Re-Thinking Masculinity: Discourses of Gender and Power in Two Workplaces.

Matthew Shepherd

Thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Geography,

University of Sheffield.

September 1996

Re-Thinking Masculinity: Discourses of Gender and Power in Two Workplaces.

Matthew Shepherd

Abstract

The proliferation of academic studies of men and 'masculinity' in the last twenty years has mirrored the growth of feminist studies of women and gender relations. This thesis reflects upon these theoretical developments and examines the expression of 'masculinity' amongst employees in two contrasting workplaces in Yorkshire. Adopting a Foucauldian approach, it is suggested that 'masculinity' should be analysed as a set of practices which create, maintain and reinforce inequalities between the sexes and that their achievement is situationally contingent. From this perspective, masculinity can only be understood within a framework of power, conceptualised as relational, productive and existent only in its exercise. Critical evaluation of the 'masculinity' literature demonstrates that conventional conceptualisations of 'masculinity' have produced methodological impasses, of which the most problematic is the conflation of 'masculinity' with the study of men. The thesis proposes an alternative framework which recognises that discourses of 'masculinity' relate to the words and actions of women as well as of men and that 'masculinity' is most profitably understood as a series of discourses - transcending the scale of the individual - which set out the 'rules', expectations and conditions within which everyday gender relations take place.

The empirical investigation of these ideas adopts a qualitative approach. In-depth, repeated interviews focusing upon participants' work experiences and home lives were carried out with men and women from the two workplaces - an academic department within a university and a manufacturer of metal products. Interview transcripts were interpreted using an "analysis of discourses" method. The analysis reveals that despite obvious differences in the labour processes of the workplaces, there is considerable continuity in dominant discourses of 'masculinity' regardless of participants' age, social class and, most significantly, sex. These discourses are identified as "reproduction", "breadwinning", "homemaking" and "sexual objectification".

The research demonstrates how discourses of 'masculinity' structure gender relations within the workplace at an interpersonal scale - in everyday interactions - and at an organisational scale - as reflected by sexual divisions of labour. It is shown that these discourses can be space-specific, with the negotiation of power in gender relations often more difficult in the workplace than in the home. The thesis concludes by reflecting on the implications of the study for future research on men and 'masculinity' and for geographical studies of gender. It also discusses the potential for a more closely related research agenda between feminism and the study of 'masculinity'.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank everyone who has helped me through this research, in particular Peter Jackson for his support, encouragement, invaluable advice and the use of his books! Thanks are also due to Nicky Gregson for her help and encouragement.

I wish to thank many others for their help and guidance along the way. Daniel Gutting deserves a special mention for giving me friendship, discussions, support and a wonderful sense of humour. I would also like to thank all my fellow postgrads in the department, but particularly Tim Lucas, and also Beth Longstaff.

The research would not have been possible without all the people who gave me their time to be interviewed, and to them I will remain indebted.

I would also like to thank my parents for keeping faith and my sister, Jane. My greatest thanks are reserved for Carol Talbot who has contributed more to this PhD than she could possibly imagine. Without her love, support, encouragement and ideas both me and the thesis would be considerably weaker.

Contents

List of Tables

PRECURSOR

PRECURSOR

> masculinity may well be geography's best kept secret, highly influential in the discipline's history and so rarely subject to critical scrutiny. (Jackson 1993: 8)

It is now widely acknowledged that masculinity has been obscured from academic study and that it has been the "invisible" gender (Kimmel 1993a). Whilst feminist and women's studies have examined women's experiences and the construction of femininity, parallel studies of men have remained comparatively few. However, there is a growing body of work within gender studies devoted to the investigation of men and masculinity. Masculinity is now being 'problematised' (Ramazanoglu 1992). This issue forms the focus of the thesis. Through the presentation and discussion of empirical research in two workplaces the thesis questions the concept of masculinity and contributes to debates on gender in the geographical discipline. It considers why and how masculinity should be studied and indicates ways in which it might be beneficially re-thought. It concludes that masculinity must be understood as substantially more than the 'actions of men' and that its operation is highly complex, dependent upon the construction of discourses which serve as constraining forces upon people's identities, everyday lives and experiences. The Precursor outlines the background to this research, discusses the academic context within which it took place, and sets out the structure of the thesis.

My interest in 'masculinity' pre-dated the research, although not consciously. Despite questioning the differences of men and women and pondering my own uncertain relation to dominant images of men, I had not theorised this as masculinity, nor had I considered it to fall within the scope of geographical study. However, the research process has developed a consciousness in me that not only are debates on masculinity important to geography and geographers, but also that personal experience is a useful and valid point of entrance into academic study:

> the initial impetus of the study came from my own observations and experiences [...] which did not 'fit' with theoretical models current at that time. [They were also part of] guiding the choice of interview topics and in informing the insights of analysis. (Dyck 1993: 54)

My lived experiences and interests as a man 'who can recognise injustice when he sees it' (Connell 1987: xi) are as pivotal to the products of the research as academic theories and stimuli and have therefore shaped the direction of the study. In this way, feminism has formed an important force behind this research - academically and personally - with its illustration that sex forms a major vehicle for social inequalities.

Both the role of feminism within the study of masculinity (which will be discussed at length in Part One) and the relation between men and feminism have remained ambivalent. This should not exclude the two being mutually informing. It will be argued that feminist theory is essential to the understanding of masculinity and that insights from masculinity studies can be of significance to feminism (the prospects for a more closely related research agenda between feminism and masculinity are considered in Part Four). Its current minimal occurrence reflects shared suspicion. This study argues the need for dialogue to create a more significant engagement between feminism and research on masculinity. Whilst the value of this has been noted, its undertaking in academic practice is uncommon:

> essential though research specifically on women is, feminist research (as opposed to women's studies) must not become *confined* to this. Feminist research must be concerned with all aspects of social reality and all participants in it. It seems obvious to us that any analysis of women's oppression *must* involve research on the part played by men in this. (Stanley and Wise 1993: 31)
> the latent effect of seeing feminist research as being exclusively about women's lives is that it allows things male to go uninvestigated almost as though the idea of the male-as-norm were not being questioned, with only the female 'deviation' needing investigation and explanation. (Leyland 1987: 42)

The potential for a feminist approach to masculinity will be discussed throughout the thesis, and it is suggested that the understanding of masculinity must be positioned within a feminist informed theoretical framework.

Simultaneously it is hoped to illustrate the continuing significance of feminism to 'malestream' geography; historically it has been regarded as irrelevant to the discipline:

> What tend, somewhat dismissively, to be termed 'women's issues' were excluded from consideration for many years on one or several of four grounds - that they are trivial; that they are at the wrong spatial scale, for example the domestic; that the methods used to examine these issues are not respectable (not science, inappropriate to geography); that the work is biased, subjective or, worse, political. (McDowell 1992a: 404)

The research of gender from a feminist perspective within geography has shifted from descriptive studies of the geography of women to investigation of gendered power relations (Bowlby 1992). Rose (1993a) identifies a number of areas of study that feminist geographers have been particularly concerned with: the debates over public and private spaces; gender and development; the interlinking of patriarchy, capitalism and race; the acknowledgement of differences amongst women; and the grounding of understanding in material social relations. Rose (1993a) also insists upon the recognition of work that reiterates the importance of differences between the genders (although, perhaps, it is more profitable to study explicitly the differences in *power*

between the genders). With growing interest in gender rather than the geography of women *per se*, attention has also turned to the investigation of masculinity (such as Jackson 1991), the connections between masculinity and power (McDowell 1993) and particularly towards the "masculinist" nature of the geographical tradition (see Bondi and Domosh 1992 and Rose 1993b, and Foord 1994 for discussion of masculinism specifically within economic geography; and Pile 1994 on the masculinism of dualistic epistemologies in the discipline).

A significant change in the study of gender within geography has occurred in the 1990s which can be traced to the increasing engagement of geographers with intellectual developments outside of the discipline. To state the effect before the cause, the consequence has been a radical shift in what is considered 'geography' and what is considered 'gender': there is increasing concern with the metaphorical conceptualisation of space (see Keith and Pile 1993), beyond "Euclidean space" to the imagined (Crang 1994: 677); there are changes of scale, with study less focused on macro-processes and more on the micro-scales of the domestic (such as Gregson and Lowe 1994) and the body (such as Cream 1995); there is discontent with the singular, so that talk is of geographies, genders and sexualities. These are, perhaps, the products of postmodern critiques that emphasise difference and multiplicity and which have called for the end of meta-narratives (Lyotard 1984), and of the highly influential Foucauldian philosophical critiques of sex and gender presented by Judith Butler (1990a, 1993) which have led to a "queer" turn in geography (Rose 1994). As a result, there has been a proliferation of studies applying the concept of "performativity" in the geography of sexualities (such as Bell *et al* 1994, Bell and Valentine 1995), the attempted spatialisation of these theories (see contributions in Pile and Thrift 1995), and a questioning of identity politics and feminism specifically through the suggestion that there is no pre-discursive sex upon which gender is constructed. As a result, there has been a thorough questioning of geographical certainties, contributing to a deepening identity crisis for the discipline (although others, such as Hanson 1992, believe the renewed concern with difference reflects inherently geographical concerns).

This has been coupled with the "cultural turn" in geography more generally, with a greater significance placed upon the investigation of consumption, arguably to the

detriment of the continued study of the social and the economic (see Gregson 1995)[1].
There is also an increasing influence on geographic thought of Foucauldian forms of
analysis which it is argued have turned attention towards the analysis of discourses
(which is thought to prioritise language at the expense of the material) as opposed to
more geographical traditions of observation and action. The Foucauldian "turn"
appears to have much to offer geography as a discipline. Foucault's theorising has
been adopted by some geographers, prompted by his own (uncertain) relationship with
Geography - which he summarised as using "measure, inquiry and examination"
(Foucault 1980a: 75) - and who appeared to feel geographers have regarded their
subject unreflexively (witness his rather defensive dialogue with geographers in
Foucault 1980a). Despite this, there has been a great deal of importance attached to
Foucault's comments that "the history of *powers*" would be a history "written of *spaces*"
(Foucault 1980a: 149) and that "space is fundamental in any exercise of power"
(Foucault in Rabinow 1986: 252). His more explicitly geographical comments on
space and spatial metaphors have been utilised by geographers as evidence of the
importance of geography (note Philo 1992), whilst his empirical studies of institutions,
notably of prisons (Foucault 1977) and mental institutions (Foucault 1965, 1967), have
stimulated consideration by geographers (such as Driver 1985, Parr and Philo 1995)
who have developed upon the concept of panopticism and self-surveillance (although
see Porter 1996 for a damning critique). Foucault's "archaeological" method (Foucault
1971, 1972) - which informed this study - has remained particularly under-utilised
amongst geographers (although strongly influential in Gregory 1994 and adopted
effectively by Ogborn 1995). Working against the backdrop of these significant
changes that some branches of the discipline are reacting to, this study is an attempt
to utilise the challenges to received academic wisdom that Foucault's analyses have
offered (notably in Foucault 1972) towards a social geography that recognises the
importance of discourses within a conceptualisation which includes practice (although,
admittedly, future studies need to attend more emphatically to participant observation
of practices than this research has been able), and presents an empirical study which
has applied Foucauldian principles.

The original rationale of the study was to locate "the spaces and places of masculinity".
The objective was to examine the social construction of masculinities, to understand
the complexity and diversity of their construction (to explain how and why they are

---

[1] du Gay (1996) notes that 'culture' now dominates all the social and human sciences, but welcomes the
opportunities this brings for a more integrated study of production and consumption.

constructed in these ways), and to discover the meaning of masculinity for different types of men. Additionally, the aim was to distinguish the geographies of these constructions and the importance of the role of space and place. Finding a specific focus for the study of masculinity proved difficult; originally the contexts were to be football and football stadia, then advertising and the consumption of adverts, and then the spatial domains of the street, home and workplace (reflecting the call for the investigation of these spatial domains as vital in the maintenance of the gender regime in Connell 1987). Latterly, interest became centred more particularly upon the workplace and the relation of experiences of masculinity across work and home spaces. It had been anticipated that differences in the constitution of masculinity would be found between a 'mental' and a 'manual' workplace and so between middle class men and working class men, as had been illustrated in Tolson's (1977) discussion of the development of masculinity amongst men of different social positioning. Significantly, this thesis reveals these differences to have been over-stated.

The primary research objective was to discuss topics identified in the literature as constitutive or reflective of masculine identities in those spaces important to their construction. Great significance has been attached to the function of 'work' in the formation of masculine identity (note Bertaux-Wiame 1981) and it is thought central to "men's public identity" (Lewis 1983: 120). Since geographical investigation of masculinity has been most concerned with its expression in financial services (McDowell and Court 1994, 1995) and "high-tech" industries (Henry and Massey 1994, Massey 1995), in this study it was hoped to compare two distinct types of workplace - shop floor culture and a university academic department - and importantly to focus on workplaces with a mix of male and female employees to allow a thorough investigation of gender relations at work. Shop floor work has been regarded as particularly significant to masculinity (note Collinson 1988), and while there have been no empirical studies of masculinity in academia, universities have been highlighted as sites of contested power relations (Scott 1984, McAuley 1987, Ramazanoglu 1987, McDowell 1990, Rose 1994). However, recruitment problems of shop floor workers for this project resulted in the comparison of the academic workplace with predominantly management and former shop floor workers at a metal manufacturing company (although the two workplaces were still broadly characterised as 'middle' and 'working' class). 'Home' has also been identified as influential on masculinity, especially the separation of 'home' and 'work' spheres by men, with the implication that there are

distinct 'work' and 'home' masculinities. The literature has posited 'home' and 'work' spaces as increasingly important locations for the development of gender identities as unemployment for men and growing employment for women has broken down traditional strict spatial separation of the sexes (Wheelock 1991). This has been heightened by the politics of the domestic economy (note Oakley 1974, Dowling and Pratt 1993, Moore 1993) as a central concern of feminist action. Therefore, it was felt important to explore these topics and domains at length in the interviews, as well as a range of other issues including attitudes towards women at 'home' and at 'work', relationships with family and leisure interests (Hood 1993). Interestingly, the strategy employed in this method "did not work". What it was hoped the interviews on home and work would reveal did not necessarily emerge. The clearly different answers from men and women that had been expected did not materialise. This prompted reconsideration of the objectives and theory of the research.

In many ways, the rationale employed in the research corresponds to the critique presented in Part One, namely that the "data collection" stage was entered with preconceptions and stereotypes about 'masculinity' and the respondents. A tendency for this in masculinity research has been noted:

> there may be a kind of stereotyping of stereotypes and investigations of masculinity will go where it is conventionally expected to find masculinity, that is on the sports field, in the army or in solidly male work groups. (Morgan 1992: 42)

It had been hoped to replicate findings from the masculinity literature that men are emotionless (Bowl 1985), openly homophobic (Kimmel 1994), completely rational (Seidler 1989), violent (Hanmer 1990, Hearn 1993), aggressive (Messner 1990a) etc. and that these signifiers are more obvious amongst working class men (Tolson 1977, Willis 1977), and then to 'map' (Pile and Thrift 1995) the different forms of masculinity which were disclosed. This was challenged in the research: the 'results' did not fit the theory. As the research developed, it became obvious that *commonalities* between different people were highly significant, as were questions of how similar ways of being were expressed by different means. It was discovered how "differences" are frequently discursively constructed: they are invoked for a purpose, not existing "in reality". The challenge became to theorise situations and individuals outside of the dominant framework of "masculine" traits and categories but which / who are implicated in 'patriarchal' value systems nevertheless. Rather than making the interview material conform to the expectations, the expectations had to be re-theorised using the findings.

In other words, the research highlighted the problems that can occur from the imposition of frameworks onto findings and of 'selective reading' of interview material. This is not to be taken as an argument for "objectivity", being "unbiased" or "scientific", but for remaining critical of one's aims and intentions. For example, one interviewee described their characteristics, attitudes and personality; combined with analysis of what was said during the interview it was possible to describe this person as strong willed, very determined, confident, career orientated, defensive, independent from friends / a loner, very aggressive and confrontational:

> I get quite aggressive, I've been brought up to always have a say in things, and if I don't get a say in anything, I get aggressive, having a good old slanging match, well, not a slanging match, but having a discussion with them and telling them not to treat me like an idiot, I've got more upstairs than what they give me credit for.

Other characteristics included having "a bad attitude", being forceful, assertive, opinionated and "stroppy" which all contrasted with their partner, who is laid back, meek, quiet and dependent upon people. Conventional frameworks of masculinity analysis would define this person as very "masculine", a typical man, someone who displays many of the traits usually associated with traditional men: dominating and uncompromising (compare with a similar characterisation made in Morgan 1992: 56-57). But such ways of thinking cannot account for this "aggressive" person being a woman, Emma, and the 'subordinate' partner being her husband[2]. Such examples illustrate the need for theory to be flexible and not constraining. It must be able to theorise beyond the confines of stereotypes; it is neither sufficient to label Emma "a masculine woman" or as having an "assertive femininity" nor necessary to try to categorise aspects of her personality as reflective of her gender identity. To do this would reinforce essentialist theory that people's character is determined by their sex. Therefore, such findings raise an alternative set of questions, such as: 'what determines characteristics as "masculine"?' and 'how are women to be theorised in the study of masculinity?' Similar examples changed the focus for research; rather than concentrating analysis upon labelling an individual as, for example, aggressive, it suggests analysis needs to be concerned with the *consequences* of actions which are aggressive. Hence, understandings are liable to change as research progresses and this needs to be accounted for in analysis. This is as true for this study as any other. Whilst the original objective had been to locate the geography of masculinity, from the findings it had to be accepted that it was more necessary to question the conceptualisation - the basis - of masculinity itself, and then relate this to the geographical imagination.

---

[2] See Campbell, A. (1993) for an account of aggression in women, which dismisses the gendering of aggression as 'masculine'.

Therefore, the aims of the thesis changed during the course of the research. Rather than locating the spaces and places of masculinity and carrying out a "mapping" exercise, a new set of objectives evolved:

- to reconceptualise the notion of masculinity, incorporating postmodernist critiques and retaining a feminist political standpoint;
- to build upon the increasingly substantial masculinity literature, but to remain sensitive to feminist critiques of it;
- to achieve an understanding of masculinity within a Foucauldian theoretical framework of power;
- to derive, and to apply, this conceptualisation within an empirical context using interview material gathered in the case study workplaces;
- to contribute an empirical study of masculinity to a body of work which has remained ethnographically under-researched;
- to gain an improved understanding of the geographies and sociologies of gender and to evaluate future prospects for such research;
- to apply geographical understandings and knowledges to the study of masculinity and therefore to increase the level of engagement by geographers in this interdisciplinary field of research.

This final point has proved especially important. For whilst most research has abstractly studied dis-embodied and un-placed conceptualisations of masculinity, geographical concern with 'reality' has hopefully stimulated this research to attend to social issues which have been appropriately "grounded".

The overall result has been the iterative production of a theory based in the literature and on empirical findings. Therefore, it is important to note that the conventional form of a thesis does not permit the accurate description of this process. The sequential nature and structure perhaps creates a false impression of the development of the practical aspects of the research and of the theory. At no point until the final form of the thesis has the development been so straightforward. The remainder of the thesis may unravel a 'story' of the research: review of the literature leading logically to the theory which determined the interview research and which neatly structured the 'results'. This is not the case, it was much more unstructured and unexpected, mutation rather than evolution. The combination of stimulating literature, "problem" research and personal experience determined the direction of the investigation. The

following presents not the end point for the exploration of masculinity, but the start for further questioning.

This apology therefore precedes a linear presentation of the material. Part One is divided into four main sections. "Understanding Masculinity" focuses upon the development of masculinity research since its naissance in the 1970s. It illustrates the progress of both popular and academic understandings of the subject, and discusses the multidisciplinary approaches adopted in its study. It raises the key issues to have been explored and highlights a series of methodological problems which it is argued have impeded the study of masculinity from truly being the study of gender. Critically investigating the impulse towards postmodern approaches, it is suggested that a Foucauldian "genealogy" of masculinity hints towards more radical prospects for the continuing study of the concept and contemplates the value of incorporating feminist politics. "Re-Defining Masculinity" builds upon the previous section, assessing the critical arguments to propose a reconceptualisation of masculinity which is based within a framework of power. Contemplating various theoretical studies of power, it is shown how a Foucauldian understanding offers a number of advantages to the student of gender, particularly its emphasis upon the relational nature of power in everyday interactions. However, it is stressed that Foucault's work is best incorporated with certain aspects of traditional conceptualisations of power to allow for a better understanding of how people become *differentially* positioned in relations of power. The discussion then centres upon 'discourse' as the means of the articulation of power, and relates this more specifically to masculinity to conclude that masculinity is situationally contingent. "The Spatialisation of Masculinity" explores the constitution of 'home' and 'work' spaces, illustrating the role that space plays in the exercise of masculinity. In this way it provides contextual material for the empirical findings of the thesis. The final section of Part One, "Researching Masculinity", describes the empirical research process by providing details on the study workplaces and the individuals who were interviewed. It details the research methodology and outlines some of the topics of conversation that were engaged in, before relating the material to the forms of analysis which were undertaken. This concludes that an analysis of discourses proved the most profitable method.

Part Two is the first of two parts which reflect upon the empirical findings of the study. It begins by relating the theoretical concept of discourses directly to empirical examples from the research. In doing so it develops the notion of "dominant

discourses" and illustrates the analytical problem of the contradictions which exist in the discourses-intentions-practices nexus. It moves on to illustrate examples of dominant discourses, focusing upon the discourse of reproduction. It discusses the dilemma that women are expected to face between having children and having a career as a discourse of masculinity, and shows how the two labels - "career woman" and "mother" - are discursively constructed and negotiated amongst the research participants. The discourses of "breadwinning" and "home making" are considered as dialectically constructed, and it is suggested that the vital component of their construction is the practising of masculinity between the spaces of 'home' and 'work'. In discussing the negotiation of these discourses it is considered whether the concept of "changing men" (Segal 1990) has an empirical reality. The example of Brian focuses upon his spatialised discourses of masculinity and concludes that his 'double-voiced discourse' contains elements of the neo-traditionalist "men's rights" ideology. Emma exemplifies the 'successful' contestation of power relations in the home, but also exemplifies the entrenchment of discourses in the workplace and the difficulty and inability she has encountered in resisting power there. Discourses of sexual objectification are highlighted as a central means of differentially valuing the 'masculine' and the 'feminine', whilst the case study of Andrew demonstrates the endowment of this discourse within daily gender relations. The final section of Part Two attends to the situational contingency of masculinity by utilising interview and observational material. Focusing upon the two interviews with a married couple, Ned and Norma, it is illustrated how differently valued subject positions were actively forged by Ned drawing upon discourses of the sexes.

Part Three continues to examine the dominant discourses revealed during the research, but it changes its scale of focus to the organisational context of the workplaces. It first considers the "institutionalisation" of masculinity (Connell 1987). It is argued that institutionalisation is reflected in the two workplaces by sexual divisions of labour. At South Yorkshire Metal Products (SYMP) it emerges that this division is based upon the discursive construction of "sex differences", where men are constructed as physically superior to women and it is shown that this reasoning is invoked to explain the segregation of women into inferior jobs in the company. It is argued that the sexual division of labour in the academic department revolves around the discursive construction of teaching as the 'inferior' component of the lecturing job and it is shown how women have been channelled into the role of teachers in the Department. Both sets of examples reveal that discourses of women as "ancillary" to

men are dominant. The remainder of Part Three concentrates upon "important personalities". It is suggested that two individuals in the workplaces (Richard Brown at SYMP and Peter Collins in the Department) utilise their workplace authority to ensure that their own discourses of the sexes (which both value the 'masculine' more highly) gain acceptance and dominate in their respective workplaces. In-depth focus upon Richard proposes that his discourses are situationally contingent and rely upon a spatial separation of the work and home spaces. In the Department, Peter Collins is shown to have used his authority to differentiate tangibly between the sexes, but it is suggested that wider organisational structures, such as the university's Equal Opportunities policies, mediate this success (and are themselves mediated by their interpretation by individuals). The negotiation of institutional 'edicts' is discussed in relation to the use of "politically correct" language in universities, and it is conceded that the proliferation of non-sexist discourses in academia is likely to leave dominant discourses of the sexes largely unaffected. Part Three concludes with the proposition that relational understandings of power indicate the institutionalisation of masculinity to occur in everyday interactions between individuals and the ability of those people to have their discourses accepted as "truth".

In the final section, Part Four, a series of conclusions are drawn from the research process. Bringing together the arguments presented throughout the thesis, the conceptualisation of masculinity proposed in Part One is evaluated, and it is suggested that it could offer prospects for the future feminist study of masculinity. Drawing upon contemporary feminist theory, it is demonstrated that the involvement of men in feminism is perhaps less contentious than has previously been argued. Part Four concludes with a discussion of the continued role of men and feminism, and the study of masculinity, and relates the significance of these findings for geographical understandings of gender.

PART ONE:

"METHOD"

PART ONE

Similar to the "Method" outlined by Foucault (1978), Part One discusses developments in the literature (of masculinity) whilst simultaneously questioning the core concept - masculinity itself. Contemporary academic thinking on masculinity is best examined by focusing on the various frameworks and approaches adopted across disciplines. Part One highlights the traditions that have provided the foundation for this study and discusses the scope and limitations of current research and their consequences. It will become clear that masculinity research has inherited a legacy largely unsupportive of feminist agendas which try to uncover and transform the power inherent to gender relations. Part One critiques conceptualisations of masculinity and develops upon theories which understand gender relations as power relations as a project of re-thinking masculinity. It then proposes a reconceptualisation (that is developed and tested in Parts Two and Three) and outlines the methodology employed in the empirical research.

A. UNDERSTANDING MASCULINITY

The last twenty five years have witnessed a growing academic interest in men and masculinity (note, for instance, Brod and Kaufman 1994). The stimulus for this growth has been primarily from the Women's Liberation Movement / feminism and from Gay Liberation (Carrigan, Connell and Lee 1985). In particular, scholarly work throughout history has made reference to a generic 'man' to generalise the experiences of humankind. The consequence has been the exclusion of women and women's experiences and the need to make women 'visible' (see Rowbotham 1973). However, it has also been observed that the generic use of 'man' does not refer to the specific experiences of men as men, but rather treats subjects as genderless. This has stimulated interest in uncovering what life is like for men through exploration of masculinity and its relation to men's identities, as a parallel to investigations of women and women's identities of femininity. Just as the 'second-wave' of feminism centred upon women's "consciousness-raising" as a means to discover and understand sexual oppression, the 1970s saw the start of similar groups for men to discuss their lives as men, their role in the oppression of women, and the ways that they too are oppressed by sexism:

> The central theoretical proposition of the 1970s masculinity literature, even if it sometimes remained implicit, was that men are oppressed in a fashion comparable to women. (Carrigan, Connell and Lee 1985: 567)

14

These groups prompted the first experiential oeuvre on men and masculinity, the product of 'anti-sexist men' such as Bradley *et al* (1971), Snodgrass (1977) and Tolson (1977), and a "radical anti-sexist men's magazine", *Achilles Heel*, was established in 1977. At the same time a loose formation of a "men's liberation movement" aligned itself with, and proclaimed support for, feminism and is typified by Farrell (1974) and Armistead (1975).[1]

This new interest in gender provided stimulus to existing 'sex role' research, a psychological approach of categorising the attitudes, characteristics and behaviours of the two sexes into 'ideal' masculine, feminine and androgynous roles. This formed the first sustained academic theorising of masculinity (such as Bem 1974, Pleck and Sawyer 1974, David and Brannon 1976; for examples of gendered traits, see Brannon 1985), and is on-going into the 1990s (note Pleck, Sonenstein and Ku 1993). However, it has been largely rejected as a viable way of understanding gender: "sex roles reinforce the popular notions of the 'otherness' of the opposite sex" (Kimmel 1994: 123); that is, it theorises only *differences*, so perpetuating a dichotomised notion of gender. The sex role concept fails to account for changes in gender relations and completely ignores the function of power within them (Connell 1987).

Focus on gender has progressively strengthened since the height of sex role studies in the mid- to late-1970s. As academic feminism has become more established its theories have questioned every aspect of academe, from the production of knowledge to the category of 'woman' itself. There is now a broad 'discipline' of women's, feminist and gender studies. Simultaneously, literature on men as a gender has flourished, although at a much smaller scale. Focus has been almost exclusively upon masculinity, men's identities and to a lesser extent men's role in the production of sexist oppressions. Similarly, "men's studies" has been established (see Brod 1987). This development has been viewed very cautiously. Opposition has been raised to its potential to attract funds which otherwise may be used to support 'women's issues' and so ultimately to be a way for men to dominate and control one of the few areas of study legitimised as women-centred. This caution has been accepted and reiterated by certain contributors to "men's studies" such as Hearn (1987, 1989), Connell (1987, 1995) and Morgan (1992) who are keen to accept the criticism of feminists such as Canaan and Griffin who see its growth as another way of creating "jobs for the boys" (1989: 7; see also 1990). Thus, Hearn and Morgan (1990: 204) encourage any

---

[1] The history of the men's movement is chronicled by Cooper (1990).

'critique of men' to be "anti-sexist, anti-patriarchal, pro-feminist and gay affirmative". This has not deterred others (such as Brod 1987, Kimmel 1987) from declaring 'men's studies' to be an essential contribution to changing gender relations, nor those (such as Farrell 1994) who feel it is essential to give men a 'voice' in the face of the onslaught from feminism that has made women the dominant sex. The increase in masculinity literature has continued unabated into the 1990s.[2] However, the position of masculinity studies has remained contradictory and in conflict with feminist goals of political change for equality between the sexes. What does it say?

DISCIPLINING MASCULINITY

The rapidly proliferating investigation of masculinity has not been restricted to any particular academic discipline. The social sciences, arts and humanities have all at least begun to make masculinity a topic of research and, indeed, it has been noted that research needs to be inter-disciplinary:

> It is no longer enough to take refuge in conventional psychological or sociological perspectives or on familiar disciplinary habits. The most interesting work will be interdisciplinary. (Griffin and Wetherell 1992: 165)

It is evident that the problematising of masculinity has begun: in sociology, Connell has stressed the importance of understanding masculinity as connected to labour relations, identity and oppressive gender relations (see Connell 1987, 1990, 1992, 1995; Connell, Davis and Dowsett 1993) whilst others (such as Seidler 1989, Kimmel 1993a, 1993b, Coltrane 1994) have complemented these ideas in trying to produce a social theory of masculinity; psychology has highlighted errant masculine behaviour (note Segal 1990; Miles 1992) and the psychoanalysis of gender formation (such as Richards 1990, Frosh 1994); in law and criminology investigation has centred on the role of masculinity in explaining why men commit more crime (Messerschmidt 1993, Newburn and Stanko 1994, *British Journal of Criminology* 1996, Collier 1996a); sport studies have shown the nature of sport to be masculinist and sexually discriminatory (note Cahn 1993, McKay 1993) and to contribute strongly to the formation of masculine identity (Messner 1990a, Messner and Sabo 1990, Haynes 1994) whilst McArdle (1996) has combined theories of sport, the law and sociology in an attempt to understand consequences of masculinity; in history a focus on continuity and change in men's identity has flourished (for example, Kimmel 1990, Roper and Tosh 1991); anthropology has focused upon cross-cultural comparisons of masculine identities (note Gilmore 1990, Cornwall and Lindisfarne 1994); cultural studies have focused on

---

[2] For a detailed history of gender research, particularly on masculinity, see Carrigan, Connell and Lee (1985) or Connell (1987).

16

the representation of masculinity on television (Lewis 1983, Fiske 1987), through magazines (Kervin 1990) and advertising (Skelly and Lundstrom 1981, Craig 1992, Jackson 1994), in film (Krutnik 1991), through style and fashion (Mort 1988, 1994, Nixon 1994) and upon psychoanalysis and symbolism in popular culture (for instance, Lewis 1985, Easthope 1986, Winning 1988, Simpson 1994); social work has emphasised the practical ways of dealing with men, masculinity and its more extreme forms as expressed in violence (Bowl 1985, Kivel 1992; see Newburn and Mair 1996 for a resume of current social work practice); education studies have highlighted prejudice towards men and the masculine (Holland, Blair and Sheldon 1995, Tett 1996) and the development of masculinity in boys of school age (Davidson 1990, Mac an Ghaill 1994a, Nayak and Kehily 1996); whilst queer theory has focused on gay men's identity, its relation to 'straight' masculinity and representations of gay men (note Edwards 1990, Dowsett 1993, Simpson 1994) and the potential for transgressing gender 'norms' (Butler 1990a, 1993).

Within geography there has been some engagement with the subject, first explicitly by Jackson (1991), although a more extensive and vibrant research agenda by feminists has placed some focus on it implicitly, such as McDowell and Massey's (1984) study of different forms and geographies of 'masculine' work. Attention has been given to the ways in which geography is masculinist (Rose 1993b, 1994, Berg 1994) and particular interest has been shown by economic geographers in gender and the workplace and the 'performance' of masculinity and femininity within it (such as Henry and Massey 1994, McDowell and Court 1994, 1995, Massey 1995) and as workplace geographies of surveillance and display (Crang 1994). Current work in progress is beginning to engage in empirical investigation of masculinity - within 'fostering' associations in Canada (Hopkins 1996), the production and consumption of masculine identities in advertising (Housiaux 1996) and the spatialising of masculinity within Vancouver (Sommers 1996). However, whilst geographical investigation has been most influenced by feminist theory and sociological approaches, somewhat surprisingly there has been no attempt to set out a serious spatial agenda for masculinity research to examine the spatial constitution and expression of masculinities.

