Men and Masculinities

Globalization and Business Masculinities

R. W. Connell and Julian Wood

The online version of this article can be found at:

Published by:

⑧SAGE Publications

Additional services and information for **Men and Masculinities** can be found at:

Email Alerts: http://jmm.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts

Subscriptions: http://jmm.sagepub.com/subscriptions

Reprints: http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav

Permissions: http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav

Citations (this article cites 3 articles hosted on the
SAGE Journals Online and HighWire Press platforms):
http://jmm.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/7/4/347#BIBL

Globalization and
Business Masculinities

R. W. CONNELL
JULIAN WOOD
University of Sydney

The idea of "transnational business masculinity" is explored in life-history interviews with Australian managers. Their world is male-dominated but has a strong consciousness of change. An intense and stressful labor process creates multiple linkages among managers and subjects them to mutual scrutiny, a force for gender conservatism. In a context of affluence and anxiety, managers tend to treat their life as an enterprise and self-consciously manage bodies and emotions as well as finances. Economic globalization has heightened their insecurity and changed older patterns of business; different modes of participating in transnational business can be identified. Managerial masculinity is still centrally related to power, but changes from older bourgeois masculinity can also be detected: tolerance of diversity and heightened uncertainty about one's place in the world and gender order. Some support is found for the transnational business masculinity hypothesis, but a spectrum of gender patterns must be recognized in an increasingly complex business environment.

Key words: manager; masculinity; globalization; business; hegemony; gender relations; technology; embodiment; career; power

In contemporary gender studies, it is widely acknowledged that dominant forms of masculinity are associated with major forms of social power. In discussions of contemporary capitalism, it is widely acknowledged that the most powerful institutions, excepting only major states, are transnational corporations operating in global markets.

These two conspicuous facts have rarely been put together. A previous paper (Connell 1998) argued that they should be and that the global corporate economy might be the setting for a new pattern of hegemonic masculinity, found particularly among globally mobile managers. The name *transnational business masculinity* was proposed for this pattern. We now reconsider

this idea in the light of some life-history research with businessmen in Australia.

Hegemonic forms of masculinity in modernity are historically derived from the growth of industrial capitalism and the growth of imperialism. The bourgeois masculinities produced by these processes had many local variations, from the colonial settler elite of Natal (Morrell 2001) and the urban establishment of postcolonial Peru (Fuller 2001) to the corporate salaryman of Japan (Dasgupta 2003) and the industrial managers of Britain (Roper 1994). These had, nevertheless, key features in common: association with authority; social conservatism; compulsory heterosexuality; integration with a family division of labor; strongly marked, symbolic gender differences; and emotional distance between men and women. The men who were the bearers of these configurations of practice generally controlled the key industries in the local economy, so the locally hegemonic patterns of masculinity were typically integrated with the local patterns of capitalism.

Capitalism changes, however. One of its central trends has been the replacement of family enterprises by corporations, which, in turn, have grown on an ever-larger scale. Although reports of the death of the capitalist in a "managerial revolution" are exaggerated and family capitalism persists (Gilding 2002), this long-term trend has certainly heightened the importance of managers as a social group. Men continue to be the overwhelming majority of managers, especially at the top levels of organizations (Hearn and Parkin 2001, 129). Managers have thus become, as Collinson and Hearn (1996) show, a key group for the understanding of modern masculinities. They are, nevertheless, a complex group. In a striking case study, Messerschmidt (1995) has shown how different patterns of managerial masculinity may underpin different sides of an argument in a life-and-death decision.

Masculinities, it is now widely recognized, are constantly subject to change as a result of generational differences in gender attitudes and practices (Zulehner and Volz 1998), structural changes in the gender order itself (Connell 2002), and changes in the social structures with which the gender order is linked. Among the most important of recent environmental changes are the economic, political, and cultural shifts that have been labeled *globalization*.

Globalization is by no means a simple fact. Although media discussions often picture the world being homogenized, wealth and power remain centered in the economies of the former imperial powers, Europe, the United States, and Japan (Hirst and Thompson 1996). The cultural effect of globalization also is very uneven (Altman 2001; Bauman 1998). However, the growth of global markets, the new electronic communication technologies, the reduction of tariff and other barriers to the movement of capital and goods, and the rising importance of multinational corporations and global capital markets are real social forces and, as will be seen below, very much present in the minds of Australian managers.

How much effect these forces have already had on managerial masculinities is open to question. Wajcman's (1999) important study focused on multinational-oriented companies in the United Kingdom. Her research suggests the persistence of conservative gender patterns and a masculinized model of management to which women executives were obliged to conform. Ogasawara's (1998) study in large Japanese corporations suggested, if anything, even more deeply entrenched gender conservatism, especially a rigid gender division of labor. But Hooper (2000), examining the representation of masculinity in a British-based business newspaper, points to an emphasis on cooperation and teamwork; a technocratic, new-frontier imagery associated with globalization; and few traces of old-style patriarchal masculinity. There is also clear evidence of uncertainty about gender strategies among young Japanese middle-class men (Taga 2001), and there has been public questioning and joking about the "salaryman" model of life, as the Japanese boom economy faltered and Japanese firms retreated from the old certainties (Dasgupta 2003).

