.

Chandler, R. (1955). *The little sister*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Chopra, R. (Ed.). (2007). *Reframing masculinities: Narrating the supportive practices of men*. New Delhi: Orient Longman Private.

Cockburn, C. (1991). *In the way of women: Men's resistance to sex equality in organizations*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Collinson, D. L., & Hearn, J. (Eds.) (1996). *Men as managers, managers as men*. London: Sage.

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

Connell, R. (1998). Masculinities and globalization. *Men and Masculinities, 1*(1), 3-23.

Connell, R. (2000). *The men and the boys*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Connell, R. (2005). *Masculinities* (2nd ed.). Sydney: Allen & Unwin Australia.

Connell, R. (2006). Glass ceilings or gendered institutions? Mapping the gender regimes of public sector worksites. *Public Administration Review, 66*(6), 837-849.

Connell, R. (2007a). News from the coalface: Experiences of gender reform by the staff of public sector agencies. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, *9*(2), 137-153.

Connell, R. (2007b). *Southern theory: The global dynamics of knowledge in social science*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Connell, R. (forthcoming). The machine in the tower block: Finance capital and corporate masculinities. Unpublished paper.

Connell, R., & Messerschmidt, J. (2005). Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the concept. *Gender & Society, 19*(6), 829-859.

Connell, R., & Wood, J. (2005). Globalization and business masculinities. *Men and Masculinities*, *7*(4), 347-364.

Corman, J., Luxton, M., Livingstone, D. W., & Seccombe, W. (1993). *Recasting steel labour: The Stelco story*. Halifax, NS: Fernwood Publishing.

Dasgupta, R. (2003). Creating corporate warriors: The "salaryman" and masculinity in Japan. In K. Louie & M. Low (Ed.), *Asian masculinities* (pp. 118-134). London: Routledge Curzon.

Donaldson, M. (1991). *Time of our lives: Labour and love in the working class*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin Australia.

Duménil, G., & Lévy, D. (2004). *Capital resurgent: Roots of the neoliberal revolution*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Franzway, S. (1999). "They see you coming": A comparative study of sexual politics and women union officials in (English) Canada and Australia. *Labour & Industry, 10*(2), 147-168.

Gherardi, S., & Poggio, B. (2001). Creating and recreating gender order in organizations. *Journal of World Business*, *36*(3), 245-259.

Glucksmann, M. (2000). *Cottons and casuals: The gendered organisation of labour in time and space*. London: Routledge-Cavendish.

Gear, S. (2005). Behind the bars of South African prisons: Gendered roles and vulnerability of male inmates to forced sex. *Sexual Health Exchange, 2*. Retrieved from http://www.kit.nl/exchange/html/2005-2_behind_the_bars_of_sout.asp

Goswami, S. (2007). Enterprising women, supportive men: Micro credit networks in the northeast. In R. Chopra (Ed.), *Reframing masculinities: Narrating the supportive practices of men* (pp. 138-161). New Delhi: Orient Longman Private.

Hale, M. M. (1996). Gender equality in organizations: resolving the dilemmas. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, *16*(1), 7-18.

Hall, A., Hockey, J., & Robinson, V. (2007). Occupational cultures and the embodiment of masculinity: Hairdressing, estate agency and firefighting. *Gender, Work & Organization*, *14*(6), 534-551.

Harvey, D. (2005). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hooper, C. (2000). Masculinities in transition: The case of globalization. In M. H. Marchand & A. S. Runyan (Eds.), *Gender and global restructuring* (pp. 59-73). London: Routledge.

Kanter, R. M. (1993). *Men and women of the corporation*. New York: Basic Books. (Original work published 1977)

Kerfoot, D., & Knights, D. (1996). "The best is yet to come?": The quest for embodiment in managerial work. In D. L. Collinson & J. Hearn (Ed.), *Men as managers, managers as me*n (pp. 78-98). London: Sage.

Korda, M. (1974). *Male chauvinism: How it works at home and in the office*. New York: Random House.

Kosík, K. (1976). *Dialectics of the concrete*. Dordrecht: Reidel.

Levin, P. (2004). Gender, work and time: gender at work and at play in futures trading. In C. Fuchs Epstein & A. L. Kalleberg (Eds.), *Fighting for time* (pp. 249-281). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Mac an Ghaill, M. (1994). *The making of men: Masculinities, sexualities and schooling*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Martin, P. Y. (2006). Practising gender at work: Further thoughts on reflexivity. *Gender, Work & Organization, 13*(3), 254-276.

Martinez, L. (2000). *The Algerian civil war 1990-1998*. London: Hurst.

Messerschmidt, J. W. (1997). *Crime as structured action: Gender, race, class, and crime in the making*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Meuser, M. (2007). Serious games: Competition and the homosocial construction of masculinity. *Norma*, *2*(1), 39-51.

Mills, A. J., & Tancred, P. (1992). *Gendering organizational analysis*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Moodie, T. D. (1994). *Going for gold: Men, mines, and migration*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Morrell, R. (2001). *From boys to gentlemen: Settler masculinity in colonial Natal, 1880-1920*. Pretoria: University of South Africa Press.

Ogasawara, Y. (1998). *Office ladies and salaried men: Power, gender, and work in Japanese companies*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Peterson, V. S. (2003). *A critical rewriting of global political economy: Integrating reproductive, productive and virtual economies*. London: Routledge.

Pocock, B. (2003). *The work/life collision: What work is doing to Australians and what to do about it*. Sydney: Federation Press.

Rahnema, A. (1998). *An Islamic utopian: A political biography of Ali Shari'ati*. London: Tauris.

Reid, G., & Walker, L. (Eds.) (2005). *Men behaving differently*. Cape Town, SA: Double Storey Books.

Sabo, D., Kupers, T. A., & London, W. (Eds.). (2001). *Prison masculinities*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
Sideris, T. (2005). "You have to change and you don't know how!": Contesting what it means to be a man in a rural area of South Africa. In G. Reid & L. Walker (Eds.), *Men behaving differently* (pp. 111-137). Cape Town: Double Storey Books.
Sinclair-Webb, E. (2000). "Our bülent is now a commando": Military service and manhood in Turkey. In M. Ghoussoub & E. Sinclair-Webb (Eds.), *Imagined masculinities: Male identity and culture in the modern Middle East* (pp. 65-92). London: Saqi Books.
Stobbe, L. (2005). Doing machismo: Legitimating speech acts as a selection discourse. *Gender, Work & Organization*, *12*(2), 105-123.
Taga, F. (2004). *Research on work and lives of Japanese businessmen working for Japanese-affiliated companies in Australia*. Kurume, Japan: Kurume University.
Thorne, B. (1993). *Gender play: Girls and boys in school*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers.
Tienari, J., Sœderberg, A-M., Holgersson, C., & Vaara, E. (2005). Gender and national identity constructions in the cross-border merger context. *Gender, Work & Organization*, *12*(3), 217-241.
Waetjen, T. (2004). *Workers and warriors: Masculinity and the struggle for nation in South Africa*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
Wajcman, J. (1998). *Managing like a man: Women and men in corporate management*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin Australia.
Winter, M. F., & Robert, E. L. (1980). Male dominance, late capitalism, and the growth of instrumental reason. *Berkeley Journal of Sociology*, *24-25*, 249-280.
Woodward, A. E. (1996). Multinational masculinities and European bureaucrats. In D. L. Collinson & J. Hearn (Eds.), *Men as managers, managers as men* (pp. 167-185). London: Sage.