Although a cross-disciplinary subject, the research of masculinity does have disciplinary specificities. The feminist psychologists Wetherell and Griffin (1991) (see also Griffin and Wetherell 1992) found a tendency for psychologists to focus upon men at the individual level and on masculinity outside of a social context, primarily to

understand the subjective experience of masculinity in explaining attitudes and behaviour. Amongst sociologists they found that feminism has been the key influence in prompting examination of masculinity within structural theories of power, structural relations in patriarchy and capitalism. An emphasis has also been placed on masculinit*ies*, that is, connections have been sought between gender, sexuality, 'race', class, age and culture. Feminist social scientists have concentrated upon ways male power is reproduced through concrete rituals of male self-expression. It should also be added that there has been very little empirical research on masculinity. Most analyses have been based upon personal observation, and studies which have illuminated men's experiences are very much the exception. The "ethnographic moment" (Jackson, P. 1995: 1875) has never materialised. This may explain why interest has been limited to only a few, continually re-examined topics such as the focus upon subjective experiences of masculinity and the formation of masculine identities.

KEY ISSUES IN MASCULINITY RESEARCH

This overview is by no means exhaustive but it does exemplify the quantity of work which now exists. Masculinity is being taken seriously as a topic for research - it is no longer the 'invisible' gender (Kimmel 1993a). It has been widely researched, or at least its *context* has. Masculinity in sport, in adverts, in law or in employment has been explored. But focus upon its relation to other issues, such as social oppressions, has been minimal. Disproportionate attention has been given to a few select "key issues", the most common of which has been reference to the idea that masculinity is "in crisis".

> The current concern to scrutinize masculinity - of which this book is one instance - may itself be interpreted as a symptom of masculinity in crisis. (Roper and Tosh 1991: 19)

Connell dismisses a general crisis as "ludicrous", but he does suggests that there are varying forms of "local crises" (Connell 1983: 32). This "crisis" creates a rationale for studying masculinity by setting it up as a problem urgently needing a solution. It finds advocates across the academic spectrum with its discussion as common in anti-feminist work as in pro-feminist, and is perhaps the uniting force between the two (note the 'dialogue' between Lyndon 1992 and Roberts 1992).

What is the crisis? Whilst its existence is not doubted, there is no consensus as to what it is composed of. For Hite (1994: 3) it is "a giant identity crisis in the western male soul". A similar suggestion has been put forward by Simpson, although he locates the crisis more specifically in the representation of men, where there has been "a puncturing of 'manly' visions in film, rock and roll, pornography, advertising and

sport" (Simpson 1994: 6). Brod (1990), on the other hand, links it to a 'general crisis of patriarchy' which he likens to Marx's general crisis of capitalism. Whilst Richards (1987) believes it is a crisis of sons not inheriting their fathers' masculine identities, Horrocks (1994) positions masculinity as 'fractured', 'fragile' and 'truncated', training men to be rational and violent, concretely developed in the relations of male infants with their parents: the crisis is that masculinity is a "precarious and dangerous achievement" (1). Miles (1992) claims that it is a crisis of violence, and Campbell, B. (1993) links it to rising unemployment. Arguing from a Marxist perspective, Hume (1996) posits the 'crisis' as an attack on masculine values designed to instil passivity in the working class.

The nature of the 'crisis' therefore remains a mystery. Similarly, there is little agreement on when it developed. Whilst Kimmel (1990) traces its inception over the last three centuries, it is most commonly dated to the growth of feminism. Bly (1990) accounts for its emergence in the emasculation of men by the oppressive dominance of feminism in modern western culture. Brittan relates it to attacks on male power:

> this crisis was brought about by the erosion of male power in the workplace and in the home. (Brittan 1989: 25)

Miles (1989) extends this to five points of evidence: women in the formal economy; mass unemployment weakening the male 'breadwinner'; lightened domestic duties for women; more resources for women to change their circumstances; and the decline of class based politics. Clearly, there is some consensus that its cause emanates from challenges to structures which have maintained 'male dominance' because of the changing social role of women:

> A decade or two of feminism has not only changed the world for women: it has produced a crisis of response for the thinking man. (Miles 1992: 19)
> What makes feminism a threat for so many men, or at least a source of confusion and struggle, is not only that we have privilege to lose, but that it appears - or at least feels - as if our very manhood is at stake. (Kaufman 1987b: xiv)

This challenge and this crisis are near universally regarded as negative. They are portrayed as threats that have left men bewildered as traditional ways of being or becoming a man have come to an end. As a consequence, there has been another preoccupation in the literature with changing masculinity towards new forms which can adapt to these new circumstances - new *identities* for men. The opinion, at best, is that equality for women is a good thing, but that an identity must be sought for men which accommodates this break with the past and acknowledges men's distinctive masculine identity. But is there a crisis? There have been few changes to structures of power which benefit men, there has certainly been no transformation in the value

system which underpins those structures, and it could even be suggested that "sexist oppression" is worsening - as evidenced in the growing culture of "laddishness" (which finds its apogee in the popular magazine *Loaded*) which "ironically" celebrates traditional manhood and sexism. Whilst *Living Marxism* claims debate "rages on in the media and the universities" (3), there is little evidence that society at large is at all aware that a crisis exists, or even that masculinity exists. "Crisis" suggests a decisive moment or turning point. Whilst the proliferation of men's lifestyle magazines, for instance, has been interpreted as a reflection of this crisis, it is difficult to assess this as a radical departure from existing gender relations. If there is a crisis in masculinity, it is a crisis in power. It is a reaction to instances where women have materially improved their lives, and an increased consciousness (if not its actualisation) that equality between the sexes is morally just. Thus, as will be argued fully in Part Four, the achievement of fairer gender relations must not be based in a politics of changing men's identity but in changing the actions and ideologies that uphold power structures. The vagueness surrounding the crisis of masculinity is matched (and is partly accounted for) by omission from study of a centrally important issue: the constitution of the object of knowledge - what is masculinity?

DEFINING MASCULINITY

Although there is general agreement across the disciplines that masculinity is an important research issue and although there are shared disciplinary research frameworks, there is no such agreement on the definition of masculinity. Indeed, there appears to have been little consolidated attempt to define the concept. It is important to be clear on what is meant by masculinity; the absence of a consistent, politicised definition has accelerated focus upon individual self-examination and "personal growth" therapeutic aspects of masculinity and limited focus upon social analyses aimed at transforming social structures.

Earlier 'academic' studies progressed from vague understandings of masculinity as the cultural expressions of physiological maleness (for example, Tiger 1969). Such viewpoints have remained popular today (note Greenstein 1993), and biology is still invoked to explain not only masculinity but the entire sociology of gender:

> Geneticists have discovered recently that the genetic difference in DNA between men and women amounts to just over three percent. That isn't much. However the difference exists in every cell in the body. (Bly 1990: 234)

Even those studies which are explicitly concerned with social aspects of masculinity still implicitly relate it with physiological sex to a degree:

in the end it is just a social institution with a tenuous relationship to that which is supposed to be synonymous: our maleness, our biological sex. (Kaufman 1987a: 13)

This suggests that the link is tenuous, but not that there is no link. As a consequence, masculinity has remained ill-defined and whenever the term is used in research its meaning is uncertain. This has led Segal (1990: x) to note that "the category 'masculinity' remains deeply obscure" and Connell (1990: 454) to proffer that "strictly speaking, there is no one thing that is masculinity". Obviously, a research category needs to be based on something more concrete. Most common are suggestions that masculinity is the set of signs which demarcates men from women:

What is masculinity? Roughly, it is the distinctive features of the character structure typical of men in patriarchal society. (Miles 1989: 49)
the concepts of "masculinity" and "femininity" (the behaviours, traits, and representations associated with the sexes). (Kervin 1990: 52-3)

Psychology, in particular, has reduced these signs to their significance for individuals:

The most common conception of the psychology of gender is that women and men as groups have different traits: different temperaments, characters, outlooks and opinions, abilities, even whole structures of personality. (Connell 1987: 167)

This introduces the production of subjectivity into the evaluation of masculinity. This is particularly significant because masculinity is commonly assumed to be a self-reflective assessment of how one "measures up" to social expectations of men and women:

'masculinity' is used to refer to the set of images, values, interests, and activities held important to a successful achievement of male adulthood. (Jeffords 1989: xii)
gender identity is the subjective sense that a man or woman has about his or her masculinity or femininity. (Brittan 1989: 20)

Of course, this raises questions of what are these characteristics against which one self-consciously reflects? Subsequently, masculinity has come to be equated with behaviours or attitudes commonly associated with men and with stereotypical characteristics of "real men". These traits are usually taken as a 'standard' form of masculinity, and basically refer to:

Someone who is aggressive, independent, unemotional, or hides his emotions; is objective, not easily influenced, dominant, likes maths and science; is not excitable in a minor crisis; is active, competitive, logical, worldly, skilled in business, direct, knows the ways of the world; is someone whose feelings are not easily hurt; is adventurous, makes decisions easily, never cries, acts as a leader; is self-confident; is not uncomfortable about being aggressive; is ambitious; able to separate feelings from ideas; is not dependent, nor conceited about his appearance; thinks men are superior to women, and talks freely about sex with other men. (Oakley 1981, cited in Morgan 1992: 56-57)

A more sophisticated theorising of "the real man" has been proposed by Connell (1987) with the concept of "hegemonic masculinity"[3] - the dominant cultural form of masculinity that serves as the 'handbook' for masculinity; it is

---

[3] Although see Donaldson (1993) for a questioning of the use of the term.

> a social ascendancy achieved in a play of social force that extends beyond
> contests of brute power into the organization of private life and cultural processes.
> (Connell 1987: 184)

It presents a public model of masculinity which may not be what most men are, but is very generally a model which is consented to (Ramazanoglu 1992: 343). In this formulation, masculinity is abstracted from a purely individual scale:

> a set of qualities or properties which may be said to be attached to men as a
> category rather than to particular men in particular situations. (Morgan 1987a: 188)

and abstracts masculinity from referring to individual men.

However, these theorisations retain a significant problem that persists in the literature. Masculinity is characterised as the behaviours, traits and representations of *men*. Masculinity remains a vague reflection of the actions and attitudes of men, and in this way parallel the 'common-sense' notions of gender - stereotypes of the sexes - that Connell (1995: 6) cautions against basing academic study upon. They are sterile concepts that hold men and women to *act* differently because they are *naturally* different. They produce a research logic to locate and account for *differences* between the sexes. This reduces masculinity to everything relating to men, and the study of masculinity becomes positivistic. It is noted that these approaches are

> not likely to lead to a science worth having. It is unmanageably vague: what action
> of any man in the world would *not* be an instance of masculinity? It would be
> impossible in such a framework to explore one of the main issues raised by
> psychoanalysis, the masculinity within women and the femininity within men.
> (Connell 1995: 43)

This prevents understandings of gender as *relational* and suggests instead that there are characteristics of men which are constant irrespective of geography or history and that are the product of 'nature'. The unintended consequence is that many studies reproduce the definition of masculinity as maleness and reiterate essentialist notions of masculinity and femininity as innate and immutable. A dichotomous understanding of gender based in biology persists. Given that this vacuum of meaning constitutes a fundamental weakness in the "science" of masculinity, there has been surprisingly little comment on it. Exceptionally, McMahon remarks:

> All the attributes of men discussed in the literature are spoken of as aspects of
> masculinity. It is remarkable how seldom writers of masculinity explicitly indicate
> what kind of concept they take masculinity to be. ... The usefulness of the concept
> is generally taken for granted, and what is offered is a description, frequently a list
> of traits ... The idealism and reification diagnosed earlier in the literature on male
> personality haunt the uses to which the idea of masculinity is put. Men's practices
> are the result of, or the expression of, masculinity. ... Barbara Ehrenreich noted
> how the "male role" became an explanatory cliché in academic and popular
> accounts of men. It is possible that "masculinity" is suffering the same fate.
> (McMahon 1993: 690-691)

In other words, the potential exists (and I would argue is being realised) for 'masculinity' to become an empty concept. Whilst it retains a catch-all meaning it will remain insufficient for the examination of gender. An equitable gender system will not, indeed cannot, be facilitated through investigation into every aspect of men and men's lives. Not every facet is relevant or important. Rather, there is need for a definition of masculinity which focuses upon those distinctive features which are relevant in understanding inequalities between the sexes, those which help explain how the existing gender order is maintained. Generalisation of men's experiences as masculinity has the consequence that no distinctions are made, for instance, between a man watching football or committing a serious sexual crime in that both are regarded as reflective of masculinity. Research needs to discern the significance of actions and their consequences. Masculinity is best understood as a sociological concept of power:

> as transcending the personal, as a heterogeneous set of ideas, constructed around assumptions of social *power*, which are lived out and reinforced, or perhaps denied and challenged, in multiple and diverse ways within a whole social system in which relations of authority, work and domestic life are organised, in the main, along hierarchical gender lines. (Segal 1990: 287)

This is not possible when utilising ill-defined frameworks of masculinity or when reproducing the methodological concerns which the following sections identify.[*]

a) NO ADMITTANCE: MEN ONLY

The selection of research subjects remains highly significant to the current problems. The continuing focus solely upon men has had a dual effect. It has narrowly confined gender to pre-defined, stereotyped categorisations. It has constrained potential conceptualisations of masculinity and by taking as its frame of reference actions observed being done only by men, the inference has been that they are only done by men. If masculinity is a social construction (Reynaud 1983), why should its use be limited only to men? There is a deafening hush from and about women and femininity. Calls to consider the two concepts (and indeed the two sexes) as dialectical have gone unheard. Connell (1995) has urged thinking beyond masculinity as only about men and femininity being only about women. But within empirical research on different masculinities *only* men are spotlighted as the subject of investigation. This is repeated in virtually every study[4], including Connell's own, where he focuses upon the lives of four particular groups of men, with women featuring only in passing or as things talked

---

[*] The arguments rehearsed here draw upon Shepherd (1997a).

[4] Although note Sedgwick (1996).

about in discussion (as objects to be "fucked", a term to which Connell himself raises no objection). Consequently, masculinity becomes defined by the actions and words of men. This perpetuates the equation of masculinity with everything said and done by men and femininity with everything said and done by women, preventing common themes from being revealed. Empirical research must consider both women and men if gender *relations* are to be understood. By looking only at men in a study of masculinity, the similarities of people's (male and female) discourses and practices are overlooked, eliminating from analysis ways in which women may contribute to sexual inequalities as may do men (an issue recognised by Fitzsimons 1996 and Wells 1996). The intention of most masculinity studies has been to draw distance from essentialist understandings of masculinity, but this has not been achieved. There is recognition that masculinity and maleness are not the same thing, but this methodological approach reiterates this reduction.

b) REIFICATION OF SEX "DIFFERENCES"

An effect of this one-sex focus is the reification of sexual "differences", however unintentionally. Carrigan, Connell and Lee (1985) and Segal (1993) note that research into "sex differences" has consistently uncovered more similarity between the sexes than difference, but that the differences which are found are exaggerated in the writing up of results. However, even in progressive conceptualising, authors find a similarly *huge* gulf between masculinity and femininity. Sex role research is criticised for magnifying differences, but effectively this is repeated in many pro-feminist accounts as well. Rubin (1975) has expressed that gender identity is not so much about natural differences as the suppression of natural similarities. Over-emphasis on difference can have very negative impacts. In one of this thesis's case studies, the discursive construction of sex "differences" formed the justification for discrimination in favour of male workers and against female workers - "differences" were also constructed as inferiorities: "differences" are invoked to create hierarchies (Foucault 1978). In many ways acts of men and women do not differ and are much more similar than different, particularly in that they both generally benefit men. The importance of understanding similarities is masked by the perpetual stressing of differences in the constructed discourses of men and women. It is the discursive construction of sex differences which forms the foundation for the practice of masculinity - without the emphasis on differences the 'justification' for the differential treatment of the sexes would not exist. Differences *within* the sexes are also suppressed, so that men's experiences are generalised as the 'norm', and all women are deemed to be the "same". Stressing

differences is beneficial to men because they are forged into the "important" role: in my example women occupy jobs which are ancillary to men.

Continuing emphasis upon difference has largely been a response to postmodernism. It has rightly pressured for differences between people to be recognised, and celebrated: people are not all the same, there is a great diversity. However, accepting this philosophy may have had some less favourable consequences for masculinity research. Most researchers now stress that there is no such thing as a single masculinity, that rather we should be talking about a multiplicity of *masculinities*. Together with the focus solely on men, the result is to draw false distinctions between men and women. Diversity amongst men is recognised, but similarity between the sexes is not developed. There is little questioning of the significance of differences.

c) THE TROUBLE WITH MASCULINITIES

Conceptualisation within a pluralised framework has served as an attempt to avoid the reduction of everything said or done by men as reflective of masculinity and to dispel the ensuing generalisation that "all men are the same". It has been suggested that there are different aspects of identity, practices, attitudes and behaviours which produce a multiplicity of forms of masculinity. This pluralisation has become a recurring theme in pro-feminist masculinity literature (note, for example, Brod and Kaufman 1994), whilst essentialist expositions (such as Bly 1990) have clung to a notion of a single, natural, biologically driven masculinity. To admit to plurality is regarded as a very positive progression:

> It is a project that seeks to deconstruct masculinity as a singular, monolithic category capable of being used against marginal groups, and to reconstruct masculinities as a set of possible gendered identities, each different, and all equal. (Kimmel 1993a: 35)

The academic impulse to urge the recognition and investigation of a pluralised masculinity as the only acceptable method for its study - "an identification of the plurality of masculinities are the beginnings of the deconstruction of dominant masculine doxa" (Conway-Long 1994: 63) - is characteristic of much contemporary research and is viewed as an important step towards changing gender relations. That there is not a single characteristic maleness is a notion that should be strongly endorsed. However, the adoption of a pluralised notion of masculinities has, perhaps, been accepted too uncritically. Its use is overly optimistic and simplistic. It has been grasped as if it were solving all the problems associated with the conflation of maleness and masculinity. In effect, it is no less biologically fixed.

The difference with pluralisation is that masculinity is broadened to permit differentiation by class, race, religion, sexuality etc. For instance, Hearn and Collinson (1994: 109) list "references of identity" that cut across the typology of a unified masculinity. These are age, appearance, bodily facility, care, economic class, ethnicity, fatherhood and relations to biological reproduction, leisure, marital and kinship status, mind, occupation, place, religion, sexuality, size and violence. The imagined result of combining these references would be to produce a complex grid whose ultimate consequence would be either to suggest that each individual man's personality is a unique form of masculinity, or to create multiple masculinities where any men who share any common attributes are classified as sharing the same masculinity. Such a conceptualisation is firmly tied with the positivistic concept of masculinity discussed above: "what action of any man in the world would *not* be an instance of masculinity?" (Connell 1995: 43). Whilst Connell (1995:114) forcefully states "We cannot define their personalities as types of masculinity", this is precisely what does happen in countless studies of men. The end result is consistently inaccurate for it is implied that there is, for example, *a* white, middle-class, gay masculinity or *a* black, working class, straight masculinity to which *all* men with those attributes fit. There is much talk of "black masculinities" (for instance, Mercer and Julien 1988, Westwood 1990, Mac an Ghaill 1994b), but this suggests that being black accounts for any differences in ways of being or, worse, that being black *causes* certain ways of being. Behaviour is not necessarily different between white and black men or, indeed, between working class and middle class men. Although there are important differences to be recognised, creation of false distinctions must be avoided. The characterisations still assume essentially that masculinity is inherently *male*, and that femininity is inherently *female*. Whilst attempting to admit multiplicity, there are homogenising effects nonetheless.

Whilst there is on-going encouragement to talk of a "fluidity of identity" (for example, Gutterman 1994), what is really meant is that there is scope for differences within a still very rigid notion of identity, such as masculinity. Perhaps it is more accurate to talk not so much of masculinities, as differences within masculinity. This suggests that reference to a "multiplicity" of masculinities is a fallacy; there are still basically two gender identities - masculinity and femininity. As Butler (1990a) has argued, there are limitless potential ways of "performing" gender identities, but there are boundaries placed around this potential by the regulating framework of power relations that

basically tie gender performance to sex (although drag is discussed as a way of subverting sexed gender; see also Bell and Valentine 1995 for a discussion of these arguments in relation to sexuality).

Therefore, much of the masculinity literature is one step ahead of itself: ways to categorise and explain masculinit*ies* are being sought before masculinit*y* itself has been delimited. Despite being an important first step away from essentialism, reference to the plural does not come any closer to explaining many of the key issues of concern in gender relations. In particular, talking about masculinity in the plural still does not explain how and why the exercise of power predominantly remains open to men:

> men's relative power, authority, and status compared to women ... seems to stay much the same, whatever the diversity of masculinities. (Segal 1993: 626)

Even by recognising differences between men and different men's personalities in this conceptualisation, Segal acknowledges that masculinities do not account for male access to power. Similarly,

> Of course men have changed, and some men have not. *But whether or not change in particular men's practices or sensibilities serves to undermine or merely perpetuate the power relations of gender is a far trickier issue.* (Segal 1993: 637; emphasis in original)

Explaining male power requires a conceptualisation less concerned with every aspect of men and men's lives and more interested in uncovering those specific aspects which uphold the sexual inequalities which generally benefit men:

> We need to recognize that men are a gender class, in terms of their power over women, but deconstruct at the same time the monolithic implications of that. (Hearn in Wetherell and Griffin 1991: 383)

However, it is vital to remember that "The disintegration of history into a multiplicity of voices does not make all narratives equal" (Ramazanoglu 1996: 21) - to simply study a multiplicity of masculinities is insufficient if the differences in power relations between each is not acknowledged and challenged.

d) REDUCTION OF STRUCTURE

Another methodological problem stems from the scale of research at which the study of masculinity is focused. Connell (1987) has proposed that an important component of understanding masculinity is the understanding of power. He has insisted that masculinity be examined above and beyond the scale of the individual, that it involves labour relations, power and cathexis (emotional attachment) - it is not just about individual men:

> In common-sense understanding gender is a property of individual people ... It is a considerable leap to think of gender as being also a property of collectivities,

institutions and historical processes ... There are gender phenomena of major
importance which simply cannot be grasped as properties of individuals, however
much properties of individuals are implicated in them. (Connell 1987: 139)

The call is for research to place men as its object of study within a wider social context

and a specific context of workplace and employment relations. Masculinity is about

practices which are institutionalised. This idea has been acknowledged and supported

in theory, but has been neglected in practice. This is not to deny that there have been

studies of masculinity within organisations (for example, Cockburn 1983, Collinson

1988 and McDowell and Court 1994, 1995 within workplace settings, and Willis 1977,

Mac an Ghaill 1994a and Nayak and Kehily 1996 within educational establishments),

but rather to emphasise that these constitute a minority. The overwhelming emphasis

has been upon the individual. This is partly the result of an interest in psychology. As

a discipline its focus has remained upon individual men, particularly aberrant men.

The major growth area of masculinity literature has been in "pop" psychology

discussing men "connecting" with themselves and other men, celebrating manhood

(distinctively different from being a woman) and about finding one's true masculinity,

invariably meaning "the wildman" - the enduring qualities of man the hunter, man the

protector and the man the dominator sex (Bly 1990, Keen 1991). This publishing

division has been massively popular: Bly's *Iron John* sold over one million copies in the

USA and has spawned the mytho-poetic men's movement and its concern with

maintaining men as the leading sex in the face of "emasculating" feminism. This

movement has pervaded popular culture, clearly influencing television shows such as

Home Improvement and films, notably *The Unforgiven* (Simpson 1994). It has also re-

popularised 'men's groups' where men come together to discuss their feelings and to

"heal the wound" but with a regressive potential (see Kimmel and Kaufman 1994,

Connell 1995, Pfeil 1995, Bonnett 1996 and Collier 1996a for various degrees of

criticism of the movement):

Men's groups, like women's support groups, run the risk of overemphasising
personal change at the expense of political analysis and struggle. (hooks 1984: 72)

In the academic masculinity literature this trend has been followed, however

unwittingly. Studies of male power have shared many of pop psychology's concerns,

focusing upon men's feelings of powerlessness rather than upon the institutionalisation

of male power. The effect has been neglect of structures which uphold and maintain

masculinity and concentration on how men and men's personalities are constructed,

largely outside of reference to gender relations.

e) THE "HISTORY" OF "MASCULINITY"

Much of this criticism is equally valid for historical studies of masculinity. This is not to deny that there have been interesting historical examinations (Davidoff and Hall 1987, Mangan and Walvin 1987 and Kimmel and Mosmiller 1992 are three interesting examples). Rather, that they contribute to the reproduction of contemporary assumptions about masculinity. Connell (1995: 185-203) has attempted to trace 'The History of Masculinity'; as he says, "Masculinities are, in a word, historical" (185). However, by focusing upon the causes of the formation of the modern gender order through history (with a focus on the key period of 1450-1650), it becomes a search for 'causes' that fit present day conceptions of masculinity, rather than a search for any discontinuities and contradictions that explain how the terms masculinity and femininity have changed through time. His account insufficiently unravels *why* and *how* masculinity as a concept has come to take the form it does today. Connell suggests that masculinity has been produced by: the decline of religion's power over people's lives; the development of Empires; the growth of cities / urban areas; and European civil war. This macro-scale approach makes no mention of the micro and there is no reference to men strengthening their position of power in relation to women at an individual scale. The adopted formulation is too sweeping, has a strong Euro-American focus, and fails to account for what Connell himself calls masculinit*ies*. It reproduces the assumption that there has always been an object 'masculinity' that could be observed at any time in the past.

A "genealogy", on the other hand, encourages alternative ways of thinking by rejecting a search for origins of a supposed truth about masculinity. The approach uncovers why current "truths" have taken the form they do; for example, why are masculinity and femininity talked about today as 'identities' and does this serve a purpose? Genealogy is a method for studying history achieved through the analysis of discourses which rejects the assumption of phenomena being linked by unbroken continuity. It identifies:

> the accidents, the minute deviations ... the errors, the false appraisals, and the
> faulty calculations that gave birth to those things that continue to exist and have
> value for us [and] it disturbs what was previously considered immobile; it fragments
> what was thought unified; it shows the heterogeneity of what was imagined
> consistent with itself. (Foucault 1977: 146 and 147, in Smart 1985: 56)

Unlike Connell's history of masculinity, a genealogical method does not proceed from the assumption that events from say 1450, could explain configurations of gender today. Genealogy is designed to excavate patterns of power, the pattern of its exercise as opposed to who has it (McNeill 1993: 149). As Smart (1985: 59) notes,

genealogy is synonymous with the endless task of interpretation: there is no hidden meaning to be found, just more layers of interpretation which have achieved the form of truth. The key for analysis is how truth is produced, and thus how masculinity is produced.

It is worthwhile reflecting upon one concept that Foucault was particularly interested in, 'madness', to illustrate the potential that genealogy has for releasing masculinity from current meanings:

> Nor is the former text [*Histoire de la Folie*] even a history of attitudes to, or modes of treatment of, madness. Its working hypothesis could be taken on the contrary to be that 'madness' does not signify a real historical-anthropological entity at all but is rather the name for a fiction or a historical construct: the problem which it addresses is hence that of the series of conceptual and practical operations through which madness, as mental illness, has been constituted in our societies as an object of certain forms of knowledge and a target of certain institutional practices. (Gordon 1980: 235)

By substituting the concept 'madness' with 'masculinity' in the above we can immediately begin to see the possibilities for a new "history" of 'masculinity'. Sheridan notes that of 'madness':

> He offers no definition of the term. He refuses to see it as a constant, unchanging reality, man's growing understanding of which is reflected in an ever more refined vocabulary. (Sheridan 1980: 13)

This does not counter my criticism of writers on masculinity for not defining their object of study, however. Their omission is not a tactical way of freeing 'masculinity' from a constrained meaning but rather proceeds from an assumption that masculinity equates to common sense knowledges, the lay definitions of masculinity. Theirs is the "refined vocabulary". Similarly, it is necessary to refuse to see masculinity as "a constant, unchanging reality", for such a view leads back to essentialising ideas of masculinity as maleness. Likewise:

> We must abandon any notion that we now possess the truth about madness. Indeed, we must set aside anything we think we know about it, any attempt to analyse, order, classify madness from some retrospective standpoint. Not to do so would be to speak the language of exclusion, a language that Foucault himself had learnt, and rejected. (Sheridan 1980: 13)

It is not possible to approach any subject as a *tabula rasa*, but an important point is raised here for the moment: it is useful to try to forget existing assumed "knowledge" about masculinity, to look at it with fresh eyes. Shields (1991) refers to this as lifting the veil of taken-for-granted-ness. Such a standpoint avoids falling into the trap of imposing a predetermined framework of masculinity onto "results" so discovering exactly what was set out to be found, and therefore failing to see the subtleties, the nuances which may prove the most enlightening. It highlights the invaluable

contribution that Foucault's writing can offer to research on masculinity, an influence which has been neglected in masculinity work so far. It encourages looking beyond the assumptions of concepts so that masculinity / femininity can be seen no less as fictions or historical constructions than the concepts he scrutinised in his own projects, such as madness and sexuality (see Foucault 1965, 1967, 1978). It becomes clear that 'masculinity' (whatever that may be) is not tied by time, place, biology, but has a 'history' fraught with discontinuity and inconsistency. This is not to suggest that masculinity should not be defined, but to propose that it needs to be given a meaningful meaning, one freed from existing understandings of the term. It must be understood as an analytical concept distinguished from an object reality which does not simply reify existing 'knowledges' but actually challenges them.

REFLECTIONS ON MASCULINITY

The value of genealogy is to doubt accepted concepts, encouraging the re-thinking of terms such as masculinity. These assumptions can distort research findings. It is evident that masculinity / gender need to be re-conceptualised. To date, there has been very little questioning of 'masculinity' and certainly no sustained debate. However, Wil Colman's (1990) commentary on both the concept and the discipline built around it raise crucial issues which must be addressed by any researcher before engaging in the empirical exposition of masculinity. Colman similarly locates the central problem as the lack of definition of masculinity:

> The problem is this: how is the theorist to identify instances of 'masculinity'? Or, to put it another way, by what *criteria* are these instances identified? (Colman 1990: 189)

He is questioning whether there are any objective means of labelling activities or attitudes as reflective of masculinity. To date, maleness has formed the "criteria" for masculinity. When is something masculinity and what if it is done by women?

> A whole diversity of activities, experiences, tasks, things, and so forth are common to both men and women. How is the theorist to distinguish them? She [sic] has need of some independent criterion of masculinity. (ibid.: 189)

Ascribing actions done by men as masculinity and the same things done by women as femininity obscures similarities between the sexes by emphasising differences; the distinction being forged may be a spurious one. The implication is that any action observed being done by men is an element of masculinity and is thus *only* done by men or is *appropriately* done by men. This heightens the necessity for a definition. Only when there is explicit detailing of what constitutes masculinity is it possible to label certain activities or behaviours being observed by anyone (men and women or

institutions) as masculinity. Without definition, masculinity is devoid of value as an analytical category. Colman identifies this as a "methodological impasse":

> In *practice* what we find is that the theorist employs, and *necessarily* employs, the categories 'masculine' and 'masculinity' in methodological yet commonsense ways. (ibid.: 191)

Applying the 'commonsense' understandings of gender that Connell (1987, 1995) warns against in academic analysis produces material which is reflective of the strictly dichotomised, essentially different discourse of the sexes which pervades everyday life. Rather than challenging sexist assumptions, such work reinforces them. As Colman notes, the "doings of men" on some occasions may be seeable as the doings of, amongst others, 'teachers', 'fathers', 'voters', 'police officers' and 'someone cooking a meal' (195) (or as 'flight attendants' (Hochschild 1983) or 'waiting staff' (Crang 1994)). By treating men generically the theorist "necessarily disattends to the *specific* occasion and the *specific* individual" (ibid.: 195). Therefore, masculinity is better identified as only those practices which are significant for explaining or perpetuating sexual inequalities and sexual differences. There are actions which may be done, for example, as 'police officers' which have consequences for the sexes and discourses of the sexes. Importantly, labelling of these actions is *situationally contingent*. Actions which at one time in one place may be masculinity in other circumstances may not.

Crucially, such actions may be made *unintentionally*. There does not have to be any wilful activity involved in masculinity. There are actions which everyone may do everyday which create, perpetuate or maintain sexual inequalities and differences. More significant than beliefs, attitudes or intentions, are actions / practices and the consequences of them which, although not always obvious, have consequences which feed into the level of society. This idea has important implications for the way masculinity needs to be understood. For most literature has examined masculinity in terms of how men *self-reflectively* view themselves and their behaviours *as men*. To take two examples, Jefferson (1996a, 1996b) relates aspects of boxer Mike Tyson's life and criminal activities to him being a man and to him trying to negotiate himself as a man through his actions, whilst in a critical autobiography Jackson (1990) accounts for certain aspects of his own life through reference to 'measurement' of himself and his identity against other men. Yet such explanations may be neither correct nor significant; most actions are not consciously gendered, although what results from them may be - but this by-passes intentionality. Colman considers that

> it seems that in this respect men simply *do what they do*. And they do it on most occasions without considering whether or not they are presenting a satisfactory presentation of themselves as 'men'. (ibid.: 192)

This deserves reiteration. Most of the time men are unselfconsciously men - they are not moderating their every action in line with a hegemonic image of men. Those occasions when they do, it is a function of psychology - the conscious attempt to reflect "masculine power" in themselves. They are obvious, visual representations of masculinity. More important are the 'invisible' practices of masculinity which still daily perpetuate sex inequalities. It is possible to say, therefore, (after Lorber 1996: 153) that masculinity is a practice which may or may not be practised continuously and does not characterise the person.

Colman argues that this has led theorists to impose an exaggerated theoretical framework not based in empirical observation and which has little or no substance:

> Treating 'masculinity' as a theoretical construction, we observe the *work* of its construction in and as *theory.* (ibid.: 193)

Indeed, Colman goes so far as to suggest theorists happily reproduce this rationale to provide them with a "theoretical warrant" to study men as men:

> One could say that the theorist demands of men in their daily lives to live those lives as if under the auspices of theory and theoretical work. The theorist requires of men that they engage in a constant critical / theoretical self-examination. (ibid.: 196-7)

Similarly, Morgan has stated:

> If I am looking for masculinity, it may be argued, then I shall find masculinity. (Morgan 1987b: 15)

He warns that a "seek and find" approach can be levelled at masculinity research. Yet his autobiographical account appears to reflect this - there is little to suggest that his focus of study is unambiguously masculinity. Indeed, it may be more reflective of his upbringing as a Methodist. Colman concludes that the study of masculinity must be re-evaluated. He poses the central question: what sustains masculinity? He believes the answer is that one either "does theory" through conscious monitoring and impression management or importantly, because it echoes the direction that this study follows,

> masculinity is constructed and sustained by hidden but discoverable forces, discourses, ideologies, structures, and the like (in which case its contingent and moment-to-moment accomplishment is unconscious). (ibid.: 197)

Not only does this again stress situational contingency, but it also illustrates that masculinity need not be examined as a phenomenon consciously acted out. Rather than discovering what men think of themselves as men is the discovery of the discourses and practices which uphold inequality.