Niva (1998) has made the provocative suggestion of a "new world order masculinity." He has focused on media representations of masculinity, especially those surrounding U.S. intervention in the Middle East at the time of the Gulf War—an iconography that combined tenderness and compassion with toughness and aggression, all flavored with high technology. The recipe is not light-years away from what Hooper saw in *The Economist* as an imagery of global businessmen. On these indications, globalization has already emerged as an arena for cultural reconstructions of masculinity. What about reconstructions at the level of business practice and careers?

The following discussion is based on tape-recorded life-history interviews with eleven businessmen, conducted in Australia between 1997 and 2000. The interviews come from two research projects, broadly similar in the topics covered in interviewing. The respondents range between having high and moderate levels of involvement in the global economy. (Interviews with businessmen with a strong focus on the local economy were also conducted but are not discussed here.) Most of the respondents were in their thirties, chosen in a deliberate attempt to gain a picture of the generation who will be the next wave into top management, with outliers in their mid-twenties and late fifties. All are currently working in Australia, although half were born overseas, and all are native speakers of English. The group includes gay men, married men, single men, and divorced heterosexual men. All work for different companies, and in a variety of industries, although with a concentration in finance.

The interviews were conducted by the authors and by Ms. Renate Kretschmer; they lasted between one and two hours. Tapes were transcribed, and individual case studies were prepared (following the research strategy of Connell 1995) before making the combined analysis presented in this article.

THE WORLD OF MANAGEMENT

The Glass Ceiling Commission (1995), set up to explore diversity issues in U.S. business, reported that among the top U.S. corporations, ninety-five percent to ninety-seven percent of top executives were men. Our respondents recognize this picture in Australian and international business—as they should, after decades of equal opportunity employment (EEO) discourse. For instance, Terence, an overseas-born manager in a multinational firm, made the following comments on the international pharmaceutical industry:

> Yes, it is pretty much male dominated at the higher levels. As I was saying ear-lier, there are lots of women in more junior, certainly sales representatives, women who are in middle management positions. And there are occasions of women in higher levels. But I suppose if you're talking upper upper manage-ment, it is male dominated. [A]

(See also extract E below.) For some, this pattern is so entrenched that they speak as if management were inherently male.

Senior management recruits its own successors. Indeed, it has to do so as managers commonly function by building up a "team" (the sports language often heard is another medium of cultural masculinization). Some multina-tional firms have a deliberate policy of selecting an elite group of manage-ment trainees. Terence was a beneficiary of such a scheme and was rotated through several divisions of the company and several countries where the firm was operating.

> So you had a very very high profile within the company, and I could almost access anybody bar the two or three top people, which was fantastic for net-working; it was very good for my confidence. [B]

The point about "confidence," as will be seen below, is not trivial. Others cre-ated their own management training curriculum. Bruce, for instance, decided on a career in banking. He rotated himself through several Wall Street finan-cial corporations, moving from backroom work developing financial "prod-ucts" to front-of-house sales work, before ending up in a management posi-tion and launched on an international trajectory.

To get into such a process, of course, one has to be suitably positioned. Bruce took a bachelor's degree in business at an elite U.S. university. Other respondents positioned themselves by doing an MBA, which two to three decades ago emerged as a key training ground for a new type of young, inter-nationally oriented executive. Charles, now a management consultant, recog-nizes that the significance of his MBA was as much in the "can do" attitude, the networking, and the global outlook, as in the specific skills taught:

> Yeah, that is the thing about the MBA, . . . it is a funny qualification; it gives you the ability to be dangerous at most things without necessarily being competent at any. . . . I think they are very conscious of making it an international program, so they do try and mix up the case studies. . . . They put you in cross-cultural groups. In my study group, there was a Greek, a Russian, a Belgian, probably a couple of Poms [English], and maybe an American. [C]

As the MBA signifies, the world of managers is changing. Rex, an Australian-born finance sector manager, who is also a computer expert, is now in his fifties and declares a standard of gentlemanly conduct and courtesy:

> There was an upbringing, there was a certain standard and culture, form of dress, behavior and that sort of thing, which I think—yes, it has been helpful. A super awareness of not wanting to offend, not wanting to fail, to progress. . . . I'm very uncomfortable with aggression of any sort, and I will avoid conflict if at all possible. [D]

Younger respondents would find that a little comic. Brad, a multinational advertising executive in his mid-thirties, is not amused at all. He finds the patriarchs of his industry an obstacle, even a threat:

> At the top, it's a male world. (Why?) Just because that's the old Madison Avenue stereotype. Those are the same guys that are running this company, you know. . . . But that's an outdated way of thinking. . . . I love this company; I'm very passionate about this company; I think it's a great company. It's in a transition period now. It needs to shake its dusty old banker image off and start looking at things fresh. And it's in a terrific position to do that. It's a strong brand name, you know, this is a major. Unfortunately, it's kind of resting on its laurels, and it needs to move forward. It needs to get some young dynamic people involved in the organization. [E]

Brad clearly thinks of himself as one of the "young dynamic people" who are capable of transforming things.

THE WORK OF MANAGEMENT

Working as a manager in a large multinational corporation, or in the firms that deal with them, means one thing above all; that is, the managers direct (or at least try to influence) the flows of capital that constitute the corporation as a social form and, in enormous agglomerations, constitute multinational business. Manufacturing managers put capital to work in the production of goods, and as Roper (1994) has shown in the British case, they used to have a direct relationship with the production process. But as Roper further argues, this pattern of managerial masculinity has been superseded by professionalized, finance-oriented management.

It is the latter that mainly appears in these Australian interviews. For instance, Bruce, the banker quoted above, spends his days putting Australian financial institutions' capital into global circuits via New York. Charles, the management consultant, advises other large corporations on how to be more profitable and assists them with restructures. Peter worked for a multinational manufacturer as a public relations executive, trying to maintain general conditions for profitability. This was a weighty task since the industry concerned was tobacco, and he had to lobby governments, create a new worldwide image for his firm, maintain the tobacco industry's team of scientists, and ensure favorable publicity for their claims.

The labor process was described in all of the interviews. Here is a morning with Angus, a senior financial analyst for a bank who advises other companies on investment strategies:

> I have my coffee and my fruit salad when I walk in, have my breakfast reading the newspapers, and I'll go through global international news. I have an assistant who will bring me my Reuter's Business Reference, which is global, every newspaper in the world. . . . Then I am chairman of the morning meeting, which is when the analysts get up and talk to the dealers, . . . and then I will sit down and start doing some research. . . . And there will be a company announcement coming out of the speaker, and you go "Fuck!" and you will work on that, you will drop everything else, you will hit the phones. You will be marketing something else, and you know you'll have five things. [F]

Others are "all day long on e-mails," as Giles, a management recruitment agent, remarks. In most respects, the stories are very similar. In the managerial labor process, there is a heavy volume of meetings, telephoning, and e-mail communication; a certain amount of personal data-gathering and analysis; a number of tasks or projects running simultaneously, with attention switched among them according to deadlines or emergencies; coordinating the work of subordinates and specialists; and needing to keep current with a background of international and local events.

This is done in an atmosphere not exactly of panic, but certainly of pressure; the stakes are high. Angus is not a dealer, but he can still lose his company and himself a lot of money by making a few wrong moves: "Oh shit, I lose money all the time, I've lost ten grand in ten seconds; that was pretty good." It is not surprising that most respondents work long hours. Giles mentions a twelve-hour day as typical; others mention sixty- or seventy-hour weeks. Business travel is also very common, both overseas and within the country. At the extreme, Giles reckons that he is traveling every week.

It is crucial to understanding business masculinities that much of this labor is directed to other managers. Angus depends on the managers of other companies "buying" his investment advice (in both the metaphorical and the literal sense). Charles depends on the managers of other companies buying his advice on restructures and operations. Bruce depends on the managers of

other companies buying his financial products. Bill, in market research, depends on his information being bought by managers like Peter, in public relations and advertising, who, in turn, depend on other managers buying their campaigns. All except CEOs depend on their own top managers viewing their strategies favorably and wanting them to continue their operations. (Peter and Bruce have been in situations where approval from above was withdrawn, and both lost their jobs as a result.) At the same time, Angus, Charles, and Bruce are all closely examining the operations of executives of other companies and selling the results of their scrutiny.

The result is an intense multidirectional scrutiny of managers and their operations. This is not a Foucaultian "panopticon," as there is no center of surveillance. It is more a peer scrutiny, and it is inherent in how corporate capital works; this is "the market," embodied in workers like Angus, Charles, and Bruce. Some firms actually formalize this scrutiny and pay their executives accordingly. Angus and Charles both have part of their incomes linked to formal ratings provided by the firm's clients. In other cases, the scrutiny is linked to a personal business style. Bruce, for instance, insists,

> I'm a very social person, so I always thought that the way you got to customers was by knowing all about them. And not just what you would know of them from the perspective of the bank. . . . I deal with my customers like they're my friends, like they're sitting in my backyard or we're having a beer together. [G]

(Bruce's "customers" are the managers of other companies.) This pattern of mutual dependence and mutual scrutiny among businessmen is a powerful countercurrent to the competitive individualism of contemporary business ideology. It is reflected in their social conservatism and in their conformity of dress, political opinion, and reading.