Similar points of concern are discussed by Margaret Wetherell (1986) whose challenges of the social psychology of gender are useful when re-thinking masculinity. She regards sex role research as actively retrogressive, and her points of criticism are

equally applicable to most gender studies. She comments that any research of femininity / masculinity proceeds from the assumption of a categorical difference between the sexes. Work which produces traits and characteristics of the sexes reinforces what she terms 'imaginary identities', with the result that they strengthen their ideological potential and legitimacy (Wetherell 1986: 81). As with any field of study, there is the possibility of imposing a theoretical framework upon results; with masculinity this is all the more inevitable given its equation with maleness. Wetherell (1986) remarks that the prior conceptualisation of gender determines what the researcher can see: "the content becomes shaped to the category" (82). Her suggestion parallels Foucault's method of genealogy. She stresses the usefulness of examining how the labels femininity and masculinity define situations and discourse, along with the power to have these labels accepted, as opposed to identifying masculine or feminine as an inherent property of certain states. She argues that researchers must avoid the categorising of characteristics as masculine or feminine prior to research, and suggests that gender and sex hierarchies cannot be grasped if

> we assume that the content of femininity or masculinity is unvarying and can be unproblematically 'discovered' once and for all, as one might discover what is inside a box. In this case the contents of the box could be constantly changing and can always be renegotiated; the important issue is how they are negotiated and often, to continue the analogy, the agreement that there are two boxes in the first place. (Wetherell 1986: 82-3)

This suggests that a reconceptualisation of masculinity must be flexible and open enough not to predetermine its results. It must not constrain what an analysis can say. It should acknowledge that the contents of the two "boxes" are capable of constant change - that there is no property which is inherently masculine or feminine. A definition of masculinity must have an analytic purpose, not just to serve the function of naming.

Summary

In this section it has been shown that Foucault's exploration of genealogy encourages the rejection of taken-for-granted concepts. The "meaning" of a particular concept has a 'history' shaped by the play of power. Taking concepts at face value can be obstructive: analytic terms need to be re-thought and, if necessary, re-conceptualised. In the case of masculinity, the term needs to be related to something more concrete than vague references to everything to do with men. Colman (1990) suggests that current usage has no practical relevance and is purely justification for a new discipline of studies. His ideas prompt movement away from the seemingly inextricable link between men and masculinity and beyond masculinity as a self-conscious act towards

an analytical term for specific, situational practices. Likewise, Wetherell (1986) implores gender to be understood beyond the confines of sex and without pre-defined lists of what is masculine and feminine. Their ideas signal the reconceptualisation of masculinity.

But is there even any value in retaining the term? In the form academic investigation has utilised, it serves very little function in a progressive sexual politics of change. The term has been applied in a seemingly flexible way, variously categorised as attitudes, identity, behaviours, images, practices, organisation in institutions, social structures and a combination of these. But its use is apparently limited:

> A culture not constructed in such a way might have little use for the concept of masculinity. (Connell 1993a: 606)

If masculinity is culturally-specific, can it help explain 'universal male power'? Does our culture have a use for the term either? Whilst flexible, the term has remained fixed in its reference points: its application has always been to men and the different observable aspects of men. Masculinity needs to be deliberately not confined to men and the words and actions of men. The concept must be developed beyond the boundaries of existing means of categorisation. In many ways it would be beneficial not to term this discursive formation 'masculinity' at all. As Rogoff and Van Leer say of 'masculinity'

> The word itself is not neutral, but one deeply complicit in a history of oppression; renewing its academic currency may foster the very sorts of oppression our studies mean to end. To separate off the negative implications of masculinism by a neologism such as "hegemonic masculinity" obscures the fact that we do not have a definition for "masculinity" that is not already hegemonic. (Rogoff and Van Leer 1993: 748)

This presents an important consideration - even naming something 'masculinity' may perpetuate an ideology. This again invokes genealogy - 'masculinity' can be regarded as the historical product of a play of forces, the product of various relations of power. It is not only the *product* of power, it is also the *vehicle* of power. A 'truth' of masculinity (and femininity) is in place which is obscured by, and itself helps to continue to obscure, the power which constitutes it. There is a supposed knowledge about masculinity which lays waiting to be discovered. It is even the case that an entire discipline may be forged around a false notion. Rogoff and Van Leer acknowledge:

> As a result, "masculinity studies" risks substituting a hollow abstraction for a more precise analysis of situational realities. Unless it problematizes at every point its categories - and even its status as "discipline" - an enlightened approach to masculinity could unwittingly reinforce the notion of masculinity as a value-neutral object of study. (Rogoff and Van Leer 1993: 748-9)

Thus, it is necessary to remain conscious that even a *radically* re-conceptualised notion of 'masculinity' does not break free of the boundaries which confine the understanding of gender. To an extent, any use of the word masculinity is a continuation and reinforcement of the ideology of masculinism. But it is hoped that in employing the term it is possible to destabilise existing 'truths' and to appropriate the word towards more positive usage.

WHAT IS RELEVANT?

To avoid reduction to a catch-all meaning of masculinity (whilst remaining sufficiently broad to cover the different scales of masculinity from individuals to social), any reconceptualisation should consider only relevant aspects - elements which contribute to inequalities between the sexes. The objective should be elimination of these inequalities. Therefore, the processes which perpetuate them need to be the focus of investigation. It is necessary to change those practices which create our unfair society, not to catalogue the traits of every person within it. What are these important features?

> by concentrating only on *how* we know, analyze, and interpret material
> phenomenon of the past, poststructuralists have displaced questions about *what*
> needs to be known and *why*. (Hoff 1996: 26)

The study of masculinity must be pro-feminist. Feminism's critique of men's writing on masculinity is on-going. As Carrigan, Connell and Lee (1985) note, it was feminism that brought the issue of masculinity onto the research agenda, but there has been no paying back of this debt of knowledge. Male researchers have undertaken investigations without adequate reference to feminist objectives:

> problematising masculinity is not the basis of a theory and practice which
> complements or balances feminism; it is the application of feminist theory and
> practice to the study of men in ways which identify masculinity as a problem for
> men as well as for women ... much of the achievement of feminist knowledge over
> the last decades is not incorporated into men's work on masculinity. (Ramazanoglu
> 1992: 340)

Even "pro-feminist" men's accounts of masculinity have had little deep engagement with feminist thought. It may even be the case that its involvement with feminism has had a negative impact. Whilst for women consciousness raising groups largely provided a first-step to feminist consciousness, in the 'men's movement' it has promoted an emphasis on individualism. Often groups act as a first-step towards "personal growth" and "finding the inner self", at the expense of discussions of structures of male dominance. Whereas feminism is predominantly concerned with

changing power and social structures, many masculinity texts are concerned with changing individuals to benefit themselves: "Feminist interest in men and masculinity is readily intelligible. It is part of the search for an exploration of men's power over women" (Segal 1990: 60-61). There has been a particular lack of engagement with recent feminist theory, and in most masculinity writing feminism and feminists are portrayed as a unified body of women sharing the same opinions (which are largely held to be anti-men - note Bly 1990, Farrell 1994). The directions in which feminists would largely like to see masculinity work go (if at all) has been neglected in most respects; Ramazanoglu has identified a key weakness:

> Where studies of men and masculinity most need to be developed (both empirically and theoretically) is in identifying and explaining men's exercise of power and in understanding the political, as well as the personal, implications of transforming power relations. (Ramazanoglu 1992: 339)

This reflects the limited interest in power relations. There has been neither any significant involvement in evolving a political vision towards equality nor in ways of making this possible. Kimmel's (1993a: 30) comment that "social theory and social science have done exactly what cannot be done: analyze masculinity without discussing power" needs to be addressed in the study of masculinity.

There has been more interest in cataloguing the ways men are oppressed by masculinity than about ways of transforming society. Hence, Walby comments of men's writing that:

> These tend to concentrate on the unproductive aspects of masculinity for men, such as the stunting of the ability to express emotions, rather than masculinity as a route to privilege and power. (Walby 1990: 92)

Feminist literature, on the other hand, has been more concerned with how men's general privilege and *power* are maintained. Its studies of masculinity have been studies of patriarchy (Morgan 1992) - the ways material advantages are brought to certain men and expenses to women through maintenance of male dominance of structures of power. Walby (1990) identifies these structures as paid work, housework, sexuality, culture, violence and the state. A feminist approach to masculinity will be to locate and describe how these structures work. This is confirmed by Jeffords's (1989) study of masculinity and the Vietnam war. She quotes Lerner's definition of patriarchy as "the manifestation and institutionalization of male dominance over women and children in the family and the extension of male dominance over women in society in general. It implies that men hold power in all important institutions of society and that women are deprived of access to such power" (in Jeffords 1989: xii). On the same

point, Grant introduces another significant feature for study - *everyday* practices which are sometimes seemingly insignificant but which still add to sexual inequalities:

> radical feminists tend to think of it [patriarchy] as the *idea* or the day-to-day lived reality that men universally oppress women. (Grant 1993: 51)

Likewise, Bordo (1990) suggests male dominance is socially constituted by the everyday habits of masculinity and femininity (a call for the study of the everyday has also been made by Widdicombe 1995). Clearly, a study of masculinity which can contribute to feminism needs to look at and challenge this situation, to locate the precise ways in which this sexist system is upheld. That "masculinity studies" has contributed little or nothing to feminist debate is partly because of the limiting of focus to men and the problems of masculinity for men and that it "celebrates" masculinity by placing it at the centre of the analysis:

> To conceive of the study of men to be about liberating men is to have little interest in any area of social analysis that seriously critiques men as men, as part of the problem. (Hanmer 1990: 29)

What is needed is a "problematising" of masculinity and, Hanmer claims, of men. This indicates a compelling direction for research - focus on *problems*. However, concentration needs to be not only upon men, but upon both the sexes and *gender relations*:

> Gender, both as an analytic category and a social process, is relational. (Flax 1990: 44)

This concern again places emphasis upon power: Foucault (1980a) illustrates that power is inherent in all relations. This theme has prompted Grant to suggest that the role of feminism must be to transform gender and gender relations *in toto*:

> The revolt I would want to plan would be against gender itself - against both masculinity and femininity as they function in various cultures and societies. In fact, I think it is pointless to revolt against one, since the two imply each other and only exist in relation to one another. (Grant 1993: 184)

Similarly,

> we must abandon the concept of gender attributes ... and talk instead about gender relations, as enacted through daily organizational practice and as about power. (Davies 1992: 230)

Hence, a feminist study of masculinity must focus upon gender relations and power.

How can feminist concerns and the study of masculinity be combined? "Second wave" feminist theory has become increasingly sophisticated and challenging both of society and of itself. Indeed, in light of postmodernist critiques, feminism has been forced to self-reflect so that even the fundamental philosophy of feminism - its basis in the experiences of women and the category of 'woman' itself - has been thrown into doubt. There have been calls for a complete re-thinking of feminism (note Butler 1990a, 1990b, 1993, Nicholson 1990 and Grant 1993). hooks offers a useful vision for

feminism and its objectives which indicates a direction for a study of, and a definition for, masculinity. Put most simply, she describes feminism as "the struggle to end sexist oppression" (hooks 1984: 25). This encourages a focus on, and participation by, both women and men:

> Its aim is not to benefit solely any specific group of women, any particular race or class of women. It does not privilege women over men. It has the power to transform in a meaningful way all our lives. Most importantly, feminism is neither a lifestyle nor a ready-made identity or role one can step into. ... When we cease to focus on the simplistic stance "men are the enemy", we are compelled to examine systems of domination and our role in their maintenance and perpetuation. (hooks 1984: 25-26)

For hooks, feminism must seek to radically transform the dominant value-system which allows sexist oppression and domination, examining its achievement through the actions of men and women alike. To embrace this logic, an analysis of masculinity must be adopted which seeks the root causes of "sexist oppression": to attempt to isolate and highlight the ways in which power operates to continue the sexist system. Analysis of the actual *practical, everyday* ways through which the exercise of (male) power is perpetuated. This must cover a wide range of practices at many scales: in conversations, language, individual acts of coercion or violence, discriminatory practices and policies of companies, state regulations, welfare provision restrictions, sexploitation etc. An analysis which is focused neither solely on men nor solely on women, but upon gender relations, upon the power relations which comprise 'patriarchy'. Grant's (1993) re-thinking of the role of feminism illustrates that women's experiences only become part of feminism once the "feminist interpretative lens" is applied to them (109): feminist is not synonymous with women.

> *there are no universal features of women's existence* until they are named as such by feminist theory and practice. (Grant 1993: 103)

By studying gender relations - both sexes' experiences - this enables the feminist interpretative lens to be equally applied to men's experiences, and a definition of masculinity which makes this possible must be desirable. Grant (1993: 183) notes that it is time to talk about men *as men* from a feminist perspective.

TROUBLING MASCULINITY

Judith Butler's *Gender Trouble* (1990a) also contributes interesting issues for consideration in a reconceptualisation of masculinity. Of particular importance is her application of a genealogical critique to gender, positing identity categories as the *effects* of institutions, practices and discourses whose origin is to be found in multiple and diffuse points. Her argument forces a deep problematising of the concept 'identity' as she shows that the possibilities of potential identities are considerably constrained

by culture. As Foucault (1978) illustrates, "regulatory practices" govern gender identity and the potentiality for identity:

> To what extent do *regulatory practices* of gender formation and division constitute identity, the internal coherence of the subject, indeed, the self-identical status of the person? To what extent is "identity" a normative ideal rather than a descriptive feature of experience? (Butler 1990a: 16)

This is highly significant, for it suggests that the formation of gender and identity acts as a regulatory framework, it delimits boundaries and possibilities of what can be said and done. It holds that the categories of masculine and feminine are the products of this framework. From this it can be concluded that when masculinity / femininity are observed, what are seen are not 'natural' entities but the end result of a system which has formed these categories and consequently constrain action. This logic suggests that behaviours etc. are not caused by masculinity, but that what is accounted for as masculinity is in fact the naming of these behaviours. What appears to be the *cause* is in fact the *effect*; discussing Foucault's genealogical inquiry of sexuality she notes that it

> exposes this ostensible "cause" as an "effect", the production of a given regime of sexuality that seeks to regulate sexual experience by instating the discrete categories of sex as foundational and causal functions within any discursive account of sexuality. (ibid.: 23)

This leads her to propose that gender is "performative", a "stylised repetition of acts" (140):

> within the inherited discourse of the metaphysics of substance, gender proves to be performative - that is, constituting the identity it is purported to be. ... There is no gender identity behind the expressions of gender; that identity is performatively constituted by the very "expressions" that are said to be its results. (ibid.: 24-25)

This is based on the work of Nietzsche who emphasised that the "deed is everything" and that "there is no 'being' behind doing", underlining the importance attached to *practices*.

> gender is not a fact, the various acts of gender create the idea of gender, and without those acts, there would be no gender at all. (ibid.: 140)

This is disruptive of the conventions of the masculinity literature which has placed great store on the presumption of masculinity as an identity. Whilst masculinity is regarded as an aspect of personality which can be imposed or chosen and which retains the possibility of being changed by the individual, there is justification for focus on the individual in investigation and upon psychoanalysis or personality psychology as its "cure". Once masculinity is separated from identity, a whole new agenda for sexual political change becomes paramount. Butler's reappraisal of feminist politics questions the value of a common identity, suggesting that it may actually obscure a radical inquiry into the construction of identity. She concludes that systems of power "*produce* the subjects they subsequently come to represent" (2): the subject of

feminism is itself a discursive formation. Thus, emancipation of women within the system that constrains is highly problematic - there is no position that one can assume outside of this system. She suggests that this makes any project for change centred on transforming identities futile, even impossible:

> Because the articulation of an identity within available cultural terms instates a definition that forecloses in advance the emergence of new identity concepts in and through politically engaged actions, the foundationalist tactic cannot take the transformation or expansion of existing identity concepts as a normative goal. ... If subversion is possible, it will be a subversion from within the terms of the law, through the possibilities that emerge when the law turns against itself and spawns unexpected permutations of itself. (ibid.: 15; 93)

As will be elaborated in Part Four, this point is very important for understanding masculinity, and more specifically for a politics of masculinity towards changing gender relations. Suffice it to note here that this again signposts the need to conceptualise masculinity outside terms of identity. A feminist politics has little advantage to gain from it: transforming "identity" may not change gender relations. Therefore, the focus for change should be elsewhere. It is more beneficial to give attention to practices which contribute to sexist value systems, not the identity of the practitioners.

Butler also draws an important distinction between sex and gender. In academic literature gender is conventionally regarded as the cultural meanings assumed by the sexed body, an idea popularised by Oakley (1972). Butler notes that this should not preclude the construction "women" on male bodies or "men" on female bodies, reconfirming that to understand gender requires the freeing of the terms masculine / masculinity from men, and feminine / femininity from women:

> When the constructed state of gender is theorized as radically independent of sex, gender itself becomes a free-floating artifice, with the consequence that *man* and *masculine* might just as easily signify a female body as a male one, and *woman* and *feminine* a male body as easily as a female one. (Butler 1990a: 6)

She goes on to highlight that "sex" is as culturally constructed as gender, that there is no meaningful distinction between the two (as does Lorber 1996). Butler shows that the concept 'nature' is itself a discursive construction, so to divide sex / gender as being natural / cultural is incorrect: they are both cultural. This obviously has implications for the study of gender. It blurs the boundaries between sex and gender and both categories should be considered products of regulatory practices. They provide frameworks within which activities or attributes can be labelled. Hood-Williams (1996) comments that although the distinction has served useful theoretical and political purposes, it is now time to think beyond its confines. It is insufficient to call gender the cultural product based in the 'nature' of sex. The objective should be to locate how sex is 'naturalised' - which discourses cement this construction, how sex

"differences" are constructed and justified and how gender is itself then constructed out of these discourses. The construction of sex / gender is mutually reliant. As already commented, the equation of masculinity with men and femininity with women has been reified. What purpose does this serve? It is important to be clear how the terms sex and gender are used. In this thesis, sex refers to the discursive constructions 'female' and 'male' as "naturally" different. Gender will refer to the constructions 'masculine' and 'feminine' and the discursive framework which distinguishes between them.

This has implications for defining masculinity. It affirms the suggestion that any definition must not be tied to sex, augers that it must accept that 'masculine' and 'feminine' are discursive constructs which structure people and their actions, and supports the claim that this construction is situational. There are no behaviours or attitudes or attributes which are inherently masculine or feminine - they have to be constructed this way. What any study of gender must do is accept that a regulatory framework of gender exists. It must locate the specificities of this framework in order to highlight the discursive construction of 'masculine' and 'feminine' and to illustrate the ways this regulation works and the consequence of its existence: to discuss the details and minutiae of how this framework is maintained and to illustrate the practices which comprise it and occur within it.

The aim of Butler's work is subversion and displacement of naturalised and reified notions of gender - "to make gender trouble" (34) - to upset the regulatory framework

> through the mobilization, subversive confusion, and proliferation of precisely those constitutive categories that seek to keep gender in its place by posturing as the foundational illusions of identity. (ibid.: 34)

In a small way this project hopes to contribute to this objective, and the proposed re-conceptualisation of masculinity is aimed to be one way of disrupting a category which has been used in academic study to celebrate those who benefit most from the regulative framework of gender. In this way it hopes to conform to Butler's prescription for research.

> The category of sex is thus inevitably regulative, and any analysis which makes that category presuppositional uncritically extends and further legitimates that regulative strategy as a power / knowledge regime. (ibid.: 96)

reiterating that gender must not be understood as an identity - it is "a regulatory fiction" (141). Butler concludes:

> That gender reality is created through sustained social performances means that the way notions of an essential sex and a true or abiding masculinity or femininity are also constituted as part of the strategy that conceals gender's performative

character and the performative possibilities for proliferating gender configurations outside the restricting frames of masculinist domination and compulsory heterosexuality. (ibid.: 141)

which again underlines the need for a workable definition of masculinity to have a *political* purpose - to rupture masculinist ideology and the practices such ideologies inform.

The next sections will discuss and propose a way of reconceptualising masculinity, bringing together those features explored above which are essential to a progressive politics of change: one which incorporates feminist goals, which emphasises the importance of power, which prioritises the everyday and people's lived experiences, that focuses on gender relations and not just men, that views practices and not the identity of the practitioner as important, that downplays intentionality and which seeks to uncover the regulatory frameworks which sustain 'patriarchal' value systems.

B. RE-DEFINING MASCULINITY

The following sections combine approaches used in feminism, postmodernism and the theorisation of power (in particular Foucault's "analytics of power") to propose a way of examining masculinity which helps identify and account for continuing inequalities between the sexes. It is suggested that masculinity should be understood as a practice which can be employed by either sex (wittingly or unwittingly), reliant upon the discursive construction of gender. The approach does not reinforce ideas that only men can act in certain ways and only women can act in other ways. It hopes to contribute to a de-stabilising of existing notions of gender, and present ideas which extend beyond essentialist theory.

Power must be regarded as centrally important. To do this requires a shift in the paradigm of investigation. It means a return to thinking in terms of masculinity, not a plurality of masculine identities; as the earlier discussion showed, pluralisation comes no closer to explaining power. This is not to argue that there is a "discrete and omnipotent masculinity" (Segal 1993: 638), but rather that what constitutes masculinity is variable, unstable and redefinable according to different places and situations and the social relations which take place amongst them. There is more than one formation of masculinity, but to call this masculinities is misleading and uninformative. Such ways of thinking can imply that each 'different' masculinity is a relatively stable identity which maintains its attachment or detachment to power at all times, rather than being contingent upon social relations where the constituent parts which make up masculinity

(and "access" the exercise of power) in one situation may not "access" power in another. Masculinity is dynamic and fluid. What may be constructed 'masculine' amongst one set of people in one place may be constructed 'feminine' amongst another. Rather than masculinities, there are different *configurations* of masculinity. This may sound like an argument over semantics; however, continuing use of this terminology reinforces existing ideology - the play of power becomes enshrouded in the cloak of being "natural", the dictates of biology. Power becomes 'invisible'. Analysis needs to reveal this power. Rooted in essentialism, many conceptualisations offer little prospect for enacting change; the existing ways in which gender is understood are not capable of helping a feminist movement aiming for a radical overturning of dominant value systems to eliminate sexist ideology and practice. The approach outlined here rejects 'masculinity' as an entity with a simple history but views it rather as constituted as "an object of certain forms of knowledge and a target of certain institutional practices" (Gordon 1980: 235): the "common-sense knowledge of gender" (Connell 1995: 6) which pervades everyday life and is reflected in academic research is an idea which dissolves in historical time. Masculinity has assumed different forms, different configurations from those of today, and emerges as a 'knowledge' (and, following Foucauldian logic, therefore also a 'power'). Masculinity, femininity, and gender are terms which can be appropriated, and they need to be appropriated by feminism to serve a particular purpose. The following section outlines how different theories of power have been adopted in the analysis of the empirical findings presented in Parts Two and Three.

UNDERSTANDING POWER

It is vital, therefore, that engagement with power is given precedence in studies of gender. Practically the entire feminist logic is based on this premise. Indeed, it could be argued that not to focus on power is not to talk about gender at all. Interest in power / gender is on-going (see Davis *et al* 1991 and Radtke and Stam 1994 for a full history of such research), and has even found a niche in the masculinity literature: Hearn (1987) in his Marxist critique and Brittan (1989) have both devoted books to the topic. The most influential and sophisticated masculinity theorist has been Bob Connell whose *Gender and Power* (1987) and *Masculinities* (1995: 72-76) have developed a three-fold model of the structure of gender that distinguishes relations of power, production and cathexis (emotional attachment).

There is a growing tendency in the literature to focus upon power related specifically to its costs to men. This has taken the form of being explicitly counter-feminist (note Farrell 1994) but also pro-feminist (see Kaufman 1994). Once again, this is the consequence of a concentration upon individuals and the psychology of power, and has centred upon men's feelings of powerlessness:

> But I'm far from sure that most men either have or *experience* the power that feminism assumes they have. (Cohen 1991: 31 - emphasis added)

Similarly, Kimmel notes that men are incredulous at the accusation of having all the power:

> 'What are you talking about? My wife bosses me around. My kids boss me around. I have no power at all! I'm completely powerless!' (Kimmel 1994: 136)

This way of thinking assumes that because men do not *feel* powerful, then they are in need of empowerment, sympathy and corrective analysis. This logic is extended into Farrell's 'evidencing' that women are the powerful sex; but his work proceeds from a conceptualisation which fundamentally misunderstands power:

> *Power is control over one's life.* (Farrell 1994: xii - emphasis in original)

This way of thinking is not related to structures of power or access to material advantages which determine social hierarchies. This absence of a holistic view is noted elsewhere:

> Power seems to become equated with the phenomenological and immediate experience of potency. Other forms of power tend to become relatively invisible. (Wetherell and Griffin 1991: 370)

Such a narrow approach is endemic in 'pop' psychology. But it has little significance beyond heuristic value. It does not form a basis for the challenge to ideologies which uphold inequalities:

> no amount of positive thinking will convince me that women's lack of power is a psychological problem. You can feel as powerful as you damn well like and you will still be dragged out of your car and raped at knife point. Power is not an attitude, it is an attribute. (Moore 1993: 10)

It should be emphasised that the conceptualisation of power as a psychological *feeling* is not solely in the domain of men's rights authors. The psychology of power has been very much a concern of feminism. Indeed, Adler, Laney and Packer (1993), for example, in their study of feminism, power and management in education, value women's personal feelings of empowerment as highly as (if not more highly than) women's abilities to influence structuralised forms of power. This leaves a crucial issue unresolved. Ability to exercise power lies in actions and relationships - it is not reliant on acknowledgement or consciousness of power (although individuals' consciousness may be important in power's exercise). The exercise of power should, therefore, be disaggregated from *motive*. Reflection upon power must extend beyond the confines of individual empowerment.

What this brief examination of opinions does achieve, however, is to highlight that the analysis of power relations is extremely problematic. The difficulty in assessing gender / power relations is shared with theorisation of power in any circumstance - there is no satisfactory definition of what constitutes power. Bloch, Heading and Lawrence (1979: 243) argue that power is an "essentially contested concept" and that particular interpretations of power, therefore, necessarily embody particular value assumptions of which the user may or may not be aware. Thus, although discussion of power has been prevalent throughout the social sciences, it is exceptionally difficult to draw together various conceptualisations of power and be sure that they are all referring to the same subject.

Most theories of power have been greatly influenced by the work of Weber (see Weber 1978 [1921]) who developed what has come to be known as the "one dimensional view" of power - power as the ability to enforce one's will, even against resistance. This assumes that power refers to decision making and is in observable conflict, and that it will have a detectable outcome on behaviours. The problem that this way of thinking creates, as Komter (1991: 54) highlights, is that not only does it divert attention away from underlying power processes, but it also overlooks "the structural character of the unequal division of power resources between women and men". Hence, by focusing upon the purposeful actions of individuals it fails to illuminate how power operates. The "second dimension" of power covers non-decisions which deflect threat to the vested interests of the powerful and may be covert. Lukes (1974) adds the third dimension - latent conflict, a hidden discrepancy of interests of those exercising power over those subject to this power. The conflict is latent in the sense that it would arise if subordinates would express their needs and wishes. Again, though, too much emphasis is placed upon individuals and interests (although unconscious as well as conscious). Too little attention is given to the *context* within which relations take place and such theorisations of power do not seem to take into account historical processes of power.

The need to understand that people's actions take place under conditions not of their own making has stimulated interest in investigating power as the medium by which collective interests may be realised (Davis 1988). In turn, theorising power as social structures has its own problems, notably raising the questions 'what are these structures?', 'how are they sustained?' and 'how do the everyday practices of

individuals fit in?' (see Oldersma and Davis 1991). A particularly useful attempt at bridging the gaps between overly determined theories of power as actor based or societal based came in Giddens' (1984) concept of structuration. His conceptualisation of power (developed as a critique and elaboration of the major power theorists) was based around five dimensions: that power is integral to social interaction; power is intrinsic to human agency; power is relational, involving relations of dependence and autonomy; power is enabling as well as constraining; and that power is processual. By implying that power exists between agents and structures at the same time, this theory allows for a measure of fluidity to power relations. Therefore, it seems to offer a useful starting point for theorising masculinity. However, it is not sufficient for analysing situated practices and contexts. Although Giddens sought to emphasise the duality of structure and agency - as opposed to dichotomous dualisms - the theory still appears inadequately suited to analysing how power may be 'networked', that is, how actor, context, social situation, historical processes, institutional factors etc. combine at a single moment in a particular location in the exercise of power.[5] It fails to provide a 'method' for the empirical investigation of power in everyday interactions (see Gregson 1989).

What all these various theories of power do offer, however, are fundamental questionings of power and the processes of its exercise. Significantly, they indicate that the exercise of power is always complex and involves the intermeshing of a large number of forces which help determine its 'existence'. They indicate that within relations of power, individuals may be differentially positioned and, therefore, that the exercise of power, broadly speaking, involves 'winners' and 'losers', and, in Giddens' (1984) terms, may be simultaneously enabling or constraining. This does not mean that the "winner" or "loser" can be observed and labelled as such, but rather that interactions create a 'stock of knowledge' - such as unequal positioning in the relationship - that can be drawn upon in future interactions. Basic theories of power have over-simplistically modelled power; notably, early feminist theories positioned men as oppressors and women as oppressed, and hence disregarded complex influences of race, class, age, ability etc. Whilst these theories have overgeneralised, they do provide a significant insight which needs to be retained in conceptualising masculinity; namely, that power (whether conscious to individuals or not) involves *creating differences* between the individuals of a particular relation.

---

[5] An excellent introduction to the theory of 'actor networks' can be found in Newton (1996).

In the following section, it will be illustrated how the theories presented above need to be integrated with the "methodological precautions" proposed in the work of Foucault. Neither these nor Foucault's own theories are adequate in themselves in analysing power and masculinity in empirical contexts. The next section argues, however, that it is in Foucault's work that a most useful starting position for conceptualising power can be found. His writings set out a 'method' for analysing power which have proven most useful in the empirical sections of the thesis. However, his ideas are insufficient in themselves, partly the consequence of never attending to issues of gender and power explicitly in his writings (note Faith 1994). The following section shows how through adaptation and extension, a modified Foucauldian standpoint can be applied to empirical investigations at the micro-scale. It is argued that it is possible to integrate aspects of traditional theories of power with Foucauldian ideas in a consistent manner. Foucault offers useful insights that can be developed into an understanding of how people become *differentially* and *unequally* positioned in relations of power, but his ideas must be considered in conjunction with a sensitivity to the importance of space-specific power relations.

DEFINING AND ADAPTING THE FOUCAULDIAN CONCEPTUALISATION OF POWER

It is in the work of Foucault (particularly Foucault 1977, 1978, 1980a) that, I argue, the most radically innovative approach to the study of power has been presented. He articulated four "methodological precautions" whose observance is essential in the investigation of power. Foucault was particularly keen to examine power beyond its working within the State apparatus and as not confined within the terms of domination and subjugation. He noted that analysis should be concerned with "power at its extremities" and with "the point where power ... becomes embodied in techniques, and equips itself with instruments and eventually even violent means of material intervention" (Foucault 1980a: 96) - a micro-physics analysis of power.

For a study of masculinity this means that rather than focusing solely upon the State, patriarchy and the relation with capitalism *per se*, analysis must not neglect gender relations at the small scale, between individuals: the *everyday* as opposed to "great events". A problem with Foucault's work is that it offers no techniques for actually undertaking this analysis. It is interesting to note the ambiguity that permeates Foucault's writing on institutions and power. As Dwyer (1995) explains, although Foucault advocated a micro-physics of power, he never actually focused upon

individuals himself and instead centred upon institutions. At the same time, however, he also ignored large-scale institutions and social forces in his empirical studies. Therefore, his empirical findings often suffer the same problem as the simplistic power theories discussed above - there is no attempt to connect structure and agency or highlight the links between the different "levels" of power and 'actors'. This amounts to neglect of what Ramazanoglu and Holland call the "middle ground of power relations":

> neither Foucault nor feminism has adequately specified what we might loosely term the 'middle ground' of power, where complex links need to be traced between the micro-politics of the exercise of power at the level of relations between people, and some conception of the entrenchment of male power more generally, in ways which systematically privilege men over women. (Ramazanoglu and Holland 1993: 242)

Connell (1987) has similarly noted the absence of discussion of the "middle level", institutions such as family and the state. Thus, any conceptualisation of masculinity and power must recognise that masculinity transcends the personal (Segal 1990: 287), and that there are different scales at which masculinity operates (an idea facilitated by the dislocation of masculinity as the identity of men). Studies of masculinity must acknowledge all three "levels" (the individual, institutional and the social) and recognise that they are not exclusive of one another. The practice of masculinity and the exercise of power exist at all these scales, and it is important to locate where they intersect, and where and how they are mutually reinforcing or contradictory. The workplace, for instance, provides one of the key settings for individuals to assemble within institutions where expectations and assumptions constructed by social forces are brought together or contested in individual interactions. Hence, empirical analyses of power must extend focus beyond the individual or upon abstract structures and highlight the connections and networks of power far more explicitly than Foucault ever did himself. They must acknowledge everyday interactions, social relations and institutional forces.