It is also a constraint on the rejection of old-style business masculinity, the "dusty old banker image" mentioned above (extract E). Bert, a whiz kid running a computer start-up company, discovered this precisely because his firm was new and vulnerable. "There's no dress code for programmers," who work all hours and live on pizzas, but for dealing with the managers of other companies, who are the firm's clients, you need a suit:

> When you're trying to convince a client to give you several million dollars to buy a system, the company needs to look solid and look like it's going to be there. That's when you need some mature and convincing industry professional.

So the firm found a middle-aged accountant, who

> presented a really professional sort of image and everything, kind of fitted in well with all the other guys [i.e., managers of other companies] and stuff. He's like forty or something. He's been made, consequently, general manager. So he

looks after all those type of things, and he deals extremely well with the clients—as opposed to some twenty-four year old or something, who's not always that convincing when talking to a client saying we'll deliver this on time. [H]

The scrutiny reflects another key feature of managers' work; that is, it is increasingly collective. Although market ideology imagines the capitalist as an individual entrepreneur inventing a widget and selling it, the reality for most senior managers is an extremely indirect relation to the production of goods. The relation is mediated either through complex bureaucracies (large manufacturing, transport, retail firms) or through the ever-greater complexities of financial markets. As the work of managers is increasingly integrated with and performed through complex computer systems, the relationship with material production and the direct producers grows even more indirect and abstract. People like Angus and Charles need never see a widget from one year's end to the next.

This collectivization is an important basis of the doctrine of the "generic manager," which is now embedded in MBA training and is central to the corporatization of the public sector. It is also increasingly embedded in technology. "All day long on e-mails" is only the start. In a multinational firm like Charles's, a manager anywhere in the world can tap into the firm's global system, "which is an e-mail system plus a database of all the work we have ever done for anybody." He can call up spreadsheets "checking on the job summary, looking at how much money the client has spent versus how much we are charging to the client"; he can call up programs to produce charts and diagrams for slide presentations, and so on.

The "technology" is far from neutral; it is set up to produce certain kinds of effects. Its introduction is a highly political process. Rex was involved in the creation of a computerized national information and financial operations system designed to make Australian capital more globally competitive. The creation of this system involved the restructuring of a whole industry, the merging of historic enterprises into others, the elimination of old labor processes and categories of workers.

New business methods are important vehicles of "globalization" in the sense of pressure to standardize on metropolitan models. The computer software mainly comes from the United States, as does the model of the generic manager and the specific techniques. For instance, Bill, the CEO of a market research firm, holds the local franchise for a U.S.-based network from which he gets "cutting-edge techniques and technology." He is a licensee of specific research tools copyrighted by U.S. firms, which he applies not only in Australia but in market research for Asian firms in their own countries, an interesting two-step flow of influence.

BODY, SELF, AND LOCATION

The labor process described above is not healthy, involving long hours, high stress, sedentary work, and frequent travel. It is not surprising that some of our respondents are very much concerned about their bodies.

Brad, for instance, watches his weight, jogs daily, used to work out in a gym, and avoids fast food, but he has still developed a peptic ulcer. Bruce has a personal trainer, works out three times a week, goes to a naturopath, and is cautious in his sex life. "It's all about managing your own body and being smart," he says. Bert has become "extremely health conscious"; he's a vegetarian, eats organic, and practices Reiki massage. Others still eat steak; one cannot say that New Age body consciousness is rampant in business. But it is clear that "managing your own body" has become a significant issue. Angus's breakfast of coffee and fruit salad (extract F above) summarizes the tension.

Treating one's body as a thing to be managed is part of a larger phenomenon—that is, treating one's life as a thing to be managed. Angus puts this especially clearly. He is living with his girlfriend in a house that he owns and is contemplating starting a family. He applies to his own situation the kind of reasoning he applies at the office. He puts his money to work, watches his balance sheet, and knows his assets, his liabilities, and his income streams:

> So you could argue, you see yourself as a bit of corporate—as in, you're an entity. Yes, I am an entity. And I manage that. I did this exercise for a couple of friends, who didn't quite understand it. And they were horrified when I actually said, "Well, this is actually what you are worth" because they'd never done the exercise. [I]

"Being an entity" (i.e., a "financial entity," a piece of business jargon) exactly corresponds to the emerging pattern of management careers described by Gee, Hull, and Lankshear (1996), where multinational managers skip from corporation to corporation, maximizing their own returns on investments of time and money. In effect, one's life is constituted as an enterprise.