Foucault's micro-physics of power is, however, a valuable tool for understanding how power is operationalised. This does not mean exclusive study of instances where power can be shown to have been exercised over an individual. Foucault does not conceptualise power in this manner. Significantly, he stresses that analysis should by-pass the intentionality of the actors in power relations:

> analysis should not concern itself with power at the level of conscious intention or decision; ... it should refrain from posing the labyrinthine and unanswerable question: 'Who then has power and what has he [sic] in mind? What is the aim of someone who possesses power?' Instead, it is a case of studying power at the point where its intention, if it has one, is completely invested in its real and effective practices. (Foucault 1980a: 96)

This links to the earlier discussion of Butler and Nietzsche: that the important focus is upon 'the deed', not 'the doer', and directly addresses the issues of motive that preoccupied Lukes (1974). It is the practice, and its consequences, which are significant, not who did them or why. This is particularly true because, as Colman's (1990) examination showed, actions are often carried out unselfconsciously. Why people or institutions do things, or why they say they do them, may not be consistent with their outcome nor may that reason be important. This helps to break down the either / or attention on actors or structures that dominates the other power theories outlined above. Foucault suggests that rather than focus upon the subject, concern should be placed upon *the formation of subjectivity* as a result of power - how power shapes people's identities:

> we should try to discover how it is that subjects are gradually, progressively, really and materially constituted through a multiplicity of organisms, forces, energies, materials, desires, thoughts etc. (Foucault 1980a: 97)

Hence, as another "methodological precaution" Foucault notes that power functions in the "form of a chain" and is exercised through a "net-like organisation" (Foucault 1980a: 98):

> not only do individuals circulate between its threads; they are always in the position of simultaneously undergoing and exercising this power ... In other words, individuals are the vehicles of power, not its points of application. (Foucault 1980a: 98)

Foucault indicates that it is micro-mechanisms of power which have become most important in modern power relations (Foucault 1977). He cautions for an *ascending* analysis of power. Rather than looking at power from the centre and deducing the extent to which it permeates into the base, analysis needs to examine from the "infinitesimal mechanisms" and how they have been "invested, colonised, utilised, involuted, transformed, displaced, extended etc., by ever more general mechanisms and by forms of global domination" (Foucault 1980a: 99). He calls for a different type of analysis of power: a "bottom-up" approach as opposed to "top-down". In other words, in the study of masculinity, how individuals articulate power / gender. This suggests a different research agenda for masculinity. Unlike the current pre-occupation in sociological analyses with how men 'consume' images of socially hegemonic masculinity, this approach encourages the investigation of the 'creation' of dominant 'discourse' of masculinity by individuals and social groups.

Overall, this constitutes not so much a "theory" as an "analytics" of power (Foucault 1978: 82-83). As Hoy (1986a: 135) comments, it is not intended to say what power really is, but more where to look for it. Foucault's methodology provides important

considerations, namely that power is *relational*, is *productive*, and that it is *not a zero-sum commodity* which can be *possessed*: it is not an individual's or one group's or one class's domination over others. This latter point is particularly important. Bordo has noted that the traditional oppressor / oppressed model inadequately theorised the complexities of the situation of men "who frequently find themselves implicated in practices and institutions which they (as individuals) did not create, do not control and may feel tyrannised by" (Bordo 1993: 190). Similarly, Ramazanoglu and Holland (1993: 254) affirm: "Power over women can be exercised *by* men but cannot come *from* men," and they acknowledge how theories of patriarchy have not explained *why* men so generally have power over women, and that "men can be frightened, vulnerable, emotionally dependent, anxious to give pleasure and oppressed themselves by masculinity" (Ramazanoglu and Holland 1993: 247). Hence, it acknowledges that power is diffuse and complex. Additionally, Foucault continually emphasised the significance of practice to power: "power is exercised rather than possessed" (Foucault 1977: 26) and "power only exists when it is put into action" (Foucault 1982: 219); and its consequences: "The exercise of power is not simply a relationship between partners, individuals or collective; it is a way in which certain actions modify others" (Foucault 1982: 219). It is productive, not only of subjectivity, but also of resistance: "where there is power, there is resistance" (Foucault 1978: 95).

Of perhaps greatest significance is Foucault's insistence that power is relational and that one can never be outside power (Foucault 1979, in Morris and Patten 1979: 55). Whilst Deveaux (1994: 233) sees this as negative and urges feminists to reject these "fatalistic views about the omnipresence of power" and feels that Foucault theorises out of existence possibilities for radical social transformation (236), other theorists regard this approach as very positive. MacCannell and MacCannell (1993: 211), for example, reveal that it means "everyone can assume primary responsibility for shaping power relations with others". Contra opinions which read Foucault's ideas as suggesting everyone is trapped and incapable of action against power, it can be said, therefore, that individuals are accredited with positive agency (note McNay 1992). This signals an important direction for investigation of the micro-physics of power which this study tries to develop. MacCannell and MacCannell note that

> Every human encounter can be an occasion for nasty looks, verbal abuse,
> humiliation, insult, defilement. (MacCannell and MacCannell 1993: 206)

This suggests that the maintenance of discourses of sex and the practice of masculinity need not be immediately obvious nor significant. But even in "nasty looks", power is being articulated. The conditions are being set for what is deemed

appropriate in any particular context, and repetition acts as part of the regulatory framework which produces "gender". Cooper (1994) welcomes this progress away from traditional conceptualisations which have framed discussions in terms of 'A' exercises power over 'B' etc. - static binary relationship terms (such as Emerson 1962). In her own Foucauldian framework she observes that power is

> something deployed or exercised by forces ... that possess agency despite the fact that they may be affected by the overdetermined outcomes of both their own and others' exercises of power. (Cooper 1994: 442)

These form vitally significant points for examining gender relations. They recognise a dynamism in power / gender relations, and that individuals are not just passive recipients of the exercise of power upon them. Agency is credited to people to resist power. Foucauldian analytics of power move away from generalisations which imply that all men dominate all women at all times, a conceptualisation which disregards anomalies and overlooks ways of investigating how the subtleties of masculinity and power operate. This is especially useful for feminism since women can be acknowledged as able actively and effectively to resist forms of (male) power (see Bailey 1993). Additionally, this idea is important because it helps account for differences of power not only *between* the sexes but also *among* people of the same sex. Power can be viewed not simply as men exercising power over women, but as a more complex system of relations between men and women which are forged and contested; there are inequalities of power between men and between women. Women are not a unified group, passively having power lauded over them. Women can exercise power themselves, in relation to men and to other women, and some women can be just as oppressive to other women as some men can be. In this way masculinity can be understood as a technology of power which can be used by *either* sex, a notion which breaks away from essentialist ideas of gender.

Hence, this approach allows for a framework of masculinity and power which acknowledges the differences in power *between* men and women, and *amongst* men and *amongst* women. It accepts that not all men have equal access to power, a particularly valuable notion: it seems absurd that, for instance, an unemployed, middle-aged, black, gay man in the UK can be regarded as "powerful". It was illustrated earlier that one of the retaliations of many men to feminist challenges that men are powerful is that individual men may feel utterly power*less*. The conceptualisation proposed here suggests that some men may be *relatively* unempowered, but that they may still exercise power via the technology of masculinity and that power is exercised by actions, not whether one recognises one's own power. Thus, the exercise of power

by men does not come from being male, and in theory there is nothing stopping any woman exercising power more than any male. In practice, however, it is predominantly men who exercise power in relation to women.

Foucault's work has proved especially problematic for feminists (as Ramazanoglu 1993 clearly highlights), notably as he failed to address the 'woman question'.[6] A particular problem is that traditional feminist strategies have started from women's experiences of being subordinated, so traditional feminist conceptions of power and the body are not fully compatible with Foucault's:

> If we want to keep this sense of men's possession of power, and women's agency in challenging their varied experiences of subordination, we need clear responses to Foucault's conception of power. (Ramazanoglu and Holland 1993: 241)[7]

This raises a frustrating problem with Foucault's ideas. He may have dismissed the notion that people 'have' power, but he failed to sufficiently explain how people *appear* to 'have' power. For example, why men seem to be *more* powerful than women (because of the organisation of social institutions) or employers appear to have power over their workers (because of the sanctions that partner 'authority'). However much it is true that power is not a possession, it constantly appears as if it were and individuals act as if others do possess power; how this fictitious "possession" is respected and complied with requires theorisation. Therefore, the conceptualisation of power utilised in this study retains a concept of dominant positions or dominant social structures, and stresses that their role in the play of forces must be assessed:

> the fact that power is not held by any*one* does not entail that it is equally held by *all*. It is 'held' by no one; but people and groups *are* positioned differently within it. No one may control the rules of the game. But not all players on the field are equal. (Bordo 1993: 191)

Although, as was noted above, women can access the exercise of power via masculinity (which could be by practising "masculinity" in their behaviours or benefiting from its use by men to relatively disempower other women), this is not to imply that inequality does not exist. Grosz (1990) argues that masculinity and femininity mean different things according to whether they are lived in male or female bodies: "What is mapped on to the body is not unaffected by the body on to which it is projected" (Grosz 1990: 72). Rather, that in the face of inequality there is some opportunity for resistance. The extent and possibilities of this resistance is set by discourses of sex / gender. Different people are positioned differently in the regulatory framework

---

[6] See Sawicki 1994 for an overview of work on Foucault by feminists.

[7] However, in reformulations of feminism (such as Butler 1990a and Grant 1993) the notion that there is a unified category 'woman' around which to base struggle is deconstructed as a misconception.

according to their discursively constructed subjectivity. Power is the expression of these differences between people in a relationship: "Obviously, a person who wields power and a person who endures it do not share the same perceptions of reality" (Reynaud 1983: 6). There are other factors, too, which give people the appearance of "possessing" power. Notably, in the workplace, certain individuals are endowed with 'authority' and, therefore, assume a different position in the regulatory framework of gender. [This issue is developed in greater detail in subsequent sections].

It is also valuable to consider ethical issues of power. It should not be felt that masculinity is a desirable power. Although Foucault deliberately avoided making normative judgements on power, I believe that there must be some distinguishing over "right" and "wrong" power if notions of social justice are to be retained. Power does not have to be seen in negative terms, it can be used for people's good. Its value is dependent upon the consequences of the exercise of power. Cooper (1994) calls this an "ethics" of power and reiterates that power being "everywhere" is not necessarily a bad thing:

> if power can be both positive and negative, rather than exclusively one or the other, then accepting its ubiquitous nature does not undermine the possibility of developing strategies for change and transformation. (Cooper 1994: 436)

Masculinity, however, is negative in so far as it creates and perpetuates sexualised inequalities. In his desire to avoid developing a personal ethics of power, Foucault also failed to specify exactly what he considered power to be. Cooper (1994: 444) notes that despite substantial discussions of the operation of power by Foucault and Foucauldian feminists, the question of what power actually is remains relatively unaddressed. Lukes (1979) suggests that power is impossible to define. Cooper criticises Foucault for providing little clear and constant guidance as to what power means. She proposes exploring power as:

> the facilitation of particular outcomes, processes and practices. Such facilitation also includes the maintenance of *status quo* relations which may occur through actors' explicit exercise of power (such as by resisting particular changes), through the withholding of information, or through less voluntaristic forms, such as discourse (the production of meaning) and discipline. (Cooper 1994: 445)

This provides a thorough, wide ranging framework which can be applied to the analysis of gender relations. It helps to account for the dynamics of gender relations, and allows for instances where change does not occur, whether this comes from purposeful resistance or is the product of technologies of power itself. She acknowledges too that the exercise of power is not static, not fixed to definite outcomes which are always the same:

Whether it operates in a progressive or reactionary way depends on its form, the terrains on which it operates, and on the nature of those exercising and subject to power within a given social and historical moment. (Cooper 1994: 452)

She notes that there are technologies of power, such as masculinity, and sites across and through which power operates, such as the home and the workplace. This conceptualisation again allows for the idea of unequal positioning within the regulatory framework of power and concedes that power may take different forms at different times and in different places. It is important to remain aware of the criticisms of Foucault's method for the analysis of gender relations (the contributions in Gane 1986 provide a comprehensive critique of Foucauldian forms of analysis), and build them in to any conceptualisation of power (a point reinforced by Davis 1991).

One problem which remains in the analysis of power, however, is in how to locate it. The 'nature' of power is invisible: "power is unique among social phenomena in its self-concealing tendency; in many situations, its observability correlates inversely with its effectiveness, which cannot, therefore, be measured only by techniques of direct observation" (Lukes 1979: 270-271). Likewise Foucault comments that "power is tolerable only on condition that it masks a substantial part of itself. Its success is proportional to its ability to hide its own mechanisms" (Foucault 1978: 86). Hence, the invisibility or self-concealment of power has been widely noted (see also Reynaud 1983, Hartsock 1990). Foucault shows that its success results from the conceptualisation of power as the limits placed on free action but which still leaves a measure of freedom: "Power as a pure limit set on freedom is, at least in our society, the general form of its acceptability" (Foucault 1978: 86). Thus, he goes beyond this to suggest that every action, every relation is the effect of power and is constrained. He notes how his is achieved through the regulatory framework of discourses.

DISCOURSE

The empirical sections of this thesis emphasise analysis of discourses in the examination of masculinity, stressing that practices of masculinity / the exercise of power are articulated through discourses of sex. These discourses are the constraining systems which help determine what is 'appropriate' for men and women. Foucault

> argues that control is exercised through the production of dominant discourses, containing 'regimes of truth'. [...] Through such proliferating discourses, discipline and control are achieved primarily by the efforts to define, classify and categorise activities which establish fundamental 'truths' about our sexuality, shape the construction of our subjectivity and demarcate the boundaries of a normative (hetero)sexuality" (Forbes 1996: 179)

Discourses construct 'masculine' and 'feminine' (in this case in two workplaces) against which people's actions are measured; they are

> conventional ways of conceiving and representing reality which serve to produce sexual differences in specific contexts of knowledge. (Segal 1990: 92-93)

They help structure what it is possible to say and do in the workplaces. They provide the context which makes possible actions, relationships or policies which perpetuate a 'patriarchal' value system, and it is within this context that individuals exist and negotiate their lives. Thus, unravelling these discourses is key to the understanding of masculinity, for they make its existence possible. Foucault (1972) noted that discourses on madness are not based on the existence of an object 'madness', but that its appearance is made possible by the interplay of rules (created by discourses). Sheridan (1980: 98) notes that "discourse is not about objects: rather, discourse constitutes them". In this case, it is possible to say that there are no such objects as masculinity or femininity, but there are discourses and practices which define sex and what is 'appropriate' for men or for women which then define gender: "discursive formations *produce* the object about which they speak" (Dreyfus and Rabinow 1982: 61). This raises specific considerations - what exactly are discourses and how are they to be identified?

Ramazanoglu notes that Foucault identified discourses "as historically variable ways of specifying knowledge and truth - what it is possible to speak of at a given moment" (Ramazanoglu 1993a: 19). Discourses function as a set of rules. These rules create the boundaries for what can be said and done; they

> define not the dumb existence of a reality, nor the canonical use of vocabulary, but the *ordering of objects*. (Foucault 1972: 49 - emphasis added)

Discourses are therefore best understood as a form of regulation:

> In practice, discourses delimit what can be said, whilst providing the spaces - the concepts, metaphors, models, analogues - for making new statements within any specific discourse. (Henriques *et al* 1984: 106)

They act as the regulatory framework for people's "performativity" of gender (Butler 1990a). Discourses and regulatory practices govern gender. This framework puts in place a dichotomised structuring of gender - 'masculine' and 'feminine' - which are constructed as springing from the 'natural' categories of sex. In this way they are rigid, inflexible. They constrain the scope for existing outside the boundaries of what is appropriate for women and for men. The rules of gender help determine how people should act: discourses "provide a language for talking about a topic and a way of producing a particular kind of knowledge about a topic" (du Gay 1996: 43). Wetherell thus comments that it is essential

> for the social scientist to examine how femininity / masculinity labels work to define situations and discourse, in combination with the power to have those labels accepted, i.e. creating content and organizing value. (Wetherell 1986: 82)

The objective must be to describe how this framework operates. This includes practices. Discursive practices and the body of rules are determined in time and space, so have a given period, and "social, economic, geographical or linguistic area" (Foucault 1972: 117). Together they produce the rules or system of formation. Therefore, of utmost significance can be the spaces within which discourses are articulated and the (historical) time of their expression. These spaces are more than neutral backdrops to, for example, discourses of the sexes; these spaces are themselves discursively constructed - they help shape (and are themselves shaped by) the discourses taking place within them. For instance, in this study focus is on the 'home' and 'workplace'. These are spaces which carry ideological meaning and have been discursively constructed by power relations just as much as 'masculinity' and 'femininity' have been. The historical development of these spatialised discourses is traced in a later section.

This brief discussion introduces the distinction between Foucault's analysis of discourses and the "discourse analysis" methodology employed in social psychology. As Komter (1991) observes, "discourse analysis" has tended to overlook the role of power in gender relations, whilst giving precedence to the role of language. In many ways Foucauldian analyses of discourse are precisely the opposite: power is central to their understanding. Hence, analysis of discourses is crucial to understanding the exercise of power: discourses and their consequences are power. It could be said that where there are discourses, there is power. The regulatory framework which discourses construct is the means of control of people:

> We should be examining how power flows through the channels formed by discourse to reach, penetrate, and control individuals right down to their most private pleasures, using the negative methods of refusal and prohibition, but also, in a positive way, excitation and intensification. (Sheridan 1980: 169-170)

That discourses are closely related to power is a point which Foucault has consistently reiterated: "Discourse transmits and produces power; it reinforces it, but also undermines and exposes it" (Foucault 1978: 100). This is achieved because discourses produce what can be regarded as "truth" and that there "can be no possible exercise of power without a certain economy of discourses of truth" (Foucault 1980a: 93). This indicates the saturation of discourses with power. Those individuals or institutions whose discourses are accepted as "truth" are practising the power to *label* and to set the conditions and regulatory framework in which other discourses must

compete. Those who are subject to this, those who are labelled, are "in the grip of power" (Ramazanoglu 1993a: 19). Hence, there is a nexus of power-discourse-practices, where each is indicative and productive of the others:

> Power is invested in discourse; equally, discursive practices produce, maintain or play out power relations. (Henriques *et al* 1984: 115)

The role of the analyst is, therefore, to describe "the rules governing discursive practices" (Dreyfus and Rabinow 1982: 102). This leads Hacking (1986: 32) to suggest the objective of analysing discourses: concern should be not with *who* says what, but rather the conditions under which what is said has a "truth value" and so can come to be uttered, and so document the conditions of its existence (Smart 1985).

This reiterates that analysis of the exercise of power should not be concerned with subjects' conscious intentions. Unlike Weber and, to a certain extent, Lukes, Foucault dismisses the idea that discourse is reflective of consciousness and is the verbal representation of a thinking subject's 'state of mind'. Discourse

> is not a consciousness that embodies its project in the external form of language (langage); it is not a language (langue), plus a subject to speak it. It is a practice that has its own forms of sequence and succession. (Foucault 1972: 169)

This parallels the earlier suggestion that masculinity is best understood with reference to practices, not why people carry out these practices at any particular moment.

> For it is the practices, focused in technologies and innumerable separate localizations, which literally embody what the analyst is seeking to understand. (Dreyfus and Rabinow 1982: 187)

Again this emphasises the significance of the consequences of their actions:

> As Foucault phrased it, "People know what they do; they frequently know why they do what they do; but what they don't know is what what they do does." (personal communication). (Dreyfus and Rabinow 1982: 187)

Hence, the method hinges

> on the ability of the critic to go beyond the intentional level of the discourse to locate a system of problematics that are at once outside the text and within it. (Poster 1986: 217)

This is not to suggest that intentions or consciousness are not important. Indeed, I would argue that to eliminate practices of masculinity which contribute to sexist value systems requires raising consciousness; the individual must be motivated to stop the negative consequences of their actions. Rather, it serves to emphasise that it is the consequence of practices which is most important for analysis. One may not intend one's practices to be sexist or supportive of a sexist regulatory framework, but if the effect of them is to do just that then it is essential that analysis highlights the practice-consequence link. Stated intentions are often used with the purpose of denying consequences. Potter and Wetherell (1987) call these "disclaimers": 'I'm not sexist, but ...'. People construct a discourse of *saying* the right thing, appearing not to

support sexism or racism or whatever, but which has the consequence of being sexist or racist etc. It is a way of masking consequences. It is on this point that there is convergence between "discourse analysts" and Foucauldian-influenced analyses of discourse. Both urge that people's avowed attitudes should not be accepted as reflections of their actual behaviours or "true" subjectivity or that there is consistency between them.

> Discourse analysis does not take for granted that accounts reflect underlying attitudes or dispositions and therefore we do not expect that an individual's discourse will be consistent and coherent. Rather, the focus is on the discourse *itself*: how it is organised and what it is doing. (Potter and Wetherell 1987: 49)

The emphasis is very clearly upon the consequences of the discourses which are disclosed. To paraphrase Potter and Wetherell (1987: 52-53), the concern is with the sexist consequences of different forms of *accounting* in discourses.

Therefore, examination of discourses of sex and gender is vital in analysis of masculinity for they maintain it and form its practice. The use of discourses of gender has been shown to uphold "differences" which are then the basis for maintaining inequalities. Wetherell observes that

> Femininity and masculinity, examined closely, reduce to a set of codes or conventions and devices used to produce categorical difference. (Wetherell 1986: 77)

She notes that these discourses are reliant upon the assumption of a meaningful categorical difference and the reinforcement of 'imaginary identities' of masculinity and femininity (Wetherell 1986: 81). It emerges that the discourses of sex which are constructed in the two case study workplaces serve as justification for the exercise of power and the inequalities between the two sexes.

> Justifications ... do not involve the denial of responsibility, instead they claim certain actions are in fact good, sensible or at least permissible in the circumstance. (Potter and Wetherell 1987: 76)

This is precisely what occurs in the two workplaces. The division of labour along sex lines and the material consequences of this for men and women is *justified* by construction of discourses of sex. They position men and women differentially according to these discourses which hold that the sexes are naturally different and suited to certain types of work. That men materially benefit from this division is justified as a *natural* occurrence. Similarly, in an example illustrated by Potter and Wetherell (1987), it was found that rather than "reality" being neutrally described, a version of events was constructed which had the practical consequences of discrediting a group of people, so justifying their inferior positioning in social hierarchies.

The question which needs to be constantly borne in mind is 'what is gained by the construction and reproduction of a particular discourse?' The operation of power is reliant upon discourses which construct inferiority / superiority. It constructs the beneficiary of the exercise of power as superior, and others as inferior. By creating this dichotomy it facilitates the further exercise of power, because an inequality in the relation already exists. In the case of gender, when power is exercised in favour of men over women, the successful exercise is 'masculine' and those exercised upon are 'feminine'. This differential positioning can be played upon in a continuing relationship because the "feminine" is already in a devalued position, and is thus more susceptible to the exercise of power again. They serve as a 'stock of knowledge' on which future actions can draw. Hence, the conceptualisation of gender presented here diverges somewhat from Foucault's own analyses. The analysis in his empirical investigations fails adequately to consider that a "history" of power relations is carried by individuals who may interact with one another daily - the interaction between a father and daughter, for example, is endowed with a more significant "history", where unequal positioning may have developed, than that between two strangers. Individuals can become 'conditioned' by the power relations they have previously experienced, and therefore do not enter a new relationship or interaction 'fresh' on each occasion.

Masculinity, therefore, is not an empirically observable reality. Talking about Foucault's investigation of madness, Sheridan (1980: 13) comments that "madness is not initially a fact, but a judgement - even if that judgement becomes itself a fact." This offers a useful way to think of masculinity: as a judgement or a way of analysing practices and the discourses which uphold them and make them possible. In this way, analysis of masculinity can be defined as the uncovering of the discourses and discursive practices which make possible sexual inequalities. In discussing the objective of his exploration of sexuality, Foucault offers a salient observation for the study of masculinity. He notes that

> What is at issue is ... the way that sex is "put into discourse" ... The object, in short, is to define the regime of power-knowledge-pleasure that sustains the discourse on human sexuality. (Foucault 1978: 11)

Analysis of masculinity needs to ascertain how the discourses of sex articulating masculinity are sustained. When it is known how this is achieved, it will be possible to try to disrupt them and challenge them. This task is made all the more difficult because "we are dealing less with a discourse on sex than with a multiplicity of discourses produced by a whole series of mechanisms operating in different

institutions" (Foucault 1978: 33). In the empirical sections ahead, the analysis has attempted to locate the discourses which specifically operate in the two workplaces.

Therefore, drawing together the arguments of Part One, masculinity should be considered a concept not springing from biological naturalness but as a "technology of power" which has the effect of perpetuating a means of accessing power for some men relative to women, for some men relative to other men, and for some women relative to other women and men. It is a technology of power, in much the same way as are class or sexuality, for example. Technologies are not 'tangible'. One cannot take an instance of behaviour, attitude or action and say "this is caused by masculinity". Rather, masculinity needs to be seen as a practice of power. Behaviour is not caused by masculinity, masculinity is 'caused' by behaviour (in the sense that it is realised or exercised through it). Masculinity exists as practice. Thus, change in gender is far more dynamic than just being subject to historical change. It can alter situationally: femininity / masculinity can take on different forms in different spaces and at different times each day. Practices which configure masculinity in a relationship between a husband and wife are not necessarily the same as between that husband and his father, for instance, because the relationship of power is subject to change with the differences in sex, age, individual relationships, and underlying discourses.

There are certainly many other technologies of power. However, masculinity should be regarded as the power exercised in gender relations. *It is the exercise of power which creates, reinforces and maintains sexual inequalities and sexist 'oppression', achieved by the discursive construction of a 'feminine' inferior created in opposition to a 'masculine' superior, which forms the basis and the 'justification' for the exercise of power.* It is a power which produces and relies upon the creation of sexual inequalities. Rather than there being characteristics which are distinctly male, there are attributes, behaviours, actions which are constructed as *'masculine'* (often because they primarily relate to men), and things which are constructed as *'feminine'* (often because they are done by women). Certain acts come to be defined as 'masculine' or 'feminine'. They are not the same everywhere and all the time, but there is a continuity in that those labelled 'masculine' are valued and those labelled 'feminine' are relatively devalued. They are not of value by nature. They are related to the exercise of power, and purposefully, not biologically, they have a tendency to be attached to males / females. In this conceptualisation 'masculine' attributes increase "access" to the exercise of power and 'feminine' attributes reduce "access" to the exercise of power

61

because they are differentially placed in the regulatory framework of discourses. To maintain the advantageous position for those who conform to what is appropriately 'masculine', the 'feminine' is denigrated. The 'feminine' is most easily assigned to things done by women (obviously varying in/at different places/times), but is constructed 'feminine' in order to create an implied inferiority and thus powerlessness. The regulatory framework of gender constrains both men and women and the potential alternatives of their ways of living, but the 'masculine' is still accorded the most benefits.

To briefly illustrate, in one of the case study workplaces it was found that women were actively restricted from work which may lead to authority or material benefits. This was the result of the discursive construction of women as suitable for certain types of job, itself reliant on the discursive construction of women as mothers, as home makers, and as ancillary and physically inferior to men. Women were discriminated against on the basis of discursively constructed sex "differences" which perpetuated advantages for men; women were found in the most dispensable and least regarded jobs, whilst men occupied the more secure, well-paid and managerial positions. These discursive constructions were contingent. Women had previously done many of the jobs which are currently done exclusively by men - but only men are now deemed capable of these jobs. Men are constructed as 'naturally' having the characteristics needed for such work.

These discourses were achieved through practices of masculinity at a variety of scales: individual, inter-personal relationships and company policies. Masculinity and femininity are constructions which still appear firmly labelled to males and females. They are linked to relations, institutions, organisations and structures which actively create, encourage and perpetuate gender differences. It is therefore essential to begin to conceptualise femininity and masculinity within a framework which explores the links and inter-relations between men, "masculinity" and male social power, and women, "femininity" and apparent female social 'powerlessness'. Masculinity should not be limited to the individual scale and must not be regarded as an identity. Because masculinity is the practice of exercising power which perpetuates sexual inequalities, there can be 'masculine' behaviours - the practice of masculinity - but no masculinity in identity. Foucault asserts that:

> 'Discipline' may be identified neither with an institution nor with an apparatus; it is a type of power, a modality for its exercise, comprising a whole set of instruments,

techniques, procedures, levels of application, targets; it is a 'physics' or an 'anatomy' of power, a technology. (Foucault 1977: 249)

Similarly, with masculinity. It is a technology of power which extends to various scales, with varying subjects, and can be applied in various ways. Masculinity is only one aspect of a person's identity, it is not an identity in itself. As illustrated previously, Butler denounces the idea of gender as an identity:

> within the inherited discourse of the metaphysics of substance, gender proves to be performative - that is, constituting the identity it is purported to be. In this sense, *gender is always a doing*, though not a doing by a subject who might be said to pre-exist the deed. ... There is no gender identity behind the expression of gender; that identity is performatively constituted by the very "expressions" that are said to be its results. (Butler 1990a: 24-25 - emphasis added)

Gender is an artificial concept which extends and disguises the power relations responsible for its inception. Masculinities are often posited as varying according to class, age, ethnicity etc., but this privileges the role of masculinity. Class, for example, is seen to be but one aspect of masculinity. Rather, class, sexuality, age etc. constitute *an* identity (which is never fixed, static, certain), where there are components, for example the practice of masculinity, which are very difficult to use to explain any behaviour. We cannot say that a man who drinks eight pints of lager does so *because* of his "masculinity". However, we can say that a man's domestic violence is a practice of masculinity, because it creates or perpetuates sexual inequalities. Masculinity is not synonymous with power; masculinity does not account for every instance of power being exercised. As Cooper (1994: 449) stresses, deployment of power is not exclusive to one set of forces, but is *unevenly* accessible to different collectivities located along 'social vectors' of gender, class, race etc. Bodies and how they are inscribed by these technologies of power are a vital determinant of access to exercising power. It is easier to access power if your body is inscribed in the way institutions and social structures are organised to advantage certain types of people, usually white males. To understand masculinity requires an understanding of power, and only then can we begin to create a discursive formation which begins to challenge and redress the dynamics of gender relations.

To re-cap. Masculinity is articulated through discourses. They set the conditions in which power is exercised, and at the same time they transmit and are the products of power themselves. They impose the limits on the potential for liberation and constraint. They are not fixed or unchanging - they do not have the same content universally. The discourses of masculinity can be very different across places and through time. In the two case study workplaces the discourses which are constructed define and limit what should appropriately constitute 'masculine' and 'feminine' / 'men'

and 'women'. Men and women have to act within these conditions. Conformity to them creates advantages (particularly for men) whilst non-conformity creates costs (particularly for women). These conditions are continually in flux and are negotiable / (re-)negotiated.

If the discourses of sex and the practices of masculinity are constantly (re-) negotiated then masculinity is *situationally contingent*. There may be some sense of tangible, fixed masculinity, such as workplace policies or conditions of employment or legislative statutes, which are relatively static. However, within the micro-physics of gender relations (the interactions between people during the day), what constitutes masculinity may be in flux. Discourses which exist at the social scale may be drawn upon, but the construction and practice of masculinity in interactions will be dependent upon certain conditions. These may be the age and sex of the individuals, employment position, sexuality or even the type of interaction, whether friendly or hostile. There are no fixed conditions that are always the same in the practice of masculinity:

> [If I] understand masculinities in terms of sets of practices which in varying degrees contribute to the maintenance and reproduction of patriarchal systems then it does perhaps make sense to find masculinities in, sometimes, even the superficially least masculine practices. (Morgan 1992: 70)

From this it is possible to conclude that what may be analysed as masculinity in one situation may not be analysed as such in another context:

> masculinity varies as it is constructed in different situations. (Carrigan, Connell and Lee 1985: 561)

I would suggest that masculinity does not so much "vary" but is variously constituted according to different situations. Situational contingency also helps explain differential "access" to power:

> the practice of those who hold power is constrained as well. Men are empowered in gender relations, but in specific ways which produce their own limits. (Connell 1987: 108)

Connell's example is that homosexual men attract hostility because they undermine definitions of hegemonic masculinity. Masculinity is not necessarily solely reliant upon discourses of sex, but may draw on discourses of sexuality or race and other social vectors which variously determine individuals' positions in a particular relationship. This also helps explain some men's apparent feelings of powerlessness. There are situations where it is men who are constrained by the regulatory framework and, although not wishing to suggest that men generally do not have greater ability to the exercise of power, it may be that men are the explicit subjects of the exercise of power. Individuals are not just subjected to the exercise of power through masculinity, but through many other discourses. But to reiterate, the exercise can be analysed as

masculinity when it maintains inequalities or constructed differences between the sexes.

UNEQUAL POSITIONS IN THE REGULATORY FRAMEWORK: THE EXAMPLE OF 'AUTHORITY' IN THE WORKPLACE

Despite stressing in the section above that masculinity is situationally contingent, this is not to be taken as indicating that every individual is equally well placed to practice masculinity within an interaction, and therefore to exercise power. As was suggested earlier, certain individuals may be preferentially placed within the regulatory framework and others placed relationally lower. This may be the consequence of space-specific circumstances which give the impression that certain individuals "possess" power. Therefore, the weakness of Foucault's method for the analysis of power is not that differences in power are not recognised - he stresses that power creates differences that invoke hierarchies - but that he offers little suggestion as to *how* these differences occur in specific instances. He does not explicitly discuss how certain individuals may become invested with greater "access" to power. A good example of this situation will be discussed in Part Three relating to the notion of workplace 'authority' in both the case study workplaces. Within workplaces there is usually a clearly defined hierarchy of employees, with certain individuals charged with responsibilities which enable them to order other workers to do particular tasks. Hence, Huczynski and Buchanan (1991: 185) comment that differences between members of a work group begin to occur as soon as it is formed, because some members are charged with authority (or "personal power", a trend which Stewart 1989 argues will become increasingly important within corporations). Particular workplace conditions, therefore, encourage regulation of interactions between employees, although the limits of these constraints are constantly being tested in situational interactions. Hence:

> Group structure carries with it connotation of something fixed and unchanging. Perhaps the picture of scaffolding is brought to mind. While there is an element of permanency in terms of the relationships between members, these do continue to change and modify. Group members continually interact with each other, and in consequence their relationships are tested and transformed. (Huczynski and Buchanan 1991: 185)

These relationships may be under negotiation within the workplace, but they ensure unequal workplace relationships nonetheless. Therefore, where this 'authority' is acknowledged and acquiesced to (with the potential for and threat of sanctions as a backdrop) by other individuals, a hierarchical power relationship appears to be created.