One's emotions also become assets of the enterprise. Hochschild (1983) famously described the "commercialization of human feeling" in jobs such as air hostess and debt collector where emotion work was part of the job. The new managerialism builds on this but treats emotion entrepreneurially. Bruce, for instance, the banker who likes to treat customers as if they were friends [extract G above], describes his business bargaining technique:

> It depends on what position I am in the negotiation. In every negotiation you have to quickly assess whether you're in a position of strength or a position of abiding. And then you can manage yourself accordingly. Sometimes emotion is used for the point of the thing; you become emotional because you—we use

it as a trick in some ways. And you know, through my career, I've learned to manage that and use it to my best. [J]

Terence, in pharmaceuticals, hated corporate entertaining, and in order to avoid meaningless socializing at conferences, he used to retreat to his room or to the swimming pool:

> And I thought, I can't go on like that really. So I actually forced myself to enjoy it. And it makes a difference when you think, "Well I'm not hating this, I'm here for four days and I'm going to make the most of it." This is what I've started doing in my current job. And actually enjoy it. [K]

Treating oneself as an entity to be managed is likely to mean limited loyalty to the corporation one currently works for. There is an important shift here from the worlds of the U.S. "organization man" and the Japanese "salaryman," who are committed to specific corporations for a lifetime. It is not a total break. Bruce, for instance, feels, "I had some obligation and loyalty back to the bank; they were always good to me." But he jumped ship once and plans to jump again.

Charles notes the other side of this equation; that is, the companies do not offer much loyalty to the managers. There is no such thing as a guaranteed career any more. Promotions within his firm are fiercely competitive; everyone has to strive for improvement all the time and "stay hungry":

> We operate an "up-or-out" model. If you don't make the steps necessary to get promoted to the next level, which happens every two or three years, then you will get a number of chances. And if things don't improve—and you're given every support and chance—then you will probably be advised that you would be best looking for a job elsewhere. [L]

Within the global economy, being positioned for promotion often means being willing to move internationally. Brian, a professional whose involvement with international business comes from providing Australian-based services to elite businessmen, rather than being one himself, got his key career jump by a move to the Philippines and several years working for Taiwanese corporations. Peter, the public relations specialist mentioned above, was sent to corporate headquarters in Europe for training, and while there, he was recruited to work on global strategy. Brad has moved around the world within his multinational firm, rising a step in the hierarchy as he went to each new country. Terence saw that life in front of him and baulked,

> I was at this stage, moving on to a very high-flying career pathway. When you move into those sorts of positions in high management, you have quite an itinerant lifestyle. You spend a couple of years in one place, and a couple of years in another, and on you go. And I just didn't want to live like that. I was really driven by leading quite a stable happy life, centered in one place. [M]

With long-distance travel also frequent, it can be seen that there is significant material dislocation in a transnational corporate career. There can be dislocation in personal conduct too. One of our respondents described himself in a sexual "duality," maintaining a marriage at home but having casual sex on the road. The scale of sexual services available to traveling businessmen, from pornographic videos in hotel rooms to organized prostitution, suggest that this is not an isolated case.

GLOBALIZATION

All our respondents are familiar with the idea of globalization, and a number have well-developed opinions on it. Here is Giles, CEO of a locally-based firm that has offices in six other countries:

> We act local and think global. The world is now a global environment; the communications revolution has hit us. I think we'll look back in two or three decades at the 1990s and see that it was akin to the Industrial Revolution, when the communication revolution hit us. And there's no more borders any more; there's no more passports; the Internet has done away with all of those things. And all of our children are just so familiar with it. It's like waking up every day and cleaning their teeth. So technology is here; so globalization is now something that we have to accept and come to terms with. [N]

It's easy to see that this is a privileged view. There may be "no more borders" for international businessmen, but there certainly are for Afghan refugees. Not long after this interview was done, Australia's right-wing government staged an election-winning stunt by sending troops to deny entry to a boatload of refugees whose ship had sunk. Yet there is a corporate reality behind the glib talk of "revolution." The environment that managers face is very different from the parochial world of Australian business thirty years ago. All our interviewees are responding to this change in their own working lives, whether operating in offshore markets, constructing transnational careers, servicing international magnates, planning partnerships with U.S. firms, or trying to out-think multinationals in the home market.

What Giles' statement misses, but other respondents emphasize, is that globalization is an arena of power. Angus remarks,

> Globalization is real and happening. You've got big, bad, ugly American firms coming here who are culturally insensitive and putting their stamp on the world and saying, "If you don't do it with us, we're going to fuck you over, don't kid yourself." That is what they tell them. And it is one of these self-fulfilling prophecies. People start to give them business. It is one of these things, you've got the power and you're leveraging that power. . . . Americans seem to run the business on a centralized basis. America makes head office because America is America; we make all decisions. [O]

Corporations based in the metropole attempt to reshape the world to their advantage. One respondent worked for a U.S.-based multinational involved in medical insurance, in a group given the task of scanning other countries for chances to insert the U.S. strategy of "managed care." Another worked for a multinational management-consulting firm heavily involved in the privatization of public services.

But multinationals do not carry all before them. Angus goes on to talk about how an Australian firm can operate in the same market as these giants:

> They have scale; we have niche. You can fight two ways; David beat Goliath. I know it sounds silly and it is trite, but the fact is, markets have as many niches as scale. We're not going to try and take Merrills on and be Merrill Lynch; we'll lose. But we can take them on and be smarter researchers, more innovative, more imaginative, creating better ideas, focusing on our Australian clients for what our Australian clients want. [P]

The power that comes with scale produces rigidity, and the complex control and information systems in the new multinationals may exacerbate this. But the effect is still to produce pressure on the local competitors. To be "smarter, more innovative" means intensifying the managerial labor process described above [extract F].