As Foucault suggests, power is, indeed, not possessed, it can conceivably become so invested in an individual as to become 'concretised' and apparently possessed by actors. In fact, this 'power' is invested in an employment *position* and not a *person*. In recognising somebody's authority, an individual is effectively conforming to the 'rules of the game', and such "obedience" is exceptionally common as Milgram (1974) has so startlingly proven; MacCannell and MacCannell (1993) term these "instrumental gazes" (creating authority) and "identificatory gazes" (looking up to authority). Huczynski and Buchanan (1991: 192) refer to this power as "control over persons", that is, as determining the behaviour of others. However, they value such power structures as enabling organisations to achieve certain goals, and thereby they do not acknowledge that these power relationships also produce and determine individuals' identities, aspirations and psychology, and, therefore, may determine relationships and life *outside* of the workplace - at home and in familial relationships. Where authority is respected, those who are subjected to it are less able to influence relationships and interactions within the workplace. Thus, whilst masculinity may be situational, the people in that relationship may be unequally positioned and feel differentially able to shape its outcome.

Despite the insistence on situational contingency in my conceptualisation of masculinity, discourses of sex may retain *continuity* across time and space. Like the example of workplace authority above, this is partly the consequence of the discursive construction of the spaces within which interactions occur. Thus, it is very important to understand the context within which discursive practices take place - how a particular setting for an interaction has been *spatialised* may come to determine the nature of the interaction itself. In Soja's (1985) terms, the *socio-spatialisation* of masculinity may create unequal positions within the regulatory framework of power relations.

C. THE SPATIALISATION OF MASCULINITY

Giddens (1984) outlines that social interaction is in part constituted by its spatial setting; hence, "where things happen is part of the explanation of why and how they happen in the way they do" (Saunders and Williams 1988: 81); or, as Soja argues,

> The realisation that *social life is materially constituted in its spatiality* is the theoretical keystone for the contemporary materialist interpretation of spatiality. (Soja 1985: 94 - emphasis in original).

The socio-spatial context within which interactions occur is, therefore, highly significant. As the following empirical material will demonstrate, articulations of dominant discourses clearly take place in particular locations. Since this research

focuses specifically upon 'work' and 'home' spaces, it is important to highlight that there are also dominant discourses which help define and give meaning to 'home' and 'work' themselves. They are not only the passive settings and backdrops against which contesting discourses of the sexes occur, but they are also active influences on how and why these discourses are expressed and / or accepted as dominant. For example, discourses of men as "breadwinners" and women as "home makers" (which will be shown to have been articulated in the interview material) cannot be properly understood without reference to the historical development of places of paid work as a sphere dominated by men and 'home' as the sphere considered appropriate for women. Hence, dominant discourses of these spaces actively shape the discourses of the sexes which occur within them. Similarly, the discourses of the sexes which are shown to be dominant likewise help to construct or reinforce dominant discourses of 'home' and 'work' spaces. In this way, the discourses of 'home', 'work' and 'sex' are mutually constitutive.

> It is not just that the spatial is socially constructed; the social is spatially constructed too. (Massey 1984: 6).

Historical examination of 'home' and 'work' reveals how the "life spaces" of household and employment (Andrew and Moore Milroy 1988) become what Spain (1992) terms "gendered spaces": 'home' and 'work' spaces have developed particular sets of meanings, such that the 'home' has been identified as a 'feminine' sphere and the workplace has been defined the 'masculine' sphere. The remainder of this section examines the spatialisation of these domains and their associated ideologies.

THE SOCIO-SPATIALISATION OF 'HOME' AND 'WORK' PLACES.

For most people in pre-industrial Britain, the concept of 'separate gendered spheres' would have had little meaning. Workers' dwellings were often the site of production too, and large-scale collective employment was almost non-existent. A typical scenario for those employed in the textile industries was that spinning and weaving would be carried out in the workers' homes. Usually, the whole family would be involved in the labour process, although the work was normally divided by sex: men undertook the weaving whilst preparation of the textile was the task of women and children. The notion of 'family labour' was a common feature of pre-industrial Britain (see Lines 1990). However, the technological and financial changes which stimulated the rapid industrialisation of Britain - the "Industrial Revolution" - entailed monumental social, economic, cultural, political and sexual shifts. A principal change was the spatial separation of 'home' and 'work' as the majority of the population became employed in the large-scale industries that had created 'factory culture'. In the main,

the employment rate for women remained comparatively high, although work was still divided by sex - for instance, women employed in coal mining worked in those areas of the pits where men refused to labour (John 1980).

The strict division of the sexes - and the assigning of characteristics deemed appropriate to each sex - was stimulated largely by two factors, economic and moral. As Pinchbeck (1969) traces, married women became increasingly financially-dependent on their husbands, who were able to command a 'family wage' for their labour; it became expected that women would look after the home and children as technology improvements outstripped the need for labour-intensive work methods. There was a gradual decline in the levels of female employment activity. This was matched by the increasing concern throughout the nineteenth century with 'repressive' morality, one aspect of which was that the sexes were to be treated as thoroughly different, from biology to all aspects of social life. The result was that women (like children) were the focus of legislative "protection" as they were assumed too fragile for modern living. The 1842 Mines (Regulation) Act, for example, forbade women and children from working underground and, as McDowell and Massey (1984) note, this destroyed the system of 'family labour', creating mining as male dominated and, later, male unionised workplaces. Throughout social life, pressure developed to conform to prescriptions of appropriate behaviour for the Victorian lady or gentleman (Davidoff and Hall 1987) and was even strongly influential on landscape architecture designs (see Cosgrove and Daniels 1988). Hayden (1986) notes that architects from Pugin to Ledoux shared a nineteenth century commitment to separate spheres for men and women. In such ways, discourses of the sexes became physically inscribed in the landscape, creating mutually reinforcing ideas of the sexes, space and difference. These pressures were particularly intense amongst the influential middle classes:

> the Victorian ideal of the middle-class woman as the 'angel' in the home, the creator of the 'home as haven', as passive femininity, is well documented and contrasted with the working class woman as domestic labourer. (Gregson and Lowe 1995: 226)

Nevertheless, throughout the nineteenth century, as Britain progressed through industrialisation, the sexes became increasingly seen as appropriately divided into different spheres of activity. Stansell (1987) notes that the 'home' became based on a particular configuration of family members: women at home, men at work, and children under maternal supervision or at school. It is argued that as a consequence of the "feminising" of the 'home', the desires of men have been served; casting women as

domestic servants reduced men's burdens and allowed them to excel in the public sphere of the workplace.

The collectivising of labour and the growth of industrial capitalism not only prompted the sexual-spatial constitution of the 'home', but also created other new 'regimes'. The need to make factory work profitable made the regulation of 'time' more important. Thompson (1967) traces capitalism's relentless drive towards 'time-discipline' of workers whose lifestyles became regimented by the factory clock, reinforced by moralists' desires to prevent 'the devil making work for idle hands'. Similarly, Foucault (1977) notes how architectural designs, such as Bentham's panopticon, became focused upon spatial surveillance of workers, prisoners, mental patients and scholars, creating in the process "docile bodies" to ensure the upholding of institutional philosophies - a way to transform society using space. From Marx onwards, this process has stimulated countless studies of (male) workers' 'alienation' from subjectivity, as du Gay (1996) clearly illustrates. This 'alienation' contributed to the construction of the 'home' as a "haven" away from the regulation of working life, thereby making it a place where men could become "master of their own homes"; McDowell and Massey (1984: 130) comment that Durham miners became tyrants at home, venting their frustration at workplace exploitation on women in the home.

Working hours were eventually reduced as the result of legislation and technological improvements. The consequence was the inception of organised leisure for the first time (Jackson 1992) and time away from paid labour for workers (the majority of whom, of course, were male). The extension of unions and the 'family wage' enabled the further withdrawal of women from paid work in order to fulfil their culturally approved domestic 'role'. This role removed women as home makers from external structures of power, thereby allowing men to dominate public (social) life - Hayden notes that the two characteristics of industrial capitalism were:

> the physical separation of household space from public space, and the economic separation of the domestic economy from the political economy. (Hayden 1986: 29)

The new constructions of men as paid workers and women as home makers were challenged and disrupted in the twentieth century during the two World Wars. Political campaigning by women for new approaches to the home, work and family life had been met previously with political and practical indifference by the politicians and planners of those times (Hayden 1986), but with men conscripted to the army, the discursive construction of women as incapable, fragile child bearers was contested by their playing of a crucial role in arms producing factories.

On the cessation of both wars, however, government came under intense pressure to turn over to men those jobs done by women during wartime. Part of the strategy for its achievement was an unprecedented propaganda campaign involving government prescribing the appropriate roles of women and men - men as family breadwinners, women as dutiful wives (characteristics which the empirical findings of Parts Two and Three show to still exist today). Its success, Hayden (1986) illustrates, was aided by architectural and planning discourses. She claims that post-war housing was designed to allow the fulfilment of dominant discourses of the sexes: "One can describe suburban housing as an architecture of gender" (Hayden 1986: 17). There emerged a literal translation of discourses of the sexes into space which further divorced women from power (thereby reinforcing the image of women as weak and in need of (male) protection). Urban planners prioritised suburban development and the promotion of private transport, which had the effect of isolating women from workplaces and employment, creating a financial, mobility and spatial dependency upon men. These pressures extended throughout social life. Hayden (1986) argues that the twentieth century has witnessed an almost unrelenting attempt to place women in the 'home' as houseproud mothers - through urban planning, house design, the marketing of electrical appliances and their consumption, advertising and government propaganda. Feminist scholarship has highlighted how attempts by women to break down the discourse of 'home' as women's sphere by entering paid employment have been constantly challenged by sexist labour market recruitment (note Hanson and Pratt 1995), planning practices (Little 1994), sexual divisions of labour (for example, Massey 1984); and working practices (for example, McDowell 1995), whilst little concerted effort has been made by men to take over domestic responsibilities in the 'home' (cf. Wheelock 1991, Haas 1993). As the empirical findings of this thesis illustrate, the negotiation of these spheres is a feature of everyday life for women and men in the case study workplaces.

There is a clear development in this 'history' of a dichotomous constitution of 'home' and 'work' which embraces a dualism between public and private space and a concept of distinct spatial spheres broadly categorisable as 'feminine' and 'masculine'. The notion of 'separate spheres' has been widely considered in social scientific discourse. For example,

> The terms public and private refer to areas of social life and social space that are perceived to be separate and even mutually exclusive. 'Public' consistently refers

to the realm of order and reason, with the private representing disorder, desire, emotion. (Pringle 1989: 227)

This leads Pringle to suggest a broad gendering of space into private (feminine) and public (masculine); she notes how, increasingly, 'public' life has come to mean 'work' (as opposed to its original reference to political activity) and 'private' has become synonymous with the 'home'. This development leads Allan and Crow (1989: 1) to comment that the home has always been considered a 'fundamentally private affair'. Blair (1981) relates this dichotomy to the production of 'masculine' and 'feminine' gender identity:

> The whole male personality is perceived as requiring an amalgam of the private and public side. Women, on the other hand, are perceived as acquiring their social identity *and* personal individuality solely in the sphere of the private. They are defined in relation to men, as daughters, wives, mothers and so on, and they perform for them, as housewives, servants, nannies, mistresses and so on. Women have functioned as men's private life, secreted in the attic, displayed in the reception room. There is room for her at every level; but not a room of her own. (Blair 1981: 212)

In other words, spatial containment produces different subjectivities and perceptions of reality. Similarly, those spaces are constituted by the individuals and interactions taking place within them; according to Allan and Crow (1989), the private sphere of the 'home' is marked off from the public sphere of society by 'who' is encountered within it, the activities undertaken in each, and the appropriate behaviours of people in each. In their conceptualisation, 'home' means being safe and in command and is the place of "creativity and expression". Hence, the separation of 'work' and 'home' outlined above determined the latter as 'private' space, and influenced the 'appropriateness' of the activities which take place within them, such that "the domestic became the specialised domain of emotionality and self-expression" (Zaretsky 1976). Thereby, the domestic becomes associated with dominant discourses of women, whilst men become characterised with the more rational and detached world of 'public' life (see Hearn 1992).

However, the conceptualisation of 'home' and 'work' within a 'separate spheres' framework is the product of a particular dichotomous epistemology (Sayer 1992). As Jackson (1992: 128) notes "Feminist theory issues a radical challenge to established distinctions between the private and the public"; Watson (1991) argues that these dichotomies may reflect a real historical separation, but stresses that this separation is dissolving in modern social life: households are increasingly characterised by "impermanence and breakdown" (151). Therefore, to continue to characterise the two 'spheres' as so conveniently divorced in such a rigidly gendered manner is to

reproduce the discourses which produced it. Acceptance of spheres as separate amounts to a conformity to dominant discourses which insist the spheres should be detached and gendered; this is partly the result of certain ontological positions in the human sciences dominating and influencing how space and gender have been conceptualised. For example, Marxist analysis has progressed from an assumption that men's position at work determines women's oppression in capitalist relations. Thus, this has meant, as Saunders and Williams (1988) outline, not only that the role of 'production' has been overstated in analysis, but also that Marxist theory has contributed to the discourse of separate spheres. It has located the workplace - the 'masculine' - as the most important site of social relations and, in the process, has further denigrated the 'feminine' sphere of the home by not recognising its true worth in the production of social inequalities.

Similarly, there has been a readiness to view 'work' and 'home' as unproblematic givens. For instance, Saunders and Williams (1988: 83) define the home as "a socio-spatial system). Somerville (1989) points out that by viewing the home as a "socio-spatial system", the variety of meanings associated with home by individuals is lost. One could also level the criticism that studies have consistently reified such definitions. By accepting this definition as a pre-discursive reality, the real lived experiences of the 'home' are obscured in an attempt to relate generalised assumptions about 'work' and 'home' into a 'theory'. That is, by viewing the 'home', for example, as a locale for empirical research, the ideology of 'the home' as a separate sphere is reproduced and reinforced. It may be that, in empirical study, it is found that individuals do act and think of the home as an entity separate from 'public' life of the workplace (which is the case for some of the study participants discussed in Parts Two and Three). However, what we then have is the separate spheres ideology being lived out in everyday experience. In this way, arguments such as those of Somerville (1989) urge that the 'home' or 'work' should not be considered to be *a priori* realities, but must be considered as objects of study constituted by concrete practices. In a Foucauldian sense, the object 'home' is the product of power relations. Like the suggestions made for the study of gender earlier in Part One, there must be acknowledgement that the apparent *causes* of power relations - the 'home' or 'work' - are themselves, in fact, the *effects* of power relations as well. By viewing home / work as distinct separate spheres - 'masculine' and 'feminine' - the construction of those gender characteristics themselves are reinforced. Hence, when, in empirical investigation, a discourse of 'home is the appropriate sphere for women, work is the appropriate sphere for men' is

articulated, a particular constitution is being conveyed. Namely, the constitution of 'home' and 'work' as spaces, and 'women' and 'men' as sexes, as both different from each other and as mutually constitutive. It is, therefore, from within this context that academic work on 'separate spheres theory' must be viewed; much feminist work has echoed traditional analyses by celebrating the 'home' as women's sphere (although valuing the work women undertake there far more highly than their traditional counterparts). The development of academic theory in the social sciences has, by studying the 'home' and 'work' spheres as exclusive, contributed to defining what characteristics and tasks are deemed appropriate to each sex. It is from this context that the literature connecting 'masculinity' and home / work spaces must be evaluated. By and large, this work has stressed that 'home' and 'work' each have a unique and usually independent impact upon the constitution of masculine identities.

THE INTER-RELATIONSHIP OF DISCURSIVE CONSTRUCTIONS OF MASCULINITY AND OF 'HOME' AND 'WORK' SPACES

The domination of paid work by men since industrialisation has prompted the study of workplaces as a "breeding ground" for the formation of 'masculinity'. McDowell and Massey (1984) describe how nineteenth century mining defined miners' identities by the "endowment of their manual labour itself with the attributes of masculinity and virility" (130), whilst Devaney (1991: 154) argues that mining in the present day is "a world apart from women ... where the other sex does not exist". 'Work' has been widely considered the single most important determinant in the formation of masculine identity (note, for example, Willis 1977, Turkel 1985, Pratt and Hanson 1991, Jackson 1996). It is often implied that the importance of work cannot be overstated:

> Work is the key to men's public identity in industrial societies. It's the most important activity in the lives of most ... men. (Lewis 1983: 120)

Similarly, Cockburn (1983: 133) claims that "men identify work itself, the fact of waged work outside the home and family, with masculinity", whilst Bertaux-Wiame (1981: 256) found that work gave men a feeling of "who they were". This literature suggests that the 'differences' between masculinity and femininity are caused by men's occupation of paid employment and women's position as domesticated home dwellers: "the very idea of a career contradicts everyday notions of femininity" (Leighton 1992: 132).

Particular emphasis has been put upon the relationship between masculinity and wage earning (note, particularly, Gould 1974) and upon men as family "breadwinners" (such as Tolson 1977, Collinson and Collinson 1989). It is not simply work which is important to masculinity but the *type* of work. Shop-floor work has been regarded as especially

significant (Willis 1977, 1979, Collinson 1988), shaping 'masculine superiority' (Grey 1987) and masculine identity more generally (such as Roy 1973) by instilling in men a value system dominated by physical ability and resilience, and by ability to distance self from antithetical 'feminine' images of the 'home'; Collinson (1988) showed that workplace masculinity was founded upon sexist, chauvinistic, homophobic and racist humour, all of which were considered to help develop "real men". The characteristics of types of work are drawn upon in the presentation of self - Pringle (1989) showed that male secretaries (and their bosses) re-define their work to differentiate themselves from female colleagues. As a result, it is argued that there are job-specific masculinities: Game and Pringle (1984) show bank work to be gendered 'feminine' because of its service function, McDowell and Court (1994, 1995) illustrate merchant banks as sites of competing multiple masculinities and femininities, whilst Henry and Massey (1994) and Massey (1995) argue that there are distinct formations of masculinity within the "high-tech" industries which they examined.

The male preserve of work has been forcefully, and successfully, challenged by women's increasing participation in the labour force, the combined result of wartime female employment, "second-wave" (liberal) feminism and basic economic forces. It is argued that the injection of the "feminine" into the workplace has resulted in it becoming a site of contested power between the sexes (making the mixed-sex workplaces chosen for this study interesting sites for the analysis of gender-power relations). Bowl (1985) comments that the workplace provides a site for contestation of masculinity since it is undermined by the presence of competent women. Yet practices of masculinity against women may reinforce constructions of women as incompetent: Pringle (1989) quotes a secretary talking about her boss: "As far as he is concerned women are there to enhance his masculinity and authority" (46). The constitution of masculinity may, additionally, be in flux. Work previously reserved for women is being appropriated, as formerly "feminine" skills are being redefined as "masculine": in the nineteenth century men took over the occupation of spinning that had been the preserve of women (McDowell and Massey 1984); new technology in the printing industry forced men to redefine their skills (Cockburn 1984); whilst Game and Pringle (1984) cite numerous examples in Australian industries where men's work has been re-defined as their jobs have been threatened by female labour. This reasserts the contingency of masculinity and suggests, again, that to understand masculinity requires a focus upon micro-practices in workplaces, for example, to understand how its spatial constitution is fluid.

'Home' has also been identified as influential on masculinity, notably the separation of 'home' and 'work' spheres. Pringle (1989: 214) has commented that men regard 'home' and 'work' spaces as opposite and complementary, that their identity in one is reliant upon (and separated from) the other. Other studies of masculinity argue that the home is experienced as a "refuge" (Bowl 1985) and as providing the arena for the expression of emotions (Kaufman 1987a: 16) with the implication that there are distinct 'work' and 'home' masculinities. Reflecting a common theme in writing about the 'home' more generally, Tolson (1977) similarly argues that the 'home' acts as a haven for men to express themselves in a way not possible in the workplace: 'home' is the domain of 'non-work' for men, where they expect to relax, let their barriers down and be looked after (Pringle 1989). It is important to realise that 'home' and 'work' spaces may act as increasingly important locations for the development of gender identities as unemployment for men and growing employment for women continues to break down traditional strict spatial separation of the sexes (Wheelock 1991).

In the main, however, there has been far less investigation of the relationship between masculinity and 'home' than there has between masculinity and 'work'. It has been assumed that the 'home' is not a sphere which has much relation with masculinity. This reflects the pervasiveness of the separate spheres ideology. By focusing upon masculinity at work and neglecting to study men's lives outside of work and, more specifically, within the 'home' context itself, there has been a reification of 'work' as a 'masculine' domain, and 'home' as a feminine domain. In this thesis, the construction of masculinity is investigated in *both* 'spheres'. It understands 'home' and 'work' as material and discursive spaces within which interactions take place, and as sites of different *types* of relationships. In Part Two it is shown how there is a 'discursive dialectics' of 'home' and 'work'; it exemplifies how home-based subjectivities are reproduced at work; how the "breadwinner" role can structure subjectivities of individuals in the home; how relations of power at work can influence relations of power in the home setting; and it illustrates how the "gendering" of home / work is the product of processes operating *across* the two spaces. It has been emphasised in academic research that work is so very important to men in the construction of their masculine identities, but this is partly the function of the near exclusive study of men and their employment; this thesis attempts to focus beyond these confines to understand the inter-relating power relations of men and women in both the material spaces of paid work and household dwelling.

As Gregson and Lowe (1995) note, academic research has, by and large, contributed to the process of separating 'home' and 'work' spaces by the continued dismissal of the 'home' as a scale worthy of academic investigation. Since the 'home' has been dismissed as an appropriate site of study, the emphasis on workplaces has highlighted the work-masculinity link because men have dominated paid employment throughout the century and continue to occupy those work positions of greater security (that is, not part-time and temporary work which is largely done by women). This tendency is also reproduced in feminist research; for example, Watson's (1991) study of women, 'home' and employment still assumes that 'woman' means a person caring for children and that 'man' refers to a person in full-time employment and head of a married family; and Hayden's (1986) arguments still progress from an essentialised version of women and their skills as nurturers and care givers in her attempt to gain recognition for the 'feminine' sphere as valid and as important as the 'masculine' sphere of work. Hayden demands recognition of the home as a workplace, but reinforces discourses of women as appropriately home bound because of their 'natural' skills of parenting.

The study of masculinity has not acknowledged that 'work' and 'home' are not unproblematic spaces within which masculinity simply happens, nor has it managed to illustrate the nuances and links between the two spheres, instead settling for a dichotomous version of separate domains which contain people of a different sex. It has explained the "differences" between the sexes as the result of men and women occupying different 'lifeworlds' and in doing so it has neglected to focus upon how practices of masculinity and these "differences" are produced and reproduced in everyday social interactions. In this sense, they have failed to examine the micro-processes of power and provide a richer sense of the connections between 'home' / 'work'.

ALTERNATIVE READINGS OF 'HOME' AND 'WORK'

It is clear, therefore, that as 'home' and 'work' have been considered in a dichotomous way which reinforces discourses of sex, it is necessary to investigate how else the two spaces can be understood. In particular, it is necessary to acknowledge the plurality of meanings which can be attached to these spaces. There are multiple interpretations and experiences of 'home' which disrupt and contest the conceptualisation of home / work within a separate spheres dichotomy. As Clark (1987: 130-31) comments, domestic life contains "intimacy and estrangement; growing together and growing

apart; affection and violence; affluence and poverty; experience and inexperience". A simple definition of the 'home' is not sufficient. It must be viewed as significantly more than just the site of 'rest and relaxation'. The 'work' and 'home' domains may be characterised as masculine or feminine, but as Pringle (1989) notes, these dualisms are very often reversed. In the case of the workplace, she notes that it is the (female) secretary who represents order, efficiency and discipline, while the (male) boss represents chaos and disorder (Pringle 1989: 214). In this way men display the typical traits of 'femininity', and women those of 'masculinity'. This provides a direct conflict with stereotypes and the expected conformity to norms, and challenges the simple gendering of the workplace as 'masculine'. This suggests that masculinity becomes expressed in certain ways in particular spaces and at particular times. The mere presence of women in the workplace can be read as a challenge to dominant discourses; by breaking down the assumption of male dominance, the workplace becomes a site of contest over dominant discourses of the sexes, and the boundaries between what is appropriate for men and for women is blurred.

Whilst a linear 'history' of sex-spatialisation was presented above, it must be stressed that this reflects the dominant discursive constructions of 'home' and 'work' as much as reporting material reality. There has always been resistance to these discourses, such as attempts to create alternative definitions of 'home' and 'work' and of their literal geographies in town and dwelling designs. Amongst Hayden's (1986) many examples of the challenge to the spatialisation of separate spheres discourses in architecture is that of the Nina West homes in London. These were designed to deliberately bridge rigid notions of 'private' and 'public' life for their one parent family residents (both female and male led) by providing low rent apartments with in-built day care centres and opportunities for paid employment. They conflated the boundaries of distinct 'work' / 'home' spaces and dominant prescriptions of gendering of 'work'. Much (feminist) research has highlighted that the 'home' is also the site of 'work', and by challenging dominant meanings of 'home' it has challenged the way 'work' is conceptualised as well. Women's involvement in paid employment has been obscured by male categories of work, that is work taking place in 'collective' or public workplaces (Watson 1991). Notions of 'real work' have been constituted within patriarchal discourse by their spatial separation from the home (Watson 1991: 137). Similarly, Pahl (1985) begins to break down the strict dualism of the 'home' as a place of non-work and the 'workplace' as the only site of work in his typology. According to Pahl, work falls into three spheres: wage-labour; domestic work; and inter-household

exchanges of labour. He argues that their mutual links must be examined. Such typologies begin to place 'work' as central to the definition of 'home', thereby dismissing the equation of 'home' with a place of rest:

> it is important not to overlook the simple point that creating the home is essentially an active process which involves forms of work, 'housework' in the broadest sense of that term. The tension between such domestic activity and ideas of the home as a place of leisure and escape from work is immediately apparent, and highlights the contradictoriness of the home functioning as both workplace and place of relaxation. (Allan and Crow 1989: 11)

When Hayden (1986) proffers that 'home' and 'work' are two disparate worlds for male workers, but two different workplaces for women, she highlights the dichotomous notion of these spheres as a reflection of male-centred discourse.

Saunders and Williams (1988: 91) comment that the 'home' is more than a tranquil passive enclave housing workers, it is where whole sets of processes and meanings are formed and restructured. These include not only 'work' but also processes of violence and subordination (Dowling and Pratt 1993); the incidence of domestic violence against women makes a mockery of the construction of 'home' as "women's space" and the place where women are "in control". It has often been useful in political discourse to retain the notion that 'home' is 'feminised'; as Connell (1987) observes, there just are no other "feminine" spaces. However, simultaneously to being the site of 'oppression', homeplaces may be the "site for resistance" (hooks 1991: 45). Forms of resistance to traditional spatialisation of gender include co-operative forms of living and political protest, emphasising that space can be utilised as a way of contesting dominant discourses. The mutual constitution of sex and space means that by challenging the spatialisation of 'home' or 'work', the constructions of 'masculinity' and 'femininity' associated with them is being challenged as well. In this way, too, space becomes political:

> we need to think of home in terms of dominance and resistance; to consider how and why a particular ideology of home maintains its hegemonic position and how this might be contested through alternative interpretations. (Gregson and Lowe 1995: 226).

This offers a useful way of understanding how not only dominant discourses of space, but also of sex, can be negotiated. This notion is revealed in the empirical findings to be key to the analysis of masculinity.

Concluding comments:

Through an examination of the spatial constitution of home and work places, it has been suggested that 'home' and 'work' must not be seen as completely separate

spheres. It has been argued that doing so reflects an academic gendering of the two spaces, by labelling certain forms of labour as 'work' (that is, work undertaken in public environments of offices, factories, etc.) or 'non-work' (usually the work which is unpaid and located in the domestic location). By dismissing the 'home' as a site of work and by highlighting it as a site of relaxation, the work actually undertaken in the 'home' (usually by women) has been devalued. It must be acknowledged that this spatial separation is often lived out in everyday social relations, but not accepted that the 'home' and 'work' are a priori realities. The findings presented in Parts Two and Three suggest that the underlying discourses to these dichotomies are as strong as ever: whilst the physical spatial separation may be in decline, the philosophy which helped to create them is still being invoked in explaining everyday life. It needs to be understood that 'home' and 'work' acquire their meaning and constitution from the power relations of social action, but simultaneously help to shape the interactions (and power relations) which take place within them:

> 'home' and 'work' cannot readily be separated, as relations of dominance and subordination established in one domain carry over into the other. (Jackson 1992: 115)

Hence, when examining the power relations of gender and the ways that discourses of masculinity are articulated in everyday life, sensitivity must be shown to how discourses of sex are spatialised and how spaces are sexualised. As the empirical findings will demonstrate, masculinity is dependent upon situational context, and the individuals, the location, and the 'history' of power relations which make up this situation. The sites where discourses of the sexes are articulated convey discourses / knowledge / power about what is "appropriate" for the sexes already. These spaces help to create a "legacy" / stock of knowledge which can be drawn upon by actors in their own articulation of discourses.

This examination of the constitution of sex and space provides further insights for the analysis of masculinity. It reveals how, despite Foucault's insistence on the free-flowing nature of power, differential positionings in relation to power emerge. For the 'history' of power that constitutes the space within which an interaction takes place influences the form the interaction will take. Particular discourses may have become embedded in a certain site. The physical design of spaces may reflect discourses of sex and this, in turn, will influence how men and women may be positioned differentially in an interaction in that space. Many inter-relating forces of power will converge on interactions and the site of their occurrence; in a workplace, 'authority', employment policies and practices, conditions of employment, and individuals' sex will

all influence the power relations of an interaction; in the 'home', issues of financial control, divisions of labour and inter-personal relationships may be more important. Whilst everyone may have responsibility for exercising power in interactions (MacCannell and MacCannell 1993), the conditions and 'history' of power severely constrain and position individuals in relation to one another. As the thesis goes on to illustrate, there are differentials within the regulatory framework of power which are simultaneously the product of power and the producer of power, subjectivity, identity, and material reality.

D. RESEARCHING MASCULINITY

This section briefly outlines the methodology of the empirical research and discusses the practical issues that arose. The rationale behind the choice of methods was modified during the course of the research and their ultimate success or failure was not necessarily related to their initial selection. The research employed qualitative methods. Their increasing popularity within geography (Eyles and Smith 1988) reflects their suitability for studies which attempt to capture and investigate people's lived experiences and to contextualise theoretical understandings. The arguments for qualitative techniques have been widely rehearsed (see Walker 1985, McCracken 1988, Berg 1989, Cook and Crang 1995) and their necessity is obvious in studies which are interested in gaining a more in-depth understanding of a few people's lives.[8] The empirical material presented in the thesis was obtained primarily from semi-structured, repeated interviews supplemented by some limited observational data and field notes. The following sections describe the research process and the methods used to collect information.

CASE STUDY WORKPLACES AND STUDY PARTICIPANTS

The selection of the case study workplaces and interview participants proceeded from the logic that Strauss (1987: 16) calls "theoretical sampling": "Where can I find

---

[8] The value of feminist methodologies has also been discussed extensively elsewhere (note particularly Roberts 1981, Bowles and Klein 1983, Stanley and Wise 1983, 1993, Harding 1987, Reinharz 1992, and Renzetti and Lee 1993, and *Canadian Geographer* 1993 and *Professional Geographer* 1993 for explicit discussion of feminist methods in geography). They have emphasised that there is no such thing as a feminist method, only feminist ways of utilising methods. Stanley and Wise (1983, 1993) note that feminist ontology, epistemology, methodology and method are inter-linked, that one cannot be independent of the others - they are all mutually informed. However, in-depth interviews are regarded as a key tool for feminist research (see Oakley 1981a, 1981b). Much emphasis has been placed on the critique of traditional research practices. Most studies of masculinity have remained inexplicit in the political motivation behind the selection of research methods (although note Messner 1990a, 1990b, Morgan 1981, 1990, 1992: 175-186, Hearn 1993 and Connell 1995 as exceptions).

instances of 'x' and 'y'?". One objective had been to compare two contrasting types of work, to broadly define distinctions between mental and manual labour. It was decided to recruit from within the same workplace as it was felt important that there should be some common experiential link between participants. The study hoped to gauge not only individual experiences but also interactions between workers - gender relations - to get a sense of collective experiences. For this reason it was also necessary to interview people of both sexes. To counter the methodological weakness of literature identified earlier - research only of men - it was necessary to speak to both men and women to prevent responses being limited solely to the experiences of one sex. It was important not to exclude study of women's experiences: the intention was to get 'both sides of the story'. This departure from conventional approaches to masculinity proved invaluable; it added greater depth to understanding, and forced a personal re-evaluation of masculinity. It proved vital to the reconceptualisation of masculinity discussed above.

An academic department within a university was chosen as the "mental" workplace. Access to "the Department" was relatively easy, aided by a contact and confirmed by the Head of Department. A letter was then sent to every member of the academic staff (with a covering letter of encouragement from the contact), inviting them to take part in a study of experiences of work and home, with a particular focus upon men's experiences. All seventeen respondents were subsequently interviewed over a period of three months. The "manual" workplace was more difficult to arrange. Contacts were established with firms via a university industrial liaison officer but without any success. Letters were then sent to large employers presenting details of the study, and it was from one of these ("South Yorkshire Metal Products") that access was negotiated. The contact at the firm recruited participants on a voluntary basis. A good mix of shop floor workers and non-production staff was desired, but no current production workers accepted the invitation. Eleven people were interviewed over a period of three months. All the interviews took place in 1995. Biographies of every participant are presented in Appendix One.[9]

---

[9] In addition, a pilot study of four men was undertaken. Three of them (Terry, Kevin, Bob) were recruited from a "men's group" and produced four interviews. The fourth (Mick) was recruited via a friend from the professional field of the course run by the Department. He was interviewed once. In the empirical chapters there is only brief reference to the material from these interviews.