There are, then, at least two broad patterns of participation in the global business milieu: (a) as part of the managerial elite of the dominant organizations, like Charles, Peter, Bruce, and Brad; and (b) as part of a local managerial elite pursuing strategies of subordinate participation (niche marketing, essential services, etc.), like Angus, Bill, Rex, and Giles.

Whether these different forms of participation are associated with different patterns of masculinity is not clear. Individuals can leap from the former situation to the latter, as Peter did when he got the chop from his multinational and as Bruce may do voluntarily. On the whole, the evidence of these case studies seems to point to a common pattern of contemporary managerial masculinity, to which we now turn.

BUSINESS MASCULINITY

What holds people in high-stress, unhealthy, insecure jobs? Lots of money is part of the answer (see extract S below). At the top end of this group, incomes are around a quarter of a million dollars a year (about five times the national average). These men are not multimillionaires—this is a different population from the "super rich" studied by Gilding (2002) and Donaldson (1998). They are, nevertheless, very affluent, and if the younger men prosper in their corporate careers, they can expect to end up wealthy.

Also significant is the access to power. Charles, for instance, is proud that in his thirties, his advice plays a major role in investment decisions worth

multiple millions. He may be shaping industries and controlling the fates of older men. The same is true for Angus and Bruce and in other ways for Terence and Brad. They do not command on the old bourgeois model, but they are participating insiders in the making of corporate strategies that deploy huge assets and affect large numbers of people.

Power, then, is a large reality in their lives. If they are to participate in this milieu, they have to be able to use power and face power deployed by others. Here is an example from Bill's narrative of market research. A major goal of any firm in this field is to keep up its credibility and produce a flow of future contracts. Bill is explicit about the pressures shaping the labor process. You can win one tender by creative research design, but when the next tender comes along, "your very creative design becomes part of the tender process." That is to say, the managers of the client firms have shifted the goalposts, and you now have to win the competition on price. Thus, innovations are quickly routinized, and cost-cutting becomes the key to corporate strategy. Hence, market researchers' swing from door-knocking to CATI (computer-assisted telephone interviewing), and now toward the Internet, which is (potentially) incredibly cheap. Bill notes that the industry is looking at large job losses in the next ten years as CATI sites are closed down.

If you aren't willing to sack redundant workers, under such pressures, your firm will go under. So managers get used to sacking people. Even the nice guys among our respondents have done it. Rex manages to convince himself that "not perpetuating somebody in a job that they weren't suited for, or the job was really not a sustainable or lasting job, I don't think it's ever done anybody any harm." (None of our respondents has spent a significant time unemployed.) In this central respect, the new managerial masculinity does not depart from the old. It is involved in exercising and legitimizing collective power, institutional power, and personal authority in the workplace.

In two other respects, it may be different. The first is a self-conscious modernity in relation to nationality, sexuality, and gender. We have already noted how the MBA mixes students of different nationalities (extract C). The same can happen in the corporations where they work. Peter, for instance, was proud of having headed a unit that included someone from Latin America, someone from the United States, someone from the United Kingdom, and someone from Australia.

There is an equally conscious endorsement of gender equity. Brad remarks, "I wouldn't be friends with, and I wouldn't respect, anyone that discriminated on gender at all." That is now the default position, among younger businessmen, whatever departures there are from it in practice. There is a significant distance here from other power-oriented masculinities where race and gender hierarchy is a major part of the mix (Tillner 2000).

Perhaps most strikingly, the taboo on homosexuality is in decline. Several of our respondents are bisexual or gay and are "out" at work:

> I'm very open with management about, you know, my partner and I, relation-ship. And it's absolutely supportive, and no one really cares. And my clients know. And I think that that has again allowed me to excel, without a doubt. [R]

This statement is a little rose-tinted. In all cases, coming out has had to be carefully managed, and it would still be a mistake to be flamboyant. But it is at least possible to come out in a managerial workplace, and that is a major change.

The second difference is an uncertainty or provisionality, visible in nuances as much as in direct statements, concerning the position of men in the world. Terence, when asked for his view of the future of gender arrange-ments, replies that "men's positions are more threatened, and men are per-haps more vulnerable, and women are on the ascent." Terence is not agitated about this, but there is a certain tentativeness in his view of the world and in the accommodations he has made.

Bruce looks back on his marriage as central to his development. "I just grew into a man with her," but he gave the marriage up when it ran into trou-ble. Bruce started up the corporate ladder but now wants to get off it; he does not want to be senior vice president "because to do that I recognize that you have to be more of a conformist; you have to be more of a political player." Peter gave up his multinational job without a fight—when he was pushed— and also gave up two marriages, with a lot of pain. Angus doesn't feel much more secure:

> I always ask myself when is the next time they are going to sack me. Seriously, they can walk in tomorrow and say "you're not required." I live in fairy land. [This job] is grotesquely overpaid in the scheme of the broader world. I see it as a great opportunity to save money and create that nest egg for some time to make another step somewhere else or do something different. [S]

One can see here the psychological effect of the high salaries plus insecure tenure that are now characteristic of international business.