Pseudonyms have been given to every participant and their family and friends. All place and company names are fictional. Some descriptive details have been disguised to preserve confidentiality.

THE DEPARTMENT

The academic workplace is a municipal university department in the north of England. By national standards it is a large department of over seventy teaching staff (including part-time teachers). It is perhaps best described as a semi-academic department since it administers both a degree course and a professional, vocational course, which is taught by recruits from professional practice, hired on non-standard academic staff contracts. The lecturing staff is 53.6% male, and 46.4% female. The staff profile has witnessed dramatic recent change as a consequence of a large influx of predominantly female appointments. This has followed a period of approximately ten years where no new staff joined the department. Each member of staff has their own office which is used for holding tutorials. The Department has its own building - its expansion has forced other departments into new accommodation. During term time it is very busy and staff complain about the frequency of interruptions from students.

The changes which have occurred in the Department broadly reflect the rapid re-organisation of higher education accompanying the creation of "new" universities and the trebling of student numbers. Universities have become subject to more competitive forms of funding with departments and staff being critically assessed on "performance" in the 'Research Assessment Exercise' and 'Teaching Quality Assessment'. Although there is no 'line-management' structure, there is a hierarchy up which staff can be promoted: lecturer, senior lecturer, reader and professor, and other positions such as Head of Department, Dean, Pro-Vice Chancellor and (ultimately) Vice Chancellor.

SOUTH YORKSHIRE METAL PRODUCTS (SYMP)

South Yorkshire Metal Products is a long established firm in South Yorkshire which specialises in the production of a variety of high quality, mass-produced metal goods (but is not involved in steel production itself). It has a local reputation as a good employer and as a low-profile company. It is one of the district's largest employers with nearly a thousand workers, although this is a much reduced workforce from a decade ago. In this time it has witnessed significant changes as it attempts to maintain its market position: it has tried to become much more competitive, particularly in response to growing Third World competition. The company has a quite noticeably old age profile, accounted for by the many workers with long service of upwards of 35 years. SYMP prides itself on good industrial relations and has never experienced a strike; its staff are members of small-scale unions. It is now part-owned by an

expanding Swiss company. The firm occupies a large site of around two hundred acres. It has two factories (which are being reorganised to a production line system) and administrative blocks on the edges of the site. Its size is reflected by the fact it takes over an hour to walk around the premises.

The economy of South Yorkshire has undergone radical transformation since the early 1980s. Famed as a centre of steel and cutlery manufacture, the area has been forced to adjust to mass unemployment in manufacturing. Between 1981 and 1983, 41000 jobs were lost, leaving only 2.2% of the workforce employed in the steel industry and unemployment (as of January 1995) at 10.7% (Taylor, Evans and Fraser 1996). Job security at SYMP remains comparatively good; whilst other major employers have closed down, SYMP has strengthened its market position and is expanding its operations. It has been observed that economic changes in South Yorkshire have had a significant impact upon gender relations and gender politics - in a party political sense in local government (Goodwin, Duncan and Halford 1993) and in terms of effects upon 'masculine identities' of men deprived of manufacturing employment (Taylor and Jamieson 1996).

INTERVIEW STRUCTURE

A total of fifty one interviews were carried out, and these produced around seventy hours of tape recorded material. Each single interview varied in length from forty minutes to an hour and a half. The most interview time spent with any individual was approximately three hours. The material was subsequently transcribed, the bulk of it simultaneously with the research process. Whilst most of the interviews were one-to-one, two married couples were interviewed together, although this had not been pre-arranged. The majority of the meetings were held in the workplaces themselves. All the academics were interviewed in their offices, at their request. Amongst the SYMP workers, around half the interviews took place in participants' homes. All interviews at work were completed during company time for which permission had been granted.

Generally, two interviews were carried out with each individual or couple, although occasionally "both" interviews took place at the same meeting. The objective of repeated interviews was to enable more time to be spent with each person to discuss a larger variety of topics than is possible in one-off situations. It meant that any important material could be covered in the second interview if not in the first, and allowed both respondents and myself as researcher time between meetings to reflect

upon what had been said. This allowed more time both for discussion of particularly relevant subjects in depth and for getting to know the person. There was also a practical-theoretical reason. Each of the interviews was designed to focus upon certain aspects of respondents' lives. The first interview was mainly structured around their work, workplace and work history, whilst the second concentrated upon home life and non-employment activities.

The content of the interviews developed gradually and was the product of theoretical ideas that arose from the literature, of personal experience and of what worked or what was most illustrative in the interviews themselves. Issues surrounding work discussed by Willis (1977) and Tolson (1977) and on the home by Oakley (1974) and Wheelock (1991) proved particularly useful in the production of an interview schedule. The interviews were focused on specific topics but were kept flexible; some issues were not common to all the interviews and many developed from what respondents themselves said. The format for the two meetings was loosely structured around the following themes:

Interview One

> Description of work and opinions on the work and workplace
>
> Identity through work
>
> Work history and unemployment
>
> Gender relations at work and workplace discrimination
>
> Workplace authority
>
> Socialising

Interview Two

> Background on home life
>
> Division of space at home
>
> Household budgeting and the division of domestic economy
>
> Leisure time and hobbies
>
> Aspirations for the future

The theory and method developed in tandem as the research proceeded. The interviews were not designed solely for explicit discussion of 'masculinity', but to focus particularly on the spaces and activities which the literature indicated as important to masculinity. The aim was to make the discussions "geographical" (that is, bringing in

concern for the specifics of place and time as opposed to abstract generalisations, and the concern for "grounding theory" (Glaser and Strauss 1967) with empirical research) and to present different strategies for revealing masculinity. Many aspects of gender were talked about directly, as the interview material illustrates. However, it was as important to build up an understanding of the workplaces and the activities which take place within them as it was to elicit information on individual experiences; it was essential to understand the relationship between individuals and the institutional context of masculinity and so to discover the significance of masculinity beyond the limits of personal psychology.

The interview material was supplemented by a limited degree of observational data (although in no way is this to suggest that participant observation was undertaken). In writing up the results, the notes made after the interviews about the participants and their workplace or home became increasingly significant. These included observations made whilst walking around the Department and sitting in the departmental cafeteria. From SYMP, they consisted of things observed from site visits and from an extensive tour of the company's premises, and from waiting in offices, watching employees interacting and chatting with other staff who were not formally interviewed. In retrospect it would have been valuable to devote more time to this aspect of research and to assign greater significance to observations that could have perhaps been discussed with the respondents. The field notes were analysed as an integral part of the interview materials.

ANALYSIS

In many ways the analysis formed the most crucial aspect of the research method. Analysis necessarily involves examination of not only the interview materials but of the academic literature as well; as Strauss (1987) notes, the analysis of literature and interviews involves a 'dialectical' process - the reading of the one influences the reading of the other, and it is a false distinction to view the two as separate. It is from the first moments of analysis of the interviews that theory becomes "grounded" by empirical material. This analysis was exhaustive and altered as the process progressed. The first phase of written analysis occurred during transcribing. Listening to the tapes and then reading and re-reading transcripts provided the initial opportunities for seeking important information. This included not only background information about the Department (the first set of interviews) but also specific experiences that respondents recalled. The interviews were summarised, and initial

'memoing' (Strauss 1987) was undertaken. The interviews were 'coded' - breaking down, conceptualising and reconstructing data in new ways (Strauss and Corbin 1990) - and reviewed. This entailed re-reading transcripts, note making, memo production and sequencing, and cross-reference between transcripts (including the cutting up of transcripts and the producing of piles of quotes which expressed similar ideas, themes or codes). This was all carried out before embarking upon the second stage of interviewing at SYMP.

However, the combination of the discovery of a different field of literature (the debates surrounding Foucauldian philosophy) and this initial coding led to a recognition that the material did not 'fit' with the expectations created by the literature. The simplistic causality between actions and masculinity implied in that oeuvre appeared unsatisfactory. This prompted the re-analysis of all the interview material with a new set of objectives and imperatives. The interviews were analysed for what they illustrated about *individuals*, but individuals as part of an *institution* (and it remained important to describe the institutional context) and the conditions which make possible the practice of masculinity. It was also crucial to recognise the role of *social* forces, structures and ideologies. It became an analysis of *discourses*. This involved the intensive analysis of material to interpret the bases - the "rules" - which structured what people said and which provided the context within which people's actions were carried out. As the theory began to illustrate the importance of practices, analyses of them became paramount as did interest in unravelling the consequences of them. Attention became focused on discourses of sex: what participants constructed as appropriate actions or attitudes for the two sexes, how gendered subjectivity structures life, and the more 'tangible' discourses of institutions in the form of workplace policies and guidelines and determining the relevance of each of these.

E. SUMMARY

Part One has taken a critical stance on the way existing literature has developed ill-defined notions of masculinity which have been shown to be (unintentionally) essentialist and insufficient for understanding and explaining unequal gender power relations. Based upon the principles of Foucauldian theory, a conceptualisation of masculinity which begins to address these difficulties has been proposed. It has shown that reference to a genealogical analysis of masculinity avoids researching masculinity with a pre-defined list of stereotyped traits which are already conceptualised as 'masculine' (by implication, actions of men). It has also been

proposed to conceptualise masculinity within a framework of power. This has a number of advantages. Firstly, it can account for power amongst men and amongst women as well as between the sexes, and so helps explain why *all* men are not equal and why *all* women are not equal. Secondly, it frees masculinity from having to be seen as the sole domain of men, and so avoiding essentialist notions of masculinity as maleness. It also helps account for how some women can play the "man's game" (for example in the business world) and succeed over other women and men. It accredits women with a more active agency as opposed to a passive, dominated done-to role. It also allows conceptualisation of gay men as being potentially as oppressive to women as heterosexual men can be.[10] Thirdly, it discredits the notion of masculinities as the "cure" for understanding and changing masculinity and gender relations, and thus rejects its equally essentialising equation of masculinity with maleness. Fourthly, it encourages a wariness towards projects aimed at re-defining men's masculinities as the way of removing sexual inequalities by rejecting the idea of masculinity as identity.

It has also advocated the adaptation of a Foucauldian analysis of power. This is beneficial because it moves away from resource-based theories of power, so that it is not possible to say simply that men dominate women. In the process it also helps explain nuances and inconsistencies in men's own experiences of powerlessness. This frees men and women from being viewed in a dominant / subordinated and active / passive polarisation. Additionally, a micro-politics approach allows for a better understanding of how masculinity is constituted and operated between individuals as well as at a state / global level. However, it was stressed that Foucault's "analytics" provides an insufficient method for understanding how people are differentially positioned within the regulatory framework of power. Using the examples of 'workplace authority' and 'spatialisation of masculinity', it has been indicated that power can become apparently invested in people so that they seemingly "possess" power, and so can account for why certain individuals have the appearance of being "powerful".

These sections have aimed to address the frequently neglected question 'what is masculinity?' and have tried to contribute to a feminist analysis of masculinity. In the following sections these suggestions are elaborated upon, exemplified and tested

---

[10] Some feminist writers (for example, Stanley 1982, Leyland 1987 and Stanley and Wise 1993) have observed how gay men can be as sexist as heterosexual men, something which has been left largely untheorised in the masculinity literature, whilst Connell (1992) urges the de-mythologising of gay men as 'lacking' masculinity.

through reference to material gathered from two case study workplaces. The theory is developed and illustrated by examination of the *specifics* of masculinity in a variety of different situations and circumstances. It will become clear that the theory serves as a general outline, but that masculinity can only be understood in the context of particular situations. It is not the case that specific examples can be generalised to other circumstances as 'this is what is masculinity everywhere'; empirical research serves to locate the precise discourses and circumstances in which masculinity is practised at a certain time and in a particular place. In this way the objectives are similar to those of Delsing whose study purpose was:

> 1. To investigate, historically and in the present, beginning from the lowest levels, how concrete mechanisms of power function, in the materiality of ongoing subjugation.
> 2. To build strategies for change during and on the basis of such an analysis; that is, to learn to act upon what we see (the effects), and not on what we think we should see (the discourse). (Delsing 1991: 133)

In the empirical chapters, emphasis is placed upon the workplaces and the discursive construction of sex and gender that occur within them and illustrates an important linkage:

> Discourses of masculinities and femininities are struggled over in the paid workplace and the state, as well as learnt by individuals. (Walby 1990: 94)

It will be shown that in the two workplaces the production of discourses of sex makes possible practices of masculinity. Discourses set the limits on what can be said, what it is possible to say and do (what is "sayable"), and what is "appropriate". Hence, they form a framework for regulation within which power relations exist. The result is that individuals are unequally positioned in discourses, with the consequence that individuals exercise power differentially. This theory will now be discussed in relation to the empirical research in Parts Two and Three.

PART TWO:

DISCOURSES OF

MASCULINITY

PART TWO

Part One discussed the relative merits of existing "theories" of masculinity and highlighted some methodological and ontological obstacles which have been reproduced in its research. It was suggested that these weaknesses became apparent when related to my personal experience and, more importantly, during the empirical research process, both of which strongly influenced the reconceptualisation of masculinity proposed in Part One. Parts Two and Three present findings from this research, providing specific examples that illustrate the reconceptualisation and indicate how the results informed it. They develop upon the outlined theoretical structure, discuss contradictions and contemplate the consequences of the discourses and practices that emerge for a theory of masculinity.

In this study, a series of dominant discourses were revealed which it emerged were important contributors to the structuring of lives of individuals, relating to production and reproduction. These positioned the home and workplace, therefore, as noteworthy sites of discursive competition. The home and workplace become significant symbolic and physical spaces in which competing discourses are counter-posed and vie for the status of accepted "truth". Part Two of the thesis examines the disclosed discourses, illustrates how they structure and reflect the structuring of lives, and how this structuring is negotiated by individuals in everyday life. Part Three continues to explore and develop upon the disclosure of discourses in the research, but examines more explicitly masculinity within institutional contexts - the two case study workplaces. This illustrates that practices of masculinity are not limited to the interpersonal relationships of individuals but can take an organisational form, such as employment policies and practices of an employer or the embodiment of individuals' discourses in an employment context. Focus is still given to micro-level relations and specific individuals, as it is shown that the 'success' of institutional practices is reliant upon their negotiation amongst individuals who act within their structured position in the workplace. It is argued that individuals with "authority" can facilitate the acceptance of particular discourses as "truth" and even mediate or oppose the practices 'imposed' from an institutional scale, such as Equal Opportunities policies.

Specifically, Part Two examines some of the discourses of sex disclosed in the study. It illustrates how discourses are constructed and how masculinity is revealed as much by discourses of *women* as of *men*. It needs to be borne in mind that in the

conceptualisation of masculinity being developed here, masculinity is sex non-specific - its understanding is as reliant upon examination of women as it is of men, and it will be shown how the discourses of masculinity are reproduced by both sexes. Within these discourses there is stress upon "natural differences" between the sexes, where differences also indicate superiority and inferiority: 'masculine' and 'feminine'. The discursive construction of "sex differences" forms the basis for inequalities between discursively sexed individuals: an unbalanced relationship is created which facilitates the further exercise of power by emplacing a pre-existing 'legitimacy' or "justification" (Potter and Wetherell 1987: 76) for that exercise. The "performance" of gender is therefore upon discursively sexed bodies. It is suggested that the exercise of masculinity operates:

(i) through the construction of discourses of sex in which gendered constructions are differentially valued as 'superior' and 'inferior'; and

(ii) through acting upon the supposed sexual inequalities and differences suggested by these discourses to legitimise superior treatment for the 'masculine'.

Discourses of sex are highlighted, therefore, as crucial aspects of everyday interactions of individuals, organisations, society and state, and the spaces in which they are located. They explain masculinity and the continuation of sexual 'oppression', and are revealed in conversations and activities of and about men and women.

THE EXPRESSION OF DOMINANT DISCOURSES

Analysis of the words and actions of the interview participants revealed that the practising of masculinity is articulated through common discourses which have acquired a position of dominance - generally, the more frequently a discourse is revealed, the more successful has been its acceptance. Discursively sexed bodies (men and women) have different positionings in relation to dominant discourses of the sexes. In this study, it was found that masculinity was often expressed through discourses of women, and that discourses of men are often constructed in opposition to the discursive construction of women. For instance, key to dominant discourses of women were the ideas: that women are all the same; that they are all "different" from men (hence, the construction of men as the 'norm'); that there are characteristics which are 'natural' to women (and thus, similarly, there are those natural to men); and that each sex has particular roles to fulfil because of their 'nature', that is, assumptions are made about what is appropriate to each sex. Against the 'norm' of men, women are discursively constructed as "different". Differences are exaggerated and are used

as bases for 'discrimination', and the exercise of power based on sexual inequalities - masculinity.

The empirical findings of this research suggest the importance of *continuity* between discourses. The basic ideas of some of the discourses presented here are not "new", they are discourses which have been frequently identified in studies (and everyday life) before. Their revelation in the research reflects their entrenchment in the everyday lives of the study participants. Importantly, however, they are constant and shared, and they underpin practices of individuals, organisations and collectivities; these discourses are well known because they play an important role in the perpetuation of sexual inequalities. This thesis examines these dominant discourses and discusses how they are practised and how they are reflective of masculinity. For instance, the first section discusses the relation between women and women's increasing involvement in careers, undoubtedly a significant social change of this century. But the examples presented here suggest that this change has left discourses which maintain sex "differences" largely unaffected. Sally has achieved the position of "career woman" (a 'liberating' goal of liberal feminism), but reaching this status has required her to practise masculinity by reinforcing discourses which 'justify' inequalities. Sally distances herself from these discourses (forging a 'masculine' subjectivity) but she is still subject to expectations which construct her discursively as a 'woman' (and in this way exemplify a 'double subjectivity'). Steve's subject position is career-orientated and this, similarly, is reliant upon the expectation and the practice that a woman (Steve's partner, Claire) cares for their child in the home. Steve and Sally's discourses and practices are based in the same root and their practices both reflect masculinity: the consequences of their actions are to maintain sexual inequalities. In the literature, there has been ample description of 'subordinated masculinities'; this study tries to explain how the dominant form operates - as Ingraham (1994) notes, there is equal need to explain the "normal" as there is to explain the "deviant". Hence, the examination of discourses commonly disclosed in the research highlights their frequency of expression, and illustrates that their ability to constrain is greater than less common, 'subordinated' discourses. These are still the discourses which feminism or any progressive sexual politics fundamentally need to address and overturn. They are the discourses of the regulatory framework within which counter discourses are played out and negotiated.

The discussion of discourses has yet to provide empirical exemplification of their constitution. The remainder of this section focuses on the production of discourses through reference to the interview material from the two meetings with Sean. Apparent conflicts emerged between Sean's attitudes and conversational discourses that revealed ways of thinking about men and women. These serve as illustrations of the contradictions between intentions and the consequences of actions common to everyone. Whilst Sean believes in equality, describing himself as a feminist, and would typically be regarded as a "new man" (as one colleague labelled him), the series of discourses constructed in the interviews was based on essential sexual differences. For instance, when talking about increasing pressures at work, he commented that

> *Sean:* you can't possibly compete in that hot house atmosphere, and that's what women suffer from endlessly, because they prioritise differently.

The conclusion is that there are fundamental differences between the sexes. The statement "they prioritise differently" is a reduction that *all* women prioritise differently from men, differently from the *norm*. There is development of discourses of women as essentially different from men. Asked what an all-female workplace would be like, Sean says:

> *Sean:* the things that would be different around the place I suspect would be a greater tendency to talk about personal matters, private matters, family matters and so on, slight, possibly, a slight humanising.

This constructs all women as effectively the same and all men as effectively the same. The discourse firmly portrays all women as family focused and as possessing some natural ability to nurture and "humanise". Although not necessarily a negative characterisation, it still has the effect of homogenising the sexes with women being defined by their emotional capacity, itself a product of their 'femaleness'. Sean portrays the essence of men as distinct from that of women because of the detachment from emotions of 'maleness'. Sean described men as "victims" of masculinity, punished for failing to meet the requirements society sets for success and 'emotionally stunted' because of this (which compares directly to the arguments of Baumli 1985, Morgan 1987b, Seidler 1989 etc.). The discourse is constructed around women as "emotional leaders", a role learnt from their mothers.

> *Sean:* in the private setting, quite often the emotional leadership is with the girls, because they are, or they tend to be, more emotionally sensitive, more emotionally in-tune, precisely because that's the sort of area where they have the space. They hang around their mothers and so on, and mothers are into that sort of arena rather than fathers so they get a lot of early grounding in that.

This discourse also has a homogenising effect - sweeping generalisations are made about the 'normal' upbringing of children, thereby reproducing assumptions of standard psycho-analytic approaches of theorists such as Chodorow (1978) where women are

regarded as 'naturally' responsible for child care and where men are 'naturally' assumed to be outside of responsibility for children.

Another interesting discourse constructed the label "normal women". Talking about feminism, Sean mentioned the image of radical feminists and some of the topics that have been raised by radical feminism:

> Sean: they've had some good slogans, 'all men are potential rapists', for a while, but I do think that has had a bad effect in that it has kind of alienated normal women.

Hence, there is a distinction made between radical feminists and "normal" women. These "normal women" are apparently those who are married and have an active sexual relationship with their husband:

> Sean: you say that to a normal woman who is reasonably happily married for twenty years, with someone she's been like having sexual intercourse with, and Dworkin is telling her 'it's clearly incorrect to be penetrated', I think that argument is very hard to hold, I think it doesn't wash with many normal women.

This statement thereby reveals what Sean regards as the appropriate behaviour or identity for women as heterosexual and in relationships with men, which is counterposed against 'radical feminists' who are therefore discursively constructed as not-women because they are (presumably) lesbian and non-conciliatory with men.

Sean explicitly stated attitudes of equality - he is "feminist". However, the discourses of the sexes to which he contributes negate such intentions and militate against sexual equality by propagating discourses of men and women as innately, 'naturally' different. Both sexes are taken to have completely different, complementary characteristics. By this, women have naturally more placid natures, are more emotional, have their lives focused around reproduction and are (hetero)sexually active. It is these types of discourses that are of interest in this thesis for it is through them that masculinity is articulated and through which power is exercised; they begin to construct a framework of what is appropriate for men and for women and so act as a constraining force on what people can achieve.

Therefore, it is important to remember that discourses are more than just what is said and the acceptance of this at 'face value'; they are exercises of power which may be in complete contradiction to any subject's stated intentions:

> I shall abandon any attempt, therefore, to see discourse as a phenomenon of expression - the verbal translation of a previously established synthesis; instead, I shall look for a field of regularity for various positions of subjectivity. Thus conceived, discourse is not the majestically unfolding manifestation of a thinking, knowing, speaking subject, but, on the contrary, a totality, in which the dispersion

of the subject and his [sic] discontinuity with himself may be determined. It is a space of exteriority in which a network of distinct sites is employed. (Foucault 1972: 55)

The discourses which emerged were not employed by all the men or women interviewed. Other discourses emerged, some of which conflicted with the more common, 'dominant' discourses. But it is important to be aware that these discourses are played out or negotiated within contexts where certain discourses are dominant or more commonly shared, and so where their value or success in gaining acceptance is reduced. It is important that "counter-discourses" are proposed, but more important are the consequences of any discourse, which are, of course, dependent upon their ability to be accepted (as "truth"). Thus, any growth in the *expression* of, for example, feminist views or 'political correctness' or Equal Opportunities policies, is less important than the consequences of any practices which could, for instance, be contrary to these expressed concerns and which perpetuate inequalities between the sexes. Sean emphasises that discourses do not have to be consciously considered and actions do not have to follow any expressed verbal theorisation. The nexus of intentions, discourses and practices are not mutually dependent and reinforcing. Sean's stated intentional opinion is one apparently contra the discourses which his comments actually reveal: he is feminist and pro-equality, he is very interested in sexual politics and a progressive politics for women. It could be assumed that his discourses and practices will be different - "counter discourses" - from those of the 'lay person'. However, despite intentions to the contrary, Sean still propounds discourses which characterise ('natural') *differences* between the sexes and so acts against his own (I believe genuine) politics. By perpetuating discourses of difference, Sean's practices have the consequence of upholding sexual inequalities. The status quo of powerful discourses remains little affected. Sean's vision cannot be attained by his discourses and practices, because they are centred around treating the sexes as completely *different* (physically, psychically, perceptually). Indeed, it will be shown that Emma (who explicitly stated that she disagrees with feminism) has undertaken practices in her home life which have had tangible, material benefits for her *as a woman* which progress the realisation of a feminist vision far more than the feminist politicised, but essentialised, discourses constructed by Sean's actions. Equality, I would contend, will be achieved through acknowledgement of the similarities between people, not unnecessary stressing of differences. The material presented comes from a wide variety of people in different workplaces with different life histories. They have different lifestyles and ambitions, even different ways of talking. Different sex. But many similarities in their discourses or consequences of their discourses became evident.

95

Therefore, whilst some discourses or practices may be expressed or carried out differently or with completely different intentions, it is the continuity and similarity which is important: the *similarity* between the underlying *discourses* which stress *differences* (and where differences 'excuse' inequalities).

The consequence of these discourses of sex and masculinity is the construction of a "regulatory framework" (which generally pressures women into a characterisation of subordinate to men) and in relation to which there are 'masculine' and 'feminine' subject positions. One way that this framework operates is through the existence of a series of 'roles' which the sexes are expected to conform to (but which do not have to be taken on and can be negotiated). These 'roles' help produce and reproduce the construction of differences between the sexes. The forging of these differences (which then define 'masculine' and 'feminine' and the exploitation of them in further relationships) can be called "performativity" (Butler 1990a; see Simpson 1994 for discussion explicitly on the performance of masculinity): the restating, emphasising and continuing of an "identity" until that person / space / place takes it on and embodies it - that is, discourses which propose that there are sex roles to be conformed to and help to determine what is "appropriate" for either sex to say or do. Briefly, this is exemplified by Kate, whose comments illustrate ways in which both she as a woman and her husband as a man experience "expectations" which they feel they are pressured into conforming to:

> *Kate:* Quite resentful of home. I'm increasingly becoming resentful. [...] I'm resentful that I don't get more help and that people expect. I'm resentful of expectations and I think men are as well, equally as resentful of the expectations that are made on them. My husband I think wanted to watch the football yesterday, I don't think he actually wanted to put up shelves. He put up the shelves in the end and videoed the football.

Kate feels that she is expected to undertake practically all the domestic work and the immediate care of their child because she is a woman, and that her husband is expected to fulfil his role as a man by doing DIY and by providing for the family. These "expectations" are the self-recognised 'rules' of the discursive framework, the pressures which are exerted onto people to conform to what is 'appropriate' for that person because of their sex.

Therefore, it becomes difficult to act outside of one's expected role (and there are often a variety of sanctions which pressure acceptance of roles). Framing discourses of sex within frameworks of roles has the effect of 'covering over' power relations, with the result that many exercises of power are made 'invisible' (and this invisibility itself is

the product of power). Discourses become 'naturalised'; the roles of the sexes are viewed as the *natural* consequence of *natural* sexual differences. It suggests that society is ordered according to biological determinism, and that the roles women and men occupy are therefore natural too. Consequently, any differences or inequalities between the sexes are ascribed to nature, and any discourse counter to this as fighting nature:

> The fact that throughout history 'nature' has always been invoked to justify the power of one group over another has not, for most people, cast any doubt over the validity of the division of humankind into sexes. (Reynaud 1983: 1)

In this way, it emerges that what is social is ascribed to the product of 'nature', whilst the apparently 'natural' are themselves socially constructed (Butler 1990a, Cream 1995, Harvey and Haraway 1995; Fitzsimmons 1989a, 1989b terms this 'social Nature').

1. DISCOURSES OF REPRODUCTION

Perhaps the most crucial discursive constructions of the sexes in this research centred on the situations of women and men in relation to children and reproduction. It emerged that whilst there is a 'masculine' constructed position in relation to the raising of children (which is primarily occupied by men), there is a much stronger connection between having children and *all* women. The notion is so strong that the concepts of woman and mother were effectively synonymous in the interviews, reiterating Foucault's (1978: 121) claim that women are sexualised with a destiny charged with conjugal and parental obligations (see also Kopytoff 1990, Cream 1995). The construction posits having children as the event at which women fulfil their 'natural' role. This creates other "expectations" (such as providing that child's primary care) and pressures to carry them out. Reproduction becomes reinforced as 'feminine' in the devaluation of child birth and family raising, a position which men can be easily distanced from (Hollway 1994 notes that avoidance of equal childcare with women by men is a way of reproducing gender differences).

The central positioning of women in reproduction was reflected in conversations on the numerical equality of male and female staff in the Department (unusual for any department in any university). This situation was explained with reference to the job's opportunities for maternity leave and the job being good for *mothers*. Not a single indication was given that half of the workforce could be expected to be female.

> *David:* we have a predominance of women because women may feel that they may not get on as well in private practice. But for a woman in private practice it has been, and in some firms is, more difficult to get on than a man, and for a woman, if

they are going to have a family, they have problems of maternity leave. Now some firms will take a very enlightened view of that, some firms will say that 'we don't much like that, the idea of a fee-earner taking some months off to have a baby, then probably wanting to work part-time or two thirds time or whatever'.

This is a recognition that it is difficult for women to get on in private practice *because* they are female. However, this is reliant upon a discourse of women as *mothers / family raisers*: any difficulties women may face is explained through reference to their reproductive capability and an assumption that women will have children and will provide daily, direct child care themselves. This discourse of reproduction excludes men. That automatic maternity leave should be available is not an issue in itself for David. Firms making such provisions are, in his words, "enlightened", reflecting that the work of parenting should automatically be borne by women. Mothers (which effectively means *all* women) are not a good financial investment compared to men; therefore, in the paid workplace, reproduction is viewed negatively because it will cost an employer money. Since it is all women who are assumed to be reproducers, this construction posits the 'masculine' position of detachment from reproduction more highly. Reproduction is constructed as negative, valued less highly because having children is associated with career breaks to look after a baby, and retardation of career prospects because of the absence of structures that facilitate combining career and children. This 'masculine' position does not necessarily exclude women, but the 'feminine' position of reproducer does exclude men. It is constructed that children complicate work and life, and again it is in a discourse of women *only*:

> *Jack:* the flexibility is easier if you are going to be or are a married woman who has, or will have children. It's an easier job to cope with than an office job which has more fixed, more regular hours. So there may be something in that. I suspect one or two of my colleagues have come for that reason actually. But less so than it may have used to be. Because increasingly women are not interested in having children. Which is the big thing, of course, for women that traditionally complicates life and work.

Men are absent from the discourse of reproduction in Jack's explanation that the job is flexible for allowing women to work and have families. At the university, maternity leave is not a problem in the sense that it is an entitlement, but Jack propounds that the job is structured in a way that makes combining career and childcare unproblematic[1]. The implication, therefore, is that if anyone cannot succeed at both it must be a personal failing or the consequence of trying to transcend the natural role of

---

[1] Note, again the construction relates children to women only. There is no suggestion that the flexibility of academia facilitates male members of staff assuming a child care function. Jack explains women's presence in academia as a reflection of their interest in providing child care and not to do with the profession itself; Jack does not explain his own career choice in this way, suggesting that he became an academic because of his "wish and desire to learn", effectively distancing self from this constructed 'feminine' other.

their sex. The experiences of Kate and Margaret suggest that academia as a career is no less easy for primary care givers than any other job; Kate went half-time upon the birth of her son (effectively ending any career progression) and although Margaret managed to gain full-time status, she still found it very difficult to raise her family at the same time: the job makes having a family and full-time work possible, but not easy. The implication is that a university career is an 'easy-option' for the working mother, even though those who have joined from private practice say that the job is now just as pressured. Likewise,

> *Paul:* many good women are bailing out of a professional career, in practice roles, into the one with the greater flexibility and evenness of a university career. That comes as no great surprise to me, that that is one of the reasons why we have picked up so many more female, women members of staff over the last few years.

Women become associated with children to the point where having children is women's *raison d'être*. In the construction of care-giving as women's role, men do not have to 'prove' themselves in combining a career and raising a family. This makes the 'masculine' position more achievable. However, although women can be placed in the 'masculine' position, it is one which they occupy differently because of other expectations of their discursively constructed sex. Sally expressed that she would not find the combination difficult to achieve as a woman, citing that men have done it for centuries; this does not address that the expectation to provide children's primary care giving is not upon men (and obviates the need for structural changes that would present workers with opportunities for having children and career progression). Therefore, it emerges that reproduction is constructed as 'feminine' and a career is constructed as 'masculine': although women can pursue careers, the discursive framework structures women's lives around children and child care and because this is 'naturalised' as a necessary function of women's biology this construction is much more difficult to be distanced from. Jack and Paul's comments not only construct the career paths of women as determined by reproduction but also position this role as accepted by women who base their career choice around it.

CHILDREN, CAREERS AND THE 'NATURALISING' OF DISCOURSES

Career success is the 'masculine' position and is regarded as very important (particularly in the Department), and is facilitated by not having child care responsibility. Adopting this position is particularly difficult for women because having children is 'naturalised' as their function. The 'naturalness' of women and children was conveyed by the notion of "career women", a term which was used in interviews without definition freely and frequently. There were distinct constructions of 'types' of

women made in dichotomous terms, implying exclusivity. "Career women" are discursively positioned as different from "normal" women, constructed as like-men ('masculine') in that they are apparently not centrally concerned with children, and thus that their focus in life is upon their work and career.

The expectation is that women will 'choose' between a career or children: Emma commented that at SYMP you are either "a career woman" or you are "a mother" as it is felt that on becoming a mother one can no longer be career minded. To fulfil the role of "career women" requires conforming to a certain set of expectations:

> Emma: they - I sense from my bosses - have adopted the attitude that if you're going to be a career woman you should never have kids, you should never get married. You can't do that.

Emma feels that this logic is held by male managers at SYMP who employ it in deciding the career paths of women in the company, who must adhere to the "career woman" identity if they want promotion:

> Do you think there's anything stopping women getting on?
> Emma: I think it's because we have kids. Not that sure, but I think that's what it is. Once you've married and got your children, they think that's it, they're going to finish now, they don't want a career, they can't handle a career when they've got children. That's my personal opinion, that's how I perceive it to be. [...] They just like, 'that's it, that's as far as you can go', boom, boom, that's the end of your career.

The implication is that job and career success is only available to women considered by their employers as distanced from the discourse of women by being career orientated and not family focused - occupying a 'masculine' subject position in relation to reproduction. A similar scenario in private practice is described by David:

> David: The female fee-earners tended to be career women, very dominant, and had to work very hard in what was perhaps traditionally a male preserve. What you would find now is that many firms are much more enlightened, many firms are prepared to say, well you can have a lady fee-earner who job shared with a lady assistant or whatever. So things have changed.

In this construction, "career women" are excluded from the discourse of reproduction and do not fully conform to other discourses of women in that they are "very dominant". Career success seems to be facilitated (particularly for women) by appearing to be 'not-women', that is, choosing to pursue a career rather than have a family. This enables some acceptance as 'like-men' - "career women". The point where even "career women" differentiate from men is when they have children (or according to Emma even just marry): the construction of women excludes career and children, whilst for men the expectation is that having children will not interfere with work and so does not affect their 'masculine' positioning.

The 'naturalising' of women's appropriate sex role by the birth of children and the maintenance of a 'masculine' position was illustrated in the interviews with Brian. He described his and his wife's domestic situation as a "traditional arrangement"; he has paid employment and she does the bulk of the domestic work and cares for the children:

> *Brian:* The reality is, especially when children come along, that I had a full-time job, I was working [...] for my wife to sit around waiting for me to come back to wash the pots and do the ironing, do the shopping and the cooking was a bit ludicrous.

In this construction, "traditional arrangements" (which are based in unequal gender relations) are explained as the result of having children. However, even within his own account there are contradictions - he acknowledges that the domestic arrangements were determined by his role as paid worker:

> *Brian:* I think because the nature of the, that work is structured, there is a tendency to fall into the traditional domestic arrangements. And those have developed. [...] it's a division of labour really. If both of you are working .. then you do tend to.

This is still based in the discursive construction of women as appropriate child carers. There is no suggestion that their relationship, domestic arrangements or their positions as gendered subjects could have been any different than they turned out. In fact, they have not always found themselves in this "traditional" position: when they first started living together they had an "egalitarian partnership". This example illustrates how having children marks an important point in the discursive construction of the sexes where gendered constructions are 'naturalised'. That it is women who physically have children is used to justify paid work being constructed as 'masculine' and appropriate for men and children and the home being constructed as 'feminine' and appropriate for women.

"CAREER WOMEN", "CAREER MEN" AND FATHERHOOD: NEGOTIATING DISCOURSES OF REPRODUCTION.

The suggestion is that, in relation to discourses of reproduction, there is a 'feminine' position of having children (which has to be occupied by women but which is constructed as including *all* women) and that there is a 'masculine' position of being career and work orientated (which is available to all men and women who have not had children). In this section, it will be discussed how gendered subject positions and the construction of work as 'masculine' and child care as 'feminine' are reinforced by child birth, and more explicit focus will be given to the discursive positioning of men in relation to reproduction. It was discussed above that for women there is a choice between children or a career. It is shown here that Steve, as a man, does not have to make this choice, the expectation is that he can have children *and* a career; he occupies the position aspired to by Sally. In this way, Steve and Sally exemplify how

the 'masculine' position in reproduction is occupied differently according to their sex and the discursive expectations of their sex.

The change of status of women upon childbirth from "career woman" to "mother" is illustrated in Steve's reference to the "transformation" in his wife (Claire) since the birth of their first child:

> *Steve:* she's career minded like me, she likes her work. I would never have thought that we would have had a family, because she's that career minded that she loved her job, and to see the transformation from career woman to mother has been amazing. I don't know how someone changes and just loves the little boy so much and don't want to leave him, it's amazing to watch.

This illustrates the differential placement of men and women within the discursive framework. Again, it constructs children or career as exclusive - because Claire was similarly career minded, Steve assumed that subsequently they would never have a family - and despite both being career motivated, upon the birth of their child Claire became "the mother", carrying out primary direct care of the baby and taking a career break. However, the interviews showed Steve to have undergone a personal "transformation" as much as Claire, but to have retained his label as career-minded and the 'masculine' discursive positioning that this implies. Steve's conversation constructs different directions in which their transformations from career-dedication have gone. Unlike Claire's, Steve's transformation goes unrecognised and is unlikely to affect his career. The transformation of Claire to "the mother" has brought clearly defined tasks - being at home with the child and providing its direct care on a daily basis, which bring satisfaction:

> *Steve:* Claire's at home now, she's going back to work soon, but she's at home for six months and she's at home now, and you go home and ... everything's just bright and rosy. It must be stressful hearing him screaming all the time and you can't do anything with it, but there's still a smile on her face.

Steve's transformation is constructed in a much more abstract way: he has not assumed a labelled position and his change is not defined. The consequence is that he has not become "the father" in as pronounced a manner as Claire has fulfilled the expectations of her 'role'. Steve's transformation is positioned as qualitatively different:

> *So would you say that it has changed both of you?*
> *Steve:* Oh aye, I think it does, it's major step in your life, it's another responsibility, and like I say, he is the future.

For Steve, Sammy is a "responsibility", but not in the same way he is for Claire as primary care provider. The expectation upon Steve is to set the foundations for Sammy's *indirect,* long-term care in terms of financial security:

> *It must be a big change in your life having a small child come along?*
> *Steve:* It's been best thing since sliced bread. I'll tell you now. He's a little cracker. I wouldn't change anything that's happened in the past. He's my future now, and

he's the person I'm working for, provided I can put a roof over his head and give him a good secure start, that's all I want to do.

For instance, Steve is considering moving from his home town because it has a growing reputation for drug culture:

> *Steve:* The little lad's only sixteen weeks but you start to think, hang on a bit, what's it going to be like when he's a bit older?

Steve positions himself with the duty of setting a good example, and so his function is to protect Sammy by instilling his own moral responsibility:

> *Steve:* I'm not a firm believer in old family values, but I think it should be there, that kids should know about it [...] There are certain things that you can always tell your child not to do, but you're never sure whether they are going to do it or not. I think you can only tell them so much. You've got to give them a bit of a lead and just hope that what you've brought them up like is how they become. [...] I want the best standards for my little lad in the future.

For Steve to achieve this has required a change in his *lifestyle*. This is the greatest visible aspect of Steve's transformation; it has brought about a change of thinking for him which has moderated his *everyday* practices:

> *Steve:* We have our football trips and we go out, we have bus trips out, just lads, and we go out and get drunk but it's not every week. I don't think I could do it now, I'm more into a ... a family sort of thing. [...] I can't be doing getting up on Sunday morning, 'ah, great, I've got a steaming headache', and I've got a little lad demanding attention. I suppose really I don't want to .. look stupid in front of him.

But the birth of the child has not *radically* transformed Steve's life. His usual routine has been varied; but Claire has become positioned in the home (and so taken out of the paid workplace) and put into a new 'job' (child care). Steve's life-before-birth is still fundamentally the same. Child birth has added a new dimension to life in a spiritual sense (such as love and respect for the child) but not to life in a practical sense - Steve still defines himself primarily in relation to work. Sammy's arrival has been "fitted" into Steve's life:

> *Steve:* [after work] it's home where I look after me little son and I'll spend the evening with him. But I'm also studying as well, so I'm doing like a home course and trying to accommodate the little boy who is only ten weeks old, and fitting the study in as well is a little bit difficult at the minute. I'm as soft as cheesecake, me. [...] There's no concern [from Claire] as long as I don't do four hour [work] stints at home. I give the little lad a bit of time and consideration. Give him a bath on the night or something, she's quite happy then. She gets control of the telly, she can watch her soaps and I don't interrupt her on that.

In terms of parenting, Steve is positioned as 'helping' the 'mother' by taking time out from his old routine - keeping time "free" at the weekends and at night - to provide subsidiary assistance in bringing up the child.

The home has a pivotal role in this construction: it now acts as the defining space for Claire since she spends most of her time there, whilst Steve is still defined by the paid workplace. This helps explain how Steve retains his "career minded" label and Claire

has lost the "career woman" characterisation. For Steve the home remains somewhere different from work, a place where he is "able to relax and get away from this [work] and the stresses and strains of this". At the same time, Steve would consider that he is very much involved in the home (as exemplified in the ways he tries to spend more time there and is becoming more family orientated) and that his engagement in the work of the home is wholesale, commenting that he does the garden, washes the pots and changes nappies. In a sense, Steve has 'the best of both worlds' (Segal 1990); he continues to do the job which he loves, and constructs himself as centrally involved in the raising of Sammy and so gets the tag 'new man' and the benefits of this label. Underlying Steve's way of thinking remains the discourse that it is women who are, ultimately, more appropriately placed in the home as mothers than men, who are best defined by paid work and being away from the house:

> *Could you ever imagine being a househusband or something? Would that appeal to you?*
> *Steve:* When I was on the verge of being redundant before, Sammy was on his way, it was a thought that crossed uz mind. 'Why don't you stay at home and look after Sammy?' But financially that wasn't possible. I don't know, I don't know, I don't know that I could do it anyway. Yeah, it would be a novelty at first, but I like the cut and thrust and the day to day that you've got here. No, I don't think I could do that, I don't think so. [...] A housewife to me, good luck to them. Because they do a sterling job, I mean, Claire's at home now, [...] but I don't think I, you know.

Steve values the work, but for him doing it would be "a novelty"; it is something best left to Claire as a woman. Steve feels he would receive greater reward from paid employment, and therefore he is *choosing* to remain a 'career man'. In Part One it was discussed how the literature has reiterated the importance of work in the construction of men's identities (such as Bertaux-Wiame 1981, Cockburn 1983, Jackson 1996) with emphasis upon the significance of the male "breadwinner" expectation. However, although Steve's identity is strongly influenced by work, this is not so much related to his 'breadwinning' capability or about the meanings of work as it is defined in relation to discourses of women as mothers. Work is important to Steve because the alternative - the 'feminine' position of home based child carer - is unattractive.[2]

The example of Steve and Claire reaffirms how having children helps enforce discourses of sex and so stressing 'natural' differences. The discourse which defines

---

[2] This literature also underestimates the importance of work and careers in the lives of women, reinforcing the construction of women as home-defined. As the next example illustrates, career is as much part of Sally's identity as it is for Steve, if not more - being career motivated forms an important role in distancing herself from the construction of women as tied to reproduction. The importance of work for women is discussed in Arber and Gilbert (1992).

women as "career women" or "mothers" is consolidated by practical realities: physically having a child will mean a woman is removed from the workplace for a period of time and placed in the home. At that point, the home becomes constructed as *the* place of identity formation for that woman. Having a child is a momentous life point for Steve, it has truly affected the way he looks at life, but the continuity of his life - paid work during the day and home life in the evening - remains intact. Steve does not become labelled "the father" and it is not even a term he self-reflectively uses. Claire, however, becomes "the mother" and becomes enveloped within the discourse of reproduction. Steve, in a 'masculine' subject position, remains detached from the discourse of reproduction, bolstered by the role he assumes in the child's care - providing long-term financial security. Parenting is not all-consuming. In keeping home separated from work Steve can remain work defined - he has not been physically removed from the workplace for any length of time by the birth of the child. This is the identity Steve personally chooses - he loves his job and does not want this to change. Steve loves his son, but Sammy adds an extra dimension to his life to give it wholeness, whilst Claire is positioned wholly in relation to the child at this time and detached from her career. From the position of two career people, having a child has provided a point of transformation where the adoption of the positions of a career man and a mother has reinforced general discourses of the sexes.

Overall, 'career' is constructed as having a higher value than having a child. For Steve, career and work provides "cut and thrust" and excitement, where the satisfaction derived from it is worth the sacrifices it demands of one's time. There are nice things about having a child, but they are nice to come home to - bathing Sammy and playing with him. Full-time child care is constructed as less valuable than the 'masculine' construction of career - the baby is screaming all the time and causing problems, and it takes you away from work enjoyment. This constructs work as superior to home / children, which is constructed as women's 'natural' place (as a threat to the dominance of work). Steve is positioned in relation to Claire's "identity", involved in parenting but still constructing for himself an "identity" defined through paid work. This is made possible by the discourse of women as mothers from which he can be detached 'naturally' through being male. However, for a woman to achieve Steve's 'career-minded' identity requires a more active construction. If a woman is 'naturally' a 'mother', then to be defined as work focused means attaining the 'masculine' position 'like-men'. This is exemplified by Sally, who reiterates discourses of women but constructs herself as not conforming to them. The consequence is that these

discourse are upheld by Sally, whilst detaching herself from them: they are discourses of *other* women.

The interviews with Sally disclosed discourses of women as largely concerned with having children and as primary childcare givers. Whilst happy to generalise about *all* women, Sally did not include herself within these characterisations. Referring to the recent appointments of women staff to the Vocation Course, Sally distanced herself by distinguishing these new teachers (who are nearly all women) from "us" (lecturers on the Department's academic course), portraying each as very different types of people. She pondered whether these women took their jobs in order to have families:

> *Sally:* Now these are people coming out of practice. Why did they come out? Why they are all women I don't know, but we, they're with us now. Were they disillusioned with practice, were they thinking of having families and thought they could work that better working in a university than working in private practice? That influx of women has been because of the Vocation Course, which is a very different creature to what we do here.

It is being suggested that teachers on the Vocation Course have entered the profession to facilitate them raising a family: they are more family centred than work focused. This is not the position that Sally occupies. Like Jack, above, she joined a university for the career prospects and not family. Sally defines herself as "career woman" and not "mother", and in this way she adopts the 'masculine' position. Sally was also excluding herself from the dominant construction of women when she mentioned that the long teaching day is unfortunate for women because of their care responsibilities like meeting children from school; this upholds the construction of women as primary care givers - there is no suggestion that fathers in the Department should be concerned with this duty, or that maybe some of them are. Similarly, Sally discursively situated women in university workplaces as having particular functions to serve in the Department's running:

> *Sally:* For eighteen or nineteen year olds to have to come to their personal tutor who's a forty, fifty, sixty year old man, it's difficult. You need a certain number of women to fulfil various roles and that's one of them, the kind of, more ... fostering side of things.

A similar conclusion - that women are "fostering" - is drawn elsewhere:

> *Sally:* I suppose they [men] might become lazy, not think of the kind of issues they should be thinking about, or wouldn't be so aware. [...] A proposal is made at departmental meetings, if it wasn't for this woman, two or three women, realising how this will affect mature students it would be a disadvantage, it would be a loss.

These statements uphold both dominant discourses of women regarding reproduction and of their supposed qualities, such as "fostering". Men are constructed in Sally's narrative as lacking these features, whilst it is a characterisation which she does not necessarily include herself within.

Sally ensures that she is not implicated in the 'natural' connection between women and children. She could be said to be "playing politics". She emphasised that her career goal is to gain promotion to the 'senior lecturer' post, and acknowledged that to achieve this will require her to 'conform' to rule-makers - those people who will decide whether she merits promotion:

> *Sally:* if you want to be promoted you have to play the game, and there it is important to take into account what people say about you. [...] You have to change your work in order to get promoted around here. [...] promotion is the only thing which makes you do certain things in a certain way.

Promotion determines how Sally works and the way she acts in her job. For "very ambitious women" like herself, this means doing things the same way as men (or rather the discursive construction of men and the 'masculine' position):

> *Sally:* I have female colleagues and what they do isn't necessarily any different from what a man does. You have very ambitious women just like you have very ambitious men, who may do, not what I call cut-throat, some people might call it cut-throat, but I mean you're going to have those playing politics.

This includes subscribing to the criteria for promotion, such as placing work emphasis upon administration and research and attaching less importance to the function of teaching, the female dominated occupation deemed less important in the promotions process in the Department (as explained in Part Three). Sally's distancing from the discourse of women is part of her "playing politics", confirming herself as a 'worker' and a "career woman" in order to attain the 'masculine' position to improve chances of promotion:

> *Could you see yourself as a housewife, not having paid employment?*
> *Sally:* On a bad day at work, sometimes. Organising the shopping and all that kind of stuff. At the moment I think I would get very bored, frustrated. [...] I think it's a perfectly valid lifestyle, if someone is happy doing that, fine.

This statement constructs non-paid employment as an alternative to her current employment, but one which Sally does not want to do because it does not offer the challenges of a career - she considers it only on "bad days at work". Whilst Sally proves herself not to conform to discourses of women as mothers then she has a much better chance of occupying the 'masculine' subject position and so being treated 'like a man'; she is very confident that she will not be subject to any discrimination because of her sex:

> *Sally:* As far as my promotion is concerned, my promotion will be to senior lecturer, I have no doubt that there will be no discrimination against me.

Sally's construction of discourses of the sexes in this manner amounts to the practice of masculinity.

Sally's identity as 'worker', however, reveals itself as a "performance" - in many ways she does subscribe to the discursive construction of 'other' women and accepts the option of career *or* family that the discourse of reproduction structures. Sally regards having a career or a family as choices which are not directly compatible; she has chosen the career path and is playing politics to get the promotion to further her career.

> *Sally:* It is true that a number of women will take some time out of their careers and go and have a family and if I had children I simply could not compete the way I am now for that senior lectureship. That's a personal choice and I can't, you know, that's what I've decided.

There is an acceptance of the status quo, that having children will be a block to women's careers. Rather than suggesting that the current situation needs changing to remove career blocks or disadvantages for people having children whether female or male, Sally works within the regulatory framework which has created this structure. The result is for her to conform to the "career woman" identity - not having children and not displaying 'natural' womanly concerns of home interests and, in the case of the Department, not doing work with an emphasis upon students and teaching by doing research. Sally acknowledges that if and when she *chooses* to no longer conform to the career woman model, this will have direct and tangible consequences for her situation at work and will affect her future in the job:

> *Sally:* women just aren't giving up jobs like they used to or are more interested in being promoted and I know that if I do choose to have a family that will affect my promotion prospects, and I will slow down and I may come to a stop. [...] Yes, I think it is possible to be promoted, although I think you would slow down, but then that's the choice. You've decided to have the children.

Again, regarding this situation as a choice has negative consequences by perpetuating the sex inequalities which already exist in the workplace just as Steve's choices helped to affirm Claire as "mother". "Choice" suggests that one has an active agency in creating and pursuing options, not that one's options have been structured already by discourses and policies which limit, in this case, people into *either* having a career *or* becoming centrally involved in raising a family or just having a child. Sally accepts this as legitimate, that women should make this choice because it is their 'natural' role to care for children and not for this function to be shared with men or largely carried out by men:

> *Sally:* I wouldn't require my husband to stay at home and mind the house, take care of the kids, it's not fair.

The construction is that it would not be "fair" to expect a man to have to make the same choice that women are pressured into by their 'natural' role - looking after children and being stuck at home; if anyone will make that choice it will be her:

> *Sally:* I'm sure I'll have children at some stage, so I'll spend some time just rearing children, that kind of thing. It's been a choice between job and home life and job has kind of dominated so far.

It can only be speculated how much Sally 'really' believes that this should be the situation and how much it is an internalised expectation of the dominant discourses of women, for she seems to express some grievance that this 'choice' does have to be hers and that she will find it difficult combining career and children. In the following two statements she appears to hope that she can combine the two and is dis-believing that it could possibly be otherwise:

> *Sally:* Men have done it for centuries. They have had children and been promoted, so if he's willing to maybe slow down a bit and help me just keep pace, yes, it *must* be doable, men have done it for so long.
> *Perhaps that's because women have conventionally taken responsibility for childcare and the home.*
> *Sally:* I'm saying it may slow things down slightly, but it can't, it isn't a bar to promotion.

Although she has described the career / children choice as her own and appropriately her own because that is women's role, she would not object to her boyfriend being a 'househusband' and leaving her to concentrate upon her career:

> *Sally:* Oh, yeah, if it suited him then brilliant, ah heaven, yeah.

Optimistically, Sally suggests that she will not be subject to any workplace discrimination because of her sex and the discourses of her sex:

> *Sally:* if for example, because I was a woman, I was not being promoted, then yes, I would be very annoyed. But I would hope that that would never happen.

When masculinity is conceptualised as the discourses and practices which uphold sexual inequalities, it is important to consider the role everyone (men and women) plays in its achievement: Sally shows that masculinity is not confined just to men. She perpetuates the construction of discourses of women as different from men: appropriately, men will take paid employment and should not have to be involved in child care, whilst women must choose career or children. These discourses have manifestations in material forms - constraints on women's choices and activities and greater freedom for those of men. Sally seems to have internalised the expectations of these discourses, and in living them out she reinforces their construction - she distances herself from these discourses to emphasise how she is 'like-men' and therefore justified in pursuing a career and not motherhood. She does not challenge the constraining discourses of women which affect her; even though she estranges herself from this construction, she does not 'escape' discourses of reproduction. Sally phrases her estrangement in terms of her active "choice". Although it has been suggested here that Sally purposefully perpetuates these discourses of women is this

a choice at all? Does Sally really have any choice but to conform to the regulatory framework of masculinist discourses? Would she be able to pursue her career if she did not play into the dominant discourses of women which she could then prove herself not to conform to? It provides Sally with the easiest means of following her ambitions. Although this means Sally practices masculinity in doing so, this is not to 'blame' her for it. Rather, it illustrates how individual women can benefit in the same way as individual men from the maintenance of particular discourses, but that this reinforces the conditions which structure "expectations" upon the sexes. Sally may be able to 'succeed' in the Department, but it is difficult to conclude that this amounts to a 'success' for women more generally in a feminist sense. Is it a success at the expense of other women just as the success of any man may be? The discourses of sex are continued.

Concluding comments

This section has discussed masculinity in relation to the production of discourses of sexual reproduction in which women are cast into the position of child bearers and primary care-givers and in which men are positioned as not centrally involved in reproduction, with the consequence of constraining opportunities and equality for those not in the 'masculine' position. Women are allowed careers if they 'act like men' to attain the 'masculine' position. Within the discursive framework it is possible for women to achieve a more equal footing with men in terms of work and career. This does not challenge the reversion to the 'natural' identity of "mother" upon childbirth: this removes women from the 'masculine' position, constructed as no longer work orientated - they are "women" again. Distanced from the discourse of reproduction, men maintain a privileged position: not expected to fulfil a child raising role retains greater choice - this was exemplified by Steve and Sally's different placing within the framework relating to careers.

These ideas reiterate the concept of "honorary men" (Acker 1990): women 'acting like men'. Kate said that a female professor in another department reached her senior position by "being like a man": totally neglecting her family who she "never sees". This highlights both Kate's support for the discourse of men as people who neglect the family (which is reflective of her own experiences), and suggests that career success is aided by forging 'masculine' subjectivity. This highlights one way in which women can 'use' masculinity. By reproducing the discourse of men in themselves, women can act

like men and gain some access to the exercises of power which are available to men.[3] Thus, by being "career women" - being work focused, appearing to give only secondary attention to family, dismissing the discursively constructed position of other women and thus contributing to the continuation of sexual inequalities - women practice masculinity: their actions may bring material gains, but the general balance between the sexes remains untouched.

In Part One it was suggested that the configurations of discourses and practices of masculinity vary according to time and place: similar discourses may be articulated differently according to the social relations within which they occur, or different expressions or actions may have a shared consequence. There are no sets of actions which configure masculinity at all times and all places. This is illustrated in the spatial inscription of the practices of masculinity. The following section shows how discursively constructed expectations of the sexes are reinforced by spatial separation, where paid employment and the workplace provide the site deemed appropriate for men defined in opposition to the home as appropriate for women (itself dependent upon the reproduction discourses outlined above) and, therefore, reproducing the dominant discourses of 'home' and 'work' illustrated in Part One. The discussion focuses in particular upon the negotiation of these discourses and how relations to them are thought to have changed in recent years at a social scale. The contingency of masculinity is highlighted in a case study where Brian spatialises "sex roles" and, thereby, reflects 'double-voiced discourse': the proposal of two competing discourses which serve (ultimately) the same purpose - Brian constructs himself as a 'victim' of occupying a 'masculine' position.

2. DISCURSIVE DIALECTICS: DISCOURSES OF "BREADWINNING" AND "HOME MAKING" AND THE PRACTICE OF MASCULINITY BETWEEN SPACES.

The key 'masculine' 'role' has been identified as "breadwinner" or "man the provider" (for example, Tolson 1977, Willis 1977, Bowl 1985, Miles 1989, Christian 1994, Connell 1995, *Achilles Heel* 1996). This was commonly self-identified by men in the interviews; John, for instance, saw the responsibility of men to provide for their family:

---

[3] It is important to reiterate that 'acting like-men' is not to imply that there is a unified 'identity' or characteristic of men which women can self-consciously adopt. Rather, it is being used here to convey that by adopting discursively constructed characteristics associated with the 'masculine' (which will vary according to situations / workplaces etc.) then it is possible to conform to a way of being which is detached from the disadvantages of the 'feminine', and this is the case for both women and men.

111

> *John:* You've got to support the family. Make sure that they have a reasonable standard of living, keep a roof over their heads. And being fed. [...] you've got to support a family and whatever. And hopefully the family will appreciate that that's why you are away from home so much.

Through this, John constructs for himself a role as responsible for his family's material welfare, itself reliant upon being less actively involved in the home than his wife. John is shortly to retire from his job and would like to enforce his position as 'provider' by having his wife give up work too:

> *Will your wife be working when you've retired?*
> *John:* She'll be carrying on working.
> *Will you like having the house to yourself?*
> *John:* Will I like it? No, I won't. That's one of the problems, I would like her to finish work, but she's got her work. Why rock the boat?

John expresses that it is suitable for women to work as a supplement to men working, with the implication, therefore, that his wife should finish work when he does. He does not like the prospect of being positioned as the home-placed partner with his wife theoretically filling his provider role. Ned constructs his "breadwinner" role as superior to his wife's role in the home (as the site of domestic work and child care) and the place of paid work as the appropriate sphere for men. Ned conveys that it is not a woman's place to go out to work, and like John, that it is not appropriate for women in a family to work when a man is not:

> *How would you have felt if, I don't know, maybe you* [Norma] *had gone out to work, and you* [Ned] *had stayed at home and looked after the kids?*
> *Ned:* If it happened that way, I'd feel a bit guilty. I would feel a bit guilty with her being breadwinner. I don't think it's a woman's place to go out working when there's two of you in t'house. So I think you're going to become idle. I wouldn't, mind, because I'd be at work all the time. I mean, I can't keep still now can I?

This discloses a discourse that men should be wage earners in a family and that if a woman does work it is to supplement the income of a man. The importance and superiority of paid employment for men is increased by the de-valuing of the 'feminine' home sphere. This is achieved by Ned portraying housewifery as idleness. It is explicitly housewifery, and not just the work involved in the domestic economy, because Ned comments that if he was a housespouse *he* would not be idle (and he also commented that he had done the work of a househusband whilst at SYMP - cleaning lavatories). Norma's construction of housework refutes this claim of idleness; she values her part-time work because it takes her away from the home and housework, and when she is working Ned is also willing to help more around the house, so reducing the expectations upon her in the home.

Some of Ned's practices at work are based in his discursively constructed subjectivity as "breadwinner" in the home. He takes it upon himself to nurture or mentor the "lads"

who are sent to work with him into 'men' and this task allows the articulation of the discourses of the sexes constructed by him - that the role of men should be "breadwinner" through hard work in paid employment and not through being "idle" like women who are based in the home. Ned acts as a 'father-figure' for his young charges (who have included his own children) to instil in them the expectations that he has of men, and this is a skill which he prides himself upon:

> *Ned:* The lads what come with me, make no mistake about it, if they're wankers, they're out. I'll tell management and get them somewhere else because I won't tolerate tossers working with me, I'm telling you now, no way. There were no special treatment for my lad when he were with me. He walked off job and I says 'come back here'. And he come back, he knew he had to come back, because if he walked off job, there's no way there was special treatment for him, same as Richard Brown's son. I always used to be on old Dick, 'tell him, and he'd work'. Richard's wife now states that I brought Nathan out of his shell. I brought him to manhood. Whether that's right or not, I don't know, but Nathan's made a beautiful kid, a smashing lad.

Ned's role is to make 'men of the boys' by making them 'workers' and not those who walk away from hard work. In this construction, "workers" are equated with the discourse of men which Ned supports, whilst those young men who do not conform to his appraisal of hard work are inferior (reflected by their labelling as "tossers" or "wankers") and share the "idleness" associated with the home. Key to this transformation of a boy into a man is bringing him "out of his shell" or 'growing him up' (a characteristic noted in Willis 1977: 15 as a part of becoming 'one of the lads'). Ned is practising masculinity by reproducing other men into the 'masculine' position associated with paid employment:

> *Norma:* a lad lost his dad who worked for SY, and they gave him a job, didn't they? His dad was knocked up and he was a good worker, weren't he?
> *Ned:* Now he's getting ninety percent target and everyone's against him you see.
> *Norma:* Yeah, yeah.
> *Ned:* He were called Liam, and he were a smashing kid, and I says 'Liam, what SY want out of you is work'. I says 'respect your dad, he died of cancer', and as soon as I said that, by god that lad worked didn't he? He just needed that little bit of push. [...] I feel as if I've done summat to get these lads a job, by pushing them. I don't know, it grows you up.

In the case of Liam, Ned assumes the discursive role of the father by pushing the son to be a success, thereby shaping Liam into the position occupied by his father as a hard worker and a breadwinner.

This is the position that Tom feels he occupies. He constructs home and paid work as separate spheres with distinct and separate roles and the implication is that the role attached to the home is an unattractive one:

> *Could you ever envisage being a househusband?*

> *Tom:* Not really, no. I don't think it would be my scene. I've lived on my own up here for six months and I didn't particularly like it, so that's not really my scene, no. I don't envisage that. Definitely wouldn't want to swap roles, no. No way.

Key to these constructions are 'choice'; Tom's involvement in paid work and the extent of his engagement in the domestic economy reflect the "enjoyment" which he derives from both of them. Tom's wife does all the household work except for those tasks which Tom enjoys doing:

> *What sort of housework things do you tend to do?*
> *Tom:* Oh the hoovering up, definitely, definitely not the ironing. Mainly the hoovering up, and gardening and things like that because I enjoy that. That tends to be my limit.

This ability for Tom to choose what tasks he undertakes in the home is contingent upon the "role" he assumes, affording him financial control over his family and so constructing him in a 'masculine' position. Because he is in this position, upheld by his paid employment, the appropriate sphere for his wife is constructed as the home as there is no "necessity" for her to work:

> *So what do you see your role as?*
> *Tom:* In the house? The breadwinner, because my wife doesn't go out, so I'm the breadwinner, I'm keeping the roof over her head, if you like.
> *Would she like to work?*
> *Tom:* ... Not particularly she wouldn't, no. No, she's actually just gone past retirement age anyway, she does little bits and pieces of things, but no, she wouldn't like to be back in the work situation. There's no necessity either.

Being the "breadwinner" can structure relationships into positions of control and dependency; for instance, Tom uses his position to choose to do only the domestic tasks he enjoys whilst his wife is financially dependent upon him - he is "keeping the roof over her head". The two roles, therefore, while apparently symmetrical, potentially create sexual inequalities. When there is one wage earner in a family, that person can exercise financial control and determine what a dependent family is able to do. Kate experienced such a scenario, negotiated in her own marriage by insistence on not having a joint bank account:

> *Kate:* My mother had to explain to my husband why I wanted my own money, because my father ruled the roost with money. He entirely controlled the money and that was how he got his own way.

Similarly, Norma's father controlled her family in this way:

> *Ned:* I've known her mum and dad since they were forty, now they're seventy, and he's always given her £15 per week.
> *Norma:* And don't forget there were seven kids.

Norma's father used his control of money to enforce the discourses that men should be serviced by domesticated women - he strictly adhered to making only the girls help in the home and fetch goods from the shops whilst preventing the boys from doing anything but be served by women. In Ned and Norma's relationship this scenario has

been consciously not reproduced; to show aversion to his father-in-law's stance, Ned decided that Norma would be responsible for the family's money:

> *Norma:* I see to the money, yeah. I know when all mortgage and that has to be paid. At the moment my son's got me running his account, so I'm running that and all. I've got him in a little book and I've got everything written down, when it's going to go out.

However, this has still placed Norma in a servicing position - Ned and his sons leave all their 'accounting' for Norma to do and she even has to visit bank managers on their behalf.

These examples illustrate how the "breadwinner" role is not just a construction complementary to the "home maker" role, but one which enables influence of power relations ('getting one's own way') through control of material resources and so materially reinforcing control and dependency. Where there is only one wage earner in a relationship, it is possible to practice the "breadwinner" role as the 'masculine' superior position. In this way, Tom and Geoff (and others) are constructed into a superior subject position through playing out traditional expectations:

> *Do you have a household budget?*
> *Geoff:* Erm, yes. ... My wife gets a cheque from me first day of the month, and then there's other expenses, I pay for those things which come in as well.

Therefore, the significance of "breadwinning" goes beyond purely the meaning of work itself (cf. Bertaux-Wiame 1981), but rather is bound with relationships of control and dependency - having a career or a wage may be important to an unpartnered person, but discourses of "breadwinning" do not have the same significance. They are inextricably linked to emotional relationships, gender relations in the home and the domestic division of labour.