Of course, this is not the only note struck. Brad and Charles, who have rocketed up, are bursting with self-esteem and pride in their corporations. The elite recruitment schemes (see extract B above) may be intended to pro-duce that feeling. But taking our group of respondents as a whole, there is not the rock-solid confidence in men's position in the world that their actual power and wealth might imply and that an earlier generation of businessmen might have shown.

Relevant here is the self-management noted above (extracts I-K), the con-cern with health, the interest in diet, and the flirtation by some of our respon-dents with New Age therapies and by others with more conventional tech-niques, such as marriage counseling, psychotherapy, and group techniques in business. It is also worth noticing that the business self-help books crowding the shelves of airport bookshops, waiting for travelers like these, are more

often than not about the management of personality (*The Seven Habits of Highly Effective People*, *Awaken the Giant Within*, and so forth).

It almost seems as if most managers by themselves cannot create (or cannot sustain) the personalities required by global capitalism, that they need professional help to do it. So a whole industry has arisen to provide psychological support and reassurance—motivational speakers, self-help books, training courses in assertiveness, negotiating skills, and so on. One might also point to the dominant element of reassurance in advertising directed to managers as personal consumers—for example, the prestige cars, glowing leather briefcases, and so on—prominent in glossy business magazines. In a curious and suggestive paper, Kondo (1999) describes how an up-market clothing manufacturer conducted a successful advertising campaign for "the Japanese suit," suggesting that Japanese businessmen were part of a spiritual elite with superior culture and aesthetics.

CONCLUSION

The picture of business masculinities under globalization revealed in these interviews shows some continuity with older bourgeois masculinities. The association with power and preoccupation with the techniques of money remain. Indeed, the money is bigger than ever. But there is little of the old content of bourgeois masculinity—domestic patriarchy, snobbery, social authority, patriotism, religion, and so on—to give it point. As in the case of British manufacturing industry studied by Roper (1994), a cultural hollowing-out seems to have occurred, with "management" reduced to an exercise in strategizing and controlling. It has no deeper rationale than the "bottom line"—in fact, no rationale at all except profit making.

This managing, however culturally rootless, is a material and embodied practice. The embodiment of managerial masculinity is important, although it has been little studied. The experience of pressure, long hours, and tension is part of what being a manager is. The contemporary manager has to manage the body as part of constructing a career. Yet, this body-reflexive practice is not primarily a matter of self-reflexivity; it is, above all, a collective practice, the creation of a common way of life, the insertion of bodies into institutional and cultural matrices, and the living pursuit of what managers value most, profit. The fierce mutual scrutiny of managers, who, in a strong sense, embody the market, is both a gender-making process and a strategy of profit making. In the flow of managerial life, gender is not added on to capitalist rationality. (This is the flaw in most EEO strategies, which assume that gender inequality is a matter of irrational prejudice added on to a basically rational system.)

How much difference does globalization make? The globalized economy and neoliberal politics have created situations where skilful parasites can

command huge incomes, as a manager like Angus sees it. The irrationality of this is plain to Angus, but no one in this milieu can see any alternative. Antiglobalization arguments have no grip at all. Globalization, understood as neoliberal, market-based world integration, appears to our respondents as an irresistible natural phenomenon. You can surf the wave or go under. If "hegemony" involves forming the common sense of a society, as Gramsci argued, then multinational business has already achieved considerable success in Australia. By virtue of the cultural, political, and economic dominance of the institutions of multinational business, the masculinity formed in their matrix is in a strong position to claim hegemony in the gender order of the societies they dominate.

The interview evidence thus gives some support to the transnational business masculinity hypothesis (Connell 1998), the idea that global markets and transnational corporations provide the setting for a transformed pattern of business masculinity, which is achieving a hegemonic position in global gender relations. Respondents Charles, Brad, and Angus seem close to the hypothesized pattern in most ways, and elements of it appear in other lives. Tolerance, energy focused on work, flexibility, a certain libertarianism, certain technological skills, and skill in communication are prominent. The pattern is reasonably like the media images of global businessmen discussed by Hooper (2000), although with more competitiveness and less emphasis on cooperation.

The material circumstances—career lines, high incomes, and low security—of such managers help to explain this configuration of practice. Their anxiety and self-management are also intelligible responses to these conditions. We would emphasize, rather more than earlier studies of managers (Wajcman 1999, Collinson and Hearn 1996) have done, the technological collectivization of management practice and the systematic mutual scrutiny among managers. These glass-house phenomena help explain how, despite the individualism of business ideology, cohesion of the group, and gender hegemony, may be achieved or sustained.

Nevertheless, it is important to acknowledge that the transnational business masculinity pattern does not occupy the whole field. A place remains for more traditional patterns of hegemonic masculinity—as seen for example in the case of Rex (extract D above). There is possibly a generational turnover occurring, but this study is too small to be confident about that. Some of our respondents, struggling in their personal lives or coping with career downturns, seem closer to complicit masculinity (Connell 1995) than to a hegemonic position.

Furthermore, the gender anxieties and the tentativeness about life courses that are also important elements in the interviews, suggest that hegemony, even if it is developing, is by no means firmly established. The turbulence of globalization is an unsettling force, as well as being the matrix of new powers. The transnational business masculinity hypothesis accounts for only part

of the picture of change in masculinity under globalization, even in the business world.

REFERENCES

Altman, Dennis. 2001. *Global sex*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bauman, Zygmunt. 1998. *Globalization: The human consequences.* Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Collinson, David L., and Jeff Hearn, eds. 1996. *Men as managers, managers as men: Critical Perspectives on Men, Masculinities and managements*. London, Sage.

Connell, R. W. 1995. *Masculinities*. Sydney, Allen & Unwin.

———. 1998. Masculinities and Globalization. *Men and Masculinities* 1 (1): 3-23.

———. 2002. *Gender.* Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Dasgupta, Romit. 2003. Creating corporate warriors: The "salaryman" and masculinity in Japan. In *Asian masculinities: The meaning and practice of manhood in China and Japan*, edited by Kam Louie and Morris Low, 118-34. London: RoutledgeCurzon.

Donaldson, Mike. 1998. Growing up very rich: The masculinity of the hegemonic. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Gender Studies* 3 (2): 95-112.

Fuller, Norma. 2001. The social construction of gender identity among Peruvian men. *Men and Masculinities* 3 (3): 316-331.

Gee, James Paul, Glynda Hull, and Colin Lankshear. 1996. *The new work order: Behind the language of the new capitalism.* Sydney, Australia: Allen and Unwin.

Gilding, Michael. 2002. *Secrets of the super rich*. Sydney, Australia: HarperCollins.

Glass Ceiling Commission (U.S.). 1995. *Good for business: Making full use of the nation's human capital. The environmental scan. Washington, DC: Author.*

Hearn, Jeff, and Wendy Parkin. 2001. *Gender, sexuality and violence in organizations: The unspoken forces of organization violations.* London: Sage.

Hirst, Paul, and Grahame Thompson. 1996. *Globalization in question: The international economy and the possibilities of governance.* Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Hochschild, Arlie. 1983. *The managed heart: Commercialization of human feeling.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hooper, Charlotte. 2000. Masculinities in transition: The case of globalization. In *Gender and global restructuring*, edited by Marianne H. Marchand and Anne Sisson Runyan, 59-73. London: Routledge.

Kondo, Dorinne. 1999. Fabricating masculinity: Gender, race and nation in a transnational frame. In *Between woman and nation: Nationalisms, transnational feminisms, and the state*, edited by Caren Kaplan, Norma Alarcón, and Minoo Moallam, 296-319. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Messerschmidt, James W. 1995. Managing to kill: Masculinities and the space shuttle Challenger explosion. *Masculinities* 3 (4): 1-22.

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

Niva, Steve. 1998. Tough and tender: New world order masculinity and the Gulf War. In *The "man" question in international relations*, edited by Marysia Zalewski and Jane Parpart, 109-28. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

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

Roper, Michael. 1994. *Masculinity and the British organization man since 1945*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Taga, Futoshi. 2001. *Dansei no jendâ keisei: "Otoko-rashisa" no yuragi no naka de* [The gender formation of men: Uncertain masculinity]. Tokyo: Tôyôkan Shuppan-sha.

Tillner, Georg. 2000. *The identity of dominance: Masculinity and xenophobia. In Male roles, masculinities and violence: A culture of peace perspective*, edited by Ingeborg Breines, Robert Connell, and Ingrid Eide, 53-9. Paris: UNESCO Publishing.

Wajcman, Judy. 1999. *Managing like a man: Women and men in corporate management*. Sydney, Australia: Allen and Unwin.

Zulehner, Paul M., and Rainer Volz. 1998. *Männer im Aufbruch: Wie Deutschlands Männer sich Selbst und wie Frauen Sie Sehen*. Ostfildern, Germany: Schwabenverlag.

R. W. Connell is a professor of education at the University of Sydney, author or coauthor of Ruling Class Ruling Culture, Making the Difference, Gender and Power, Schools and Social Justice, Masculinities, The Men and the Boys, *and most recently* Gender, *and a contributor to research journals in sociology, education, political science, gender studies, and related fields. Current research concerns gender equity, changing masculinities, social justice in education, globalization, and intellectuals.*

Julian Wood started his sociological career in the United Kingdom where he taught at London University. He currently lives in Australia and is a senior researcher at the University of Sydney. He has worked and published in the areas of gender studies, youth cultural studies, and globalization. His current research interests include the role of intellectuals and the financialization of civil society.