The discursive role of men as "breadwinners" reinforces the construction of the home as the appropriate sphere of women and has material consequences in forging inequalities between the sexes. Cockburn (1984) notes that men's *absence* from the home during the (work)day reinforces their power at home at other times. I would contend that absence is not as important as the existence of discourses of women as responsible for the home (resulting in expectations that women will do most of the housework even when they have paid work themselves) which are reinforced by "breadwinning" discourses as discourses of men. The expectation is that "breadwinners" will undertake little, if any, direct involvement in the domestic economy. Geoff constructs the position of his wife as defined as "unwaged" and therefore as having more time for work in the home (as well as her being "better" at these jobs):

> *Who does things like food shopping?*

> *Geoff:* My wife does. ... 99%.
> *Is there any particular reason why she does it?*
> *Geoff:* She's got, she's got .. Well, she's unwaged as it were. She's moving back into nursing but she's on supply now so .. her jobs vary from nothing per week to, well, this week it's four and a half days. That though is her highest ever, normally it's one, perhaps two, days a week. You might say she's got more time for shopping and so on. [...]
> *What about housework or household chores?*
> *Geoff:* My wife again for the same reason. She's better at it too. I must say I normally do washing up, I normally, but not always, make the beds, I tend to do things which have a finish to them, cooking and so on. [...] I do ten percent say of the hoovering, of the ironing my wife does 99.9%. Cooking, largely my wife.

Female partners are still defined as home centred despite having some form of waged job, although getting paid work does seem to reduce their domestic burden (reflecting the findings of Pinch and Storey 1992). For instance, John constructs "breadwinners" as having household responsibilities if their wife works (but the construction still assumes women will 'normally' do it):

> *Who does the housework?*
> *John:* That's shared, because my wife works. [...]
> *Do you think men should do housework?*
> *John:* I think, if the wife is working, yes, you should share.

However, being in paid employment does not *change* the construction of women as the domestic workers. Geoff, for instance, will not be sharing the housework with his wife when she goes full-time again. They will be employing "a Mandy" - a cleaner - to do this. The tasks remain appropriately done by women (cf. Gregson and Lowe 1994).

The situation of the husband as 'breadwinner' and the wife as unpaid 'domestic worker' emerged as very common amongst the interviewees. However, discourses of "breadwinner" and of "home maker" were not restricted just to husband - wife relationships. In Frank's case, it appears that one of his daughters, Kelly, has assumed the role of "home maker" as she is the only woman in the home (and so introducing discourses of women as ancillary to men). Frank was widowed from Edna nearly two years ago and now lives in a house with Kelly, who is still at school. Frank's attitude towards Kelly was dislikeable - speaking about her as if she was not in the room, ordering her to get him drinks, and criticising her lack of sociability. She seems to fulfil the role once occupied by her mother: physically, by doing the household work that Edna once did, and situationally in that Frank treats her as ancillary to himself as a woman fulfilling a woman's role. Frank says that his wife used to do everything around the house:

> *It must have been quite difficult adjusting after your wife had passed on?*
> *Frank:* Yeah. I managed okay. But it is a big change in your life in't it? She used to look after all money side, and I didn't have a clue where things were. I used to

leave it all to her, so I was in a bit of a quandary where everything were. It's all right now, but it's not the same is it?

Now the bulk of household work is left to Kelly who does most of the cooking and a lot of the shopping for the two of them:

> *Frank:* We do the shopping together. When I'm not working we go at the most convenient time. [...]
> *Who tends to do the housework?*
> *Frank:* We do it between us. I do the pots, and she does the cooking and washing, when I'm at work. [...]
> *Who tends to do the cooking then?*
> *Frank:* She likes cooking, but I do it on odd occasions. I do the potatoes for her like, she just cooks it. She's not bad now. She's actually better at it than what her mother was.

Her mother's, and now Kelly's, 'role' is to service Frank, fulfilling a domestic role whilst he "goes out to work"; although Frank suggests they share household duties, Kelly appears to do the majority of the tasks, including "just" cooking. In this discourse the expectation is that women will be ancillary. Frank constructs his own position as a man as one of protecting women; because he works at weekends he has bought a dog to protect Kelly (and the rest of his property) in his place:

> *Frank:* It's a lot when you're doing twelve hour days or nights Friday, Saturday, Sunday. That's why I've got a dog. I'd have to leave her at home on her own while I'm at work all weekend. I thought, well, she's been looking for a dog, so I'll get her a dog, it's probably better to burgle while I'm up there.

This situation again reflects a control - dependency relationship, based in discursive constructions of gender; Frank's engagement with the work of the home has not increased significantly since the death of his wife because Kelly has acted as a 'replacement' wife and assumed the "home maker" position.

NEGOTIATION OF "BREADWINNER" AND "HOME MAKER" DISCOURSES: CHANGING MEN?

This section discusses and illustrates how the discourses of "breadwinner" and "home maker" structure the lives of some of the study participants and what, if anything, they do in 'resistance' to these constraints. Mave (at SYMP), Margaret and Kate (both in the Department) are all actively involved in domestic work as primary home carer and all (to varying degrees) would consider this a key component of their identities (as much, if not more, than their paid employment). However, each positions herself differently in relation to these discourses in terms of their acceptance of the expectations placed upon them.

Mave's position is constructed as one of unquestioning acceptance of her and her husband's "roles". Mave defines "servicing men" at work to be appropriate for women, and this situation is replicated in the home. Mave and Len both work full-time, but

Mave speciously justifies her husband's non-negotiation in the domestic economy: it emerges that she does the jobs which he does not "like" to do:

> *Who tends to do the food shopping?*
> *Mave:* Me. Because he doesn't like shopping. He'd rather sit outside and wait for me. I don't like shopping really, but somebody has to do it, so I do it. [...]
> *Who tends to do the housework?*
> *Mave:* Me. Because he works Saturday, Sunday anyway, so I mean I'm at home all day Sat'day / Sunday, so that's when it sort of gets done, so I look after house, he looks after garden. I'm quite happy with that arrangement.

Mave reasons that she does the housework because Len works at weekends, although obviously it need not be done then. Mave is quite happy to justify these expectations on her as the worker in the home; she looked after their children at home for thirteen years: "it was our decision, we had them and I looked after them". It is constructed as a joint decision (although it appears Mave does not have much choice in the process).

Margaret, on the other hand, constructs her position as home maker to be the consequence of a series of expectations upon her as a woman that she will handle the bulk of domestic responsibilities. She theorises that male colleagues are able to achieve career success because of their female partners being positioned, like her, as home orientated, allowing them to focus on their workplace ambitions:

> *Margaret:* I sometimes look at the successful, some of the successful men and think that behind a successful man is the woman at home, who's bringing up the family. I'm sure that they do some things, but I, I'm thinking around ones who .. professors, that they kind of got there with wives who work part-time. It was a matter of choice rather than accident. I don't mind putting that on the tape. [...] I think the men who do get on are the bastards, the ones who've got women at home or a combination of everything.

This positions men as in receipt of tangible benefits from the structuring of the division of labour. Margaret explains that not only does she have to consider a time-consuming, demanding occupation but also that she has practical and emotional responsibilities to negotiate in the home (which affect her ability to do her job):

> *Margaret:* Women like me providing for the family. [...] It's very difficult. You can do it, but it's an emotional pressure really. It's physically hard, and however new your man is they're just men, just, well, I won't go on. The responsibility of upbringing is essentially, in my experience, on the mum however much you share things. Now, the way our household is structured, mum's the one who has to get Christmas, stockings were filled, turkey was there, at the same time she's doing all the other jobs, all the other blokes are finishing off their research, while you're doing that as well as getting Christmas for a large number of people.

Margaret does practically all of the housework and direct care of four children in their home. This is despite her husband, Doug, being retired and Margaret working full-time as a lecturer. This suggests that although she is the only partner in paid employment,

Margaret is still positioned as "home maker" in opposition to Doug's 'masculine' position. His detachment from the work of the home is as strong as those in the "breadwinner" role despite being physically in the home a lot more. His housework involvement is presented as gendered; Margaret draws upon elements of discourses of men to pressure Doug into doing some of the work at home - "the man's jobs":

> *Margaret:* I can't really get Doug to go into shops because, like most men, he hates shopping. [...] He always takes the bins out. I regard that as a man's job, I genderise it. He mows the lawn too. Dog shit off the children's shoes, that's always dad's job.

When Margaret feels that she most needs some time off, Doug will occasionally do some housework if she leaves a short list of jobs for him to do. Doug's role in the family is to do things like play sports with the children. Other than list making, Margaret does not seem to challenge her positioning - she just gets on with combining full-time lecturing, occasional public function duties and domestic work. Margaret experiences these discursive expectations more acutely because they have also been acted out by her children; she said that, especially when they were young, the children expected certain things of her as mother which she felt duty bound to fulfil although they reinforced the construction of her as mother / home maker and Doug as in a detached position. As the quote above noted, Margaret experienced physical and emotional pressure to shoulder the burden of responsibility for children, the situation for all women "however new your man".

The "new man" theme was picked up by Kate as well. Her husband (Tim) had pursued an egalitarian position when he was younger - they shared domestic responsibilities. However, as their relationship developed they both began to fulfil the expectations of the "breadwinner" and "home maker" discourses. The result is that Tim now does very little of the work in the home - he has "downed tools":

> *Kate:* I don't think, despite all this talk about the new man, that there's actually been much change in the burden of household responsibility. My husband, as he's getting older he's turning into my father basically. He's downing tools. He's been working a long time and he's tired and he's getting older. I can understand why.

The birth of their child marked the point at which these discourses were solidified and the expectations were 'naturalised'. Kate says that taking maternity leave gave her more time to do domestic work and this marked Tim's tangible withdrawal from household work and his mirroring of Kate's patriarchal father. Tim has become positioned as the 'masculine' breadwinner and Kate the mother / child rearer / housewife / part-time worker:

> *Kate:* Tim used to do the ironing. He downed tools when I went on maternity leave. Because I was at home all the time and it was done, and that was exactly when he stopped doing it, because it was simply habit. He's got out of the habit of doing it.

119

The construction positions Kate as having been unable to disengage from these roles - being at home more than her husband has defined her completely as "home maker":

> *Kate:* we have direct debits obviously now for most things but I pay the bill, the assumption will be that tomorrow I will go and get the car taxed. Sort it out, because I'm at home.

Previously, Tim had even considered taking the home maker role himself as a househusband:

> *Kate:* Ten years ago I would have said he wouldn't have minded. We did actually talk about it. [...] he would have stayed at home if he had been made redundant, and I think he would have been quite happy about it. We do know a househusband as well. He and his wife, they made the conscious decision. His wife earns more than he could do and he stayed at home and brought up the children and she goes to work.

Despite Kate's declared feminist stance, she has not been able to redefine the way her life has become structured - her counter-discourses have not succeeded in gaining acceptance, whilst Tim's practice of non-engagement in the home has taken precedence. This has been reinforced by economic circumstances; their friends 'reversed roles' because the woman was capable of earning more than her partner.

It is uncertain whether recent years have witnessed any significant changes in the discourses articulated in the practice of masculinity in relation to the domestic economy. Early second wave feminism, in particular, focused upon domestic labour as a key site of struggle, centring upon men's non-involvement in household work (note Oakley 1974). This theme has pervaded public consciousness and it appears that men are now doing much more work in the home than in the past (see, for example, Leighton 1992, Pinch and Storey 1992, Hood 1993). However, whether there has been any change in the discourses of "home maker" and "breadwinner" is less clear. In the example of Kate's friends, the male partner is constructed as "non-sexist" and an equal contributor to work in the house. However, ultimately, he is still constructed in the 'masculine' position of choosing his level of engagement whilst the female partner is ultimately still defined as responsible for the home and children - he will leave without notice to go birdwatching:

> *Kate:* There are newish men, I think. I was talking to some friends. Her husband has no sexist attitudes at all, he's very good, does the washing up and helps look after the kids, which mine did. [...] But even then this friend of ours still thinks it's his right to go out birdwatching at a moment's notice, because something interesting appears, whatever happens to all the rest of the domestic arrangements. I think men tend to do that, men tend to think they have the right to do what they want to do. They just go and everything else will mysteriously happen like the laundry fairy who flits around our house and puts clean laundry in cupboards. [...] For some of them that do it I do think it probably is a genuine change, there's others that probably do it because they're nagged at.

There is continuity and entrenchment of these discourses even in situations where their existence is not obviously apparent - amongst "new men"; this leads Kate to term them "newish men" (compare with Moore 1994). A more equal society will be based upon the sharing of all responsibilities between women and men, and this includes sharing the domestic burden. However, this needs to be accompanied by changes in the discursive structures which constrain people's lives, particularly those of women. Men's involvement in housework may not alter the power relations and sexual inequalities of the discourses of "breadwinner" and "home maker" if the choice of the level of involvement remains completely with men and there is no change to what hooks (1984) calls "sexist oppression". It has been observed that men do housework because, as Kate notes, "they're nagged at":

> [men] get all guilty and apologetic and try to make concessions without really taking the thing to heart. These men will 'help' with the washing up or other chores, but won't really see the point or grasp what it is about. (Rowan in Wetherell and Griffin 1991: 370)

This does not alter the discursive expectation that primarily the responsibilities of the home are "women's work". Steve constructs himself as a "new man", actively engaged in much of the household responsibility; he comments that he does not believe in dominant discourses that 'the woman's place is in the home':

> *Steve:* The conversation on home should be an interesting one. Do I do the garden? Yes. Do I wash the pots? Yes. Do I change the nappies? Yes. I'm as soft as cheesecake. [...] We don't even have this theory that 'your job's in the kitchen, get on with it woman'. I don't believe in that, I believe in a modern, the modern age if you like, I can cook or she can cook, you just take it in turns depending on what you're having that night. Or washing up etc.

However, these comments still position Steve as the partner with the greatest 'choice', and as became clear earlier, their domestic arrangements certainly do reinforce discourses of women as "home maker" and men as "career orientated". This thesis has emphasised masculinity as a discursive practice with the implication, therefore, that changing practices of masculinity will end sexual inequalities. However, these changes are most effective in conjunction with commitment to change political attitude or ideology. Changing practices of housework can equalise some inequalities between men and women but are most significant where these changes are made to reflect a political commitment. Kate's friend's practices ultimately discursively construct women as responsible for the home / children - the discourses are not changed. Roger plays a substantial part in childcare in the family (around which he has structured his work routine) and does shopping and housework. Simultaneously, he supports discourses of the sexes which create inequalities, uses patronising language when talking to and about women and believes there is more discrimination against

men than women at work. There is not a unified "identity" of Roger which needs to be changed, but certain of his *practices*, and this would be facilitated by an individual commitment to change and consciousness of the consequences of one's actions.[4] I do not wish to suggest the attainment of a feminist vision relies *solely* on practices, but rather on a consistency between intentions, discourses and practices.

Hence, political change is reliant upon more than just "saying the right thing" - saying one does housework because the expectation for men is increasingly that they should do more; Paul reflects this and admits that the *intention* is to share housework but that it does not actually happen:

> *Paul:* It's done on a need to be done basis often. Inevitably the man always says that the housework's shared and no doubt it isn't equally shared. Erm, we do have a cleaner, just to sort the whole thing out, but beyond that, the intention is to do things, to do things fairly equally.

Jonathan and his partner are both too career orientated to become housespouses, but the practice is that his wife is ultimately left to do more housework:

> *Jonathan:* I'd probably confess that my wife does more than I do. Because she's more intolerant of living in squalor.

These examples suggest that these men are experiencing a change in the discursive expectations of men, that they should be more centrally involved in housework, for instance. There appear to be shifts in discursive sex expectations that are being accommodated 'intellectually' (there is evidence of theoretical acceptance that men, for instance, should engage in domestic work more than in the past) but less evidence that this has tangible consequences (women still undertake the majority of household work and dominant discourses of reproduction, breadwinning and home making are still very much intact). Another changing expectation is that men will be more involved in the family:

> *Kate:* The one big difference is that men of our generation have played, or are expected to play, a wider part in bringing up the children.

This change in men's expectations within the family is reflected by David, who feels it is his responsibility to spend more time with his son than his father did with him.

> *Would you say that there are any responsibilities which go along with being a family man?*
> *David:* I think the commitment to spending a certain amount of time with child or children, which was something that my father by virtue was never able to do with me, and I made conscious commitment to try and do it with my son, with some degree of success. [...] I have a more level relationship with my son than I did with my father, we talk things through rather more.

However, these still do not amount to fundamental changes in discourses of men in the family. There is no change in the underlying, complementary discourses that it

---

[4] These issues are discussed at length in Part Four.

should be women who are directly involved in child care and the home: for David, the responsibility for men is to spend more time with their children and talk with them, which, of course, does not change the definition of men as work-centred. David (like Steve) sees his role to be one of long-term indirect care for his child and being a father means acting as a 'role model' for his son: David is currently making enquiries about the viability of his twelve year old son's future career as an airline pilot. Although men are taking a much more active role in child care (Haas 1993), in many instances this has no benefit to women. What often happens is that men do the easy jobs with children, like playing with them, whilst women are left with the less pleasant jobs like changing nappies. This is all recognised by Margaret, who characterises these changes as constituting "liberating times" for men:

> *Margaret:* I think they [men] have changed a bit internally as well. I think they're much more involved say in family life, bringing up children, and they're enjoying it, and being allowed to. We are a very much relationships age, aren't we? We've got poets and history and theatre. Men have always felt deeply and strongly about these kinds of things. They're allowed to express it much more openly. I think these are quite liberating times for men really, to be allowed to be themselves.

This constructs any changes in expectations as beneficial to men - they are getting 'the best of both worlds'. They continue to control structures of authority and power, but are now able to be involved in domains such as the family, emotional expression, and 'being themselves': "liberation" (Hearn 1983 autobiographically reports similar experiences from his engagement with his family).

The impetus for changes could be accounted for as the consequence of contemporary feminism. However, feminist analyses of discursive expectations of women as "oppressive" have been adopted by some men to suggest that they are the 'victims' of discourses of the sexes as well (note Sean's comments earlier); Geoff constructs himself as the victim of the "dual role" - paid employment and household responsibilities - as much as any woman:

> *Geoff:* I think what's holding back women here, if indeed it is, is that famous dual role that they can't, some of them, maybe all of them, can't go home in the evening and have their meal on the table and then work academically in the evening because there's other things they must do as a woman, as a wife, whatever. [...] It can affect male members of staff too. I think that as a married man, I carry much more responsibility towards my family and therefore must spend more time with them than a single male, or indeed a single female. A single female could well work all the time on writing and get promotion much faster than I could as a married man.

Geoff expresses resentment towards his family responsibilities which make it difficult for him to compete in promotions with single staff. This "dual role" may apply for some of the women in the department as primary care providers, but in Geoff's case it is

harder to accept. He acknowledged that he does not spend much time with his family and that his wife does the domestic jobs; it seems qualitatively different from the 'dual role' which Margaret has lived - full-time academic, primary care giver to four children and responsible for practically all the domestic labour. Additionally, the "breadwinner" role which is being held responsible for this 'oppression' (note, for example, Farrell 1994) is a *consequence* of discourses of women that justify their placement unequally to the 'masculine' position primarily occupied by men. For men to be 'freed' from the discourse of breadwinner requires discourses which refute the 'naturalisation' of women's role in child care. However, Margaret agrees with Geoff:

> *Margaret:* there will be a lot of unhappy men, perhaps more unhappy, because there is still this wretched breadwinner role.

That the 'breadwinner' expectation forces men to comply to a system of work which can be oppressive to them was also suggested by Kate; her account, however, acknowledges that there is a connection between the "breadwinner" role and the discourses which create expectations for women - that the 'provider' role is based upon, and develops out of, the discourse of women as home makers and child carers:

> *Kate:* I can see that they might think there was sexism in the terms that they were trapped by social expectations of the role of man. That man would be the provider. I think a lot of men feel threatened by that, especially the men who've got absolutely bloody awful jobs, that during a time of different employment, with possibilities, they would leave those jobs, but because they have to provide for those families, especially if the wife's at home with young children, they are trapped, completely. I can understand that in that way they might feel there's a sort of sexism operating against them. The sexism which keeps the woman at home, looking after the child, similarly traps the man at work. I do think there are pressures on men, equally there are pressures on women.

The discourses and the expectations accompanying each role are mutually reliant and reinforcing; they define two distinct roles and expectations of which there are pressures created by the maintenance of one to maintain the other. That is, because in a family one partner is at home full-time, it is financially more important for another party to be working. There is an important distinction to be drawn between the expectations of the discursive constructions of women and of men. The 'costs' of the "breadwinner" role are qualitatively different from those of the discourses of women which are 'naturalised' as the consequence of women's biology and around which structures are created (such as absence of child care facilities or paternity leave). There are no structures which similarly discriminate against men because of their physiological sex.

In the next section, there is closer study of this dissatisfaction with dominant discourses and how the 'oppression' of men can be utilised to justify sexual

inequalities which generally disadvantage women. Both Brian and Emma challenge and contest the home and work spatialisation of sex discourses, but their approaches and the consequences of their actions are in sharp contrast. Brian constructs his life position as a man to be one where he experiences many negative costs of the 'masculine' and uses this as justification for challenging his wife's 'feminine' position. Emma experiences material constraints from discursive expectations upon her as a woman; her challenge of them in the home context has brought tangible changes in the gender relations of her relationship. Ultimately, however, the regulatory impacts of discourses have coerced her into embodying the expectations that she resents.

TAKING UP A CHALLENGE: CONTESTING POWER BY SPATIALISING THE DISCOURSES OF SEX.

It was discussed above how home and work spaces are important to the discourses of "home maker" and "breadwinner". These themes are developed here in the context of a case study. A micro-analytic approach is adopted to "deconstruct" the home to illustrate the precise relationships between discourses of the sexes and spaces within the home. This reveals that Brian tries to influence power relations by constructing conflicting discourses of "sex roles", home, work and the family with particular importance attached to the discursive constructions of 'masculine' and 'feminine'. The examples so far have shown how the 'masculine' subject position is constructed as 'superior'; conversely, Brian deliberately positions 'masculine' as inferior and as detached from power. There is a conscious utilisation of discourses of the sexes by Brian (which are shown to parallel the political motives of the neo-traditionalist "men's rights movement") to 'justify' challenges by him (men) of his wife (women) as the 'holders' of power in the 'feminine' position.

Brian portrays the position he occupies as costly to him and other men, reinforced by a suppression of the ways in which the 'masculine' provides him and other men with material benefits. In this way, like Geoff, Margaret and Kate above, Brian constructs the discursive expectations of men, and the discourse of breadwinning in particular, as an oppressive force on men. He expressed disappointment and disgruntlement with his life, specifically aspects of home and work. They were constructed as having costs for him and Brian portrayed himself as a 'victim'. There is a challenge to this construction, apparently only in the home, primarily in his relationship with Fay, his wife. There is a contest of power - perhaps one-sided for the extent of Fay's engagement is unknown - centred upon use of the family car and spaces in the home.

125

It is interpersonal and spatially-dialectical: the conflict at home is dependent upon the constructed position of Brian at work.

The home was constructed in the interviews as a space dominated by women. This was reliant upon the construction of women as *mothers*. This was counterposed with a construction of the paid workplace as a 'masculine' space, but one which is being increasingly feminised. Hence, they relate to the dominant dichotomous discourses of 'home' and 'work' examined in Part One. In this way, Brian's work / home practices exemplify how discourses of masculinity come to be spatialised at the micro-scale. Brian's accounts place all women as conforming to expectations as home makers, mothers, child carers, ancillary to men and as appropriately *placed* in separate spheres from men - in the home and in different types of employment (part-time and temporary). In contrast, men are positioned as breadwinners - appropriate to the workplace of paid employment - which entails them undertaking the least desirable jobs. Invoking discourses of reproduction, men are defined as having a distinct role in the family to women as mothers. This separation was revealed when Brian talked about how Fay's parents ran their farm:

> *Brian:* It was run along traditional lines, her father was the patriarch, but by god her mother was the matriarch, the kitchen was her domain and the boys, as they were called, whether they were six or sixty, were the people, were the ones who ran the farm and were out there with the cows. They were not expected to be in the house. They were allowed in, 'take your dirty boots off, here's your cup of tea, sit down, here's your tea, keep out of my way from under my feet'. She ran that farm, and she ran the domestic side of that farm, Fay's mother did, with every, in every sense with the same kind of dominance that her father ran the kind of the business side of the farm, right?

This constructs the farm's spaces as divided by sex, and suggests a 'separate but equal' philosophy - men ran the farm and a woman controlled the home domain and hence this was an equal relationship. A similar characterisation of his own home was made by Brian. The home is constructed not simply as the space for women, but the sphere for particular activities:

> *Brian:* it has been different while I've been on study leave because I've been more at home so I have been more available and she's been out at work, so inevitably I've been the one who has the meal. Recently I've been there when they get back from school, I make sure that they've got something to eat and drink when they come in, and I get the meal ready for when she comes home.

Whilst on study leave and being based in the home, Brian has begun to assume the mother role - looking after the children and preparing food. For Brian, being at home "inevitably" creates this situation. The development of such roles is accounted for by the separation of spheres - the workplace creates a particular role (of men), whilst being in the home creates a different role:

> *Brian:* a lot of the women in this department have got various family responsibilities, so you get quite a high proportion of the part-timers, part time teachers in the department are women, because it suits the domestic arrangements. So there's an element of the fact that because women have the role within the home geared to the bringing up of children.

In this way, Fay has been the primary care giver for their children because "she's more likely to be home when the children get home than I am". However, being in the paid workplace themselves is not constructed as transforming the expectation of women to look after children - they still have "family responsibilities". Brian's explanation and justification for Fay's greater involvement in the home is that it is "inevitable" given that she only "sort of works":

> *Brian:* I think because the nature of the, that work is structured, there is a tendency to fall into the traditional domestic arrangements and those have developed. [...] I mean my wife sort of works, she works more than half-time, but it's not full-time, so inevitably she has more time than I do. So she does tend to do more than I do around the house.

Not working as many hours reinforces Fay's position in relation to the home. Working more hours is used to help explain Brian's different position. His responsibilities for the family are separate concerns to Fay's as a woman. Rather than providing direct care for the children, Brian fulfils the expectations of the "breadwinner"; as a man he has "financial obligations ... like my father before me". This entails long-term financial planning for the children:

> *Brian:* You try to do everything as reasonably as you can. Insurance and all of this. It's getting more and more demanding. I have to be taking an insurance policy out for just about everything these days [...] you've got many more responsibilities as a family man.

The breadwinner discourse is utilised to construct the 'masculine' position as onerous and burdensome; many reasons for disgruntlement in his life were expressed, but the most significant for Brian were money and the pressures upon him to earn as much as possible to fulfil adequately the expectations upon him as provider:

> *Brian:* I'm constrained by money. I'm constrained by the fact that I've got three children who are ages eleven, twelve and sixteen and so therefore one has certain obligations there. [...] you've got financial obligations. There's lots of responsibilities that children don't appreciate.

Slipping between the personal "I" and the impersonal "you" is a generalisation of his situation more generally to all men.

The 'masculine' position is not defined solely by familial financial provider but also by situations of male numerical dominance and by *physicality*. Common to these discursive constructions is the suggestion that everything 'masculine' has negative consequences for men as a sex which leaves them subordinated. For instance, the last time Brian experienced an all-male environment was at boarding school which he

"survived"; he felt that an all-male department would be "awful"; and talking about changes in society he noted the recent absence of a major western war with the consequence for men that "we haven't been expected to go and get pieces of our anatomy shot up". In the discourses revealed by Brian's narratives, men have to fulfil "expectations" which have personal costs. This is in contrast to the role of women. The 'feminine' becomes defined in relation to unpaid work, childcare responsibilities and emotional work, all regarded by Brian as positive, empowering and enabling women to become dominant. There was resentment of certain expectations of masculinity that men should display, namely being strong and dominant. Brian noted that he has been in relationships with women "stronger" and more "resilient" than himself; he does not want to be characterised as neither strong or resilient but stresses that he displays these characteristics in other (unnamed) areas. Hence, there is acknowledgement that these characteristics are falsely gendered, but reluctance to deny his possession of them (as they are positive traits) which would portray him as impotent - "a wimp":

> *Brian:* I'm not comfortable with the global generalisation that men always take the lead or that men are always dominant in a partnership, in a relationship. Because I think that there are many women and many ways in which many women do take the initiative, take the lead, are stronger. Certainly in relationships I've had, I think I'd acknowledge that the women that I've known have strengths that I don't, are in many ways stronger than me. More resilient or more able to, erm, .. better at taking the initiatives on certain things than I am. But, then, you know, I think, I sort of say, well, but I don't feel that that makes me a wimp or I don't feel sort of inferior or, you know, sort of anything like that, by saying that, because I know I have strengths in other areas. [...] Deeply part of my make up, but that's the case.
> *Do you think resilience or strength are seen as being things that are attributed to being male?*
> *Brian:* Oh, traditionally, yes. When you look at it I think that's only part of, if you like, a traditional stereotype, I don't think when it comes down to it, that men are any stronger or resilient, physically, yes, but, I mean, women, you know, I think as many women have far more fortitude and durability, if you think of awful words, do you know what I mean?

This begins a questioning of the construction of 'masculine' and 'feminine' positions. The 'masculine' is conveyed as weak, but there is reluctance on Brian's behalf to relinquish a 'masculine' subject position (for ultimately he benefits from it). Because of Brian's disliked position as "breadwinner", Fay (as "home maker") does much more domestic work than he does, but this benefit is explained as 'natural'- "That's how things develop" - or as the choice of Fay. Choices are something which Brian self-constructs himself and men as not having.

The situation of himself and men is generally constructed as worsening as women begin to occupy men's role. This is exemplified in discussion of the changing nature of

the paid workplace and the ways that women are taking over and controlling the masculine sphere:

> *Brian:* Economic circumstances probably are changing the way in which we earn our keep and so on. That puts less emphasis on traditional masculine and physical methods. Look at Sheffield, the steel works. I'm trying to think of specific things that will help to focus it, and I suppose look at Sheffield and steel works and the mining industry. That's gone. In fact, if you look at the labour market now, the women actually have a more commanding role in a lot, particularly in certain areas of society, than the men, because, with the shift to part-time work, casualisation and so on, the women are as marketable, *more* marketable, than the men, right?

Brian portrays the labour market as preferring the "feminine" and so displacing the "masculine"; the construction is of men as economically and socially subjugated to women, the cause located as changes in society that help women. Again, women's increasingly strong economic position relates to their home / mother role - women are part-time, casual workers to fit in with their domestic responsibilities (as was similarly noted above for women in his own place of work), at the same time men's (physical) [the work which is 'naturally' 'masculine'] work is declining although men still have the financial responsibilities in the family. The 'masculine' position is conveyed as static - rooted in men's physical nature - whilst the 'feminine' position is constructed as in transformation because the home maker role is more flexible. This amounts to a reversal of the construction of dominant discourses discussed so far in this thesis. The position of women as innately, immutably tied to reproduction (which is used to explain women's absence from better jobs at SYMP and in the Department, and is detailed in Part Three) is here placed as advantageous, making women a desirable, flexible workforce. There is no recognition that part-time, casual work is the lowest paid and least secure form of employment which (until recently) had practically no worker's protection or rights. When women are taking over the 'masculine' sphere, this is assumed to be beneficial for women even though Brian regards 'masculine' work as negative when it is men who have to do it.

The consequence, in Brian's constructions, is that the role of women is changing and bringing benefits to women at the expense of men, who are not being compensated for this loss. These general changes in relations between the sexes are being reflected specifically in Brian and Fay's lives and in their relationship. Brian is not succeeding in his natural, 'masculine' sphere of paid work and he feels a failure. He wishes that what he regards as success - completing research and doing teaching - was acknowledged more:

> *Brian:* success can be recognised in a variety of ways other than just promotion. A lot of store is put by promotion, but I think success needs to be recognised by people getting a lot more positive feedback. [...] Not everybody can be head of

department or a professor, but a lot more could be done in recognising people's day to day successes within the department. [...] Which isn't to say that I don't have satisfactions in this present job. I mean, they are of a different order, a different type, I enjoy teaching, doing the research that I'm doing at the moment, but I somehow feel that it doesn't get the same recognition [...] in my last job I was able to really look on a sense of achievement there.

Whilst wishing for a more subjective definition of success, Brian still recognises that it is promotion that constitutes success in this workplace. Without this "recognition" Brian regards himself as a failure - it is a significant cause of his work dissatisfaction. It becomes clear that Brian himself assesses success in terms of status and this is something which he has not achieved. This is taken as a personal failure and disappointment:

Brian: I am a bit disappointed, a bit disappointed with the job, it has not lived up to the expectations that I had for it. Both in terms of the nature of the job and in terms of job prospects, given what I was doing before, where I'd achieved fairly steady promotion. I hoped to have achieved more in terms of recognition as a fairly senior person in my sphere. I'm struggling to get senior lectureship. [...] I can work in and around it, so I can get enough personal satisfaction to keep going. If I had the option I would probably be looking for another job. [...] Given the opportunity I would probably apply for other jobs.

Brian wants promotion to bring him status and, constructed as most important, more money to fulfil his breadwinning financial obligations to his family. At the same time Fay is succeeding and benefiting from being a woman - she is able to penetrate the 'masculine' sphere of work. Paralleling his general opinion of women's role in the labour market, Brian commented that Fay's job is "more marketable than mine". Additionally, Fay is constructed as retaining the domestic dominance of women. Brian regards the best things about home to be "space, independence, being able to give yourself time". These benefits are accredited to Fay; being at home more often gives her more time [to do the domestic work] and so she "goes out more than I do in the evening"; Fay is constructed as having leisure time and as controlling domestic decisions.

As a consequence of these constructions, it emerged that Brian attempts to disrupt discourses of the sexes, particularly the construction of the home as 'feminine'. This takes the form of posing a series of counter-discourses of the home as a "strategy of resistance". This 'resistance' is against the same discourses which Brian has himself constructed. For instance, Fay is portrayed as in control of spaces within the home and as the domestic decision maker *because* she conforms to Brian's view of the sexes where the home is the 'feminine' space of women as "home maker". By forging counter discourses, Brian's practices are a challenge to Fay's position in the home; he is trying to destabilise the kitchen as "women's space" and he wants control of the car

to end the discourse of women as controllers of domestic decisions (such as shopping). This amounts to a 'double-voiced discourse' (Matejka and Pomorska 1971). Brian's actions construct a discourse which he consciously tries to dispel by posing counter-discourses:

> One voice attempts to overthrow the other at the same time as the reader hears both voices sounding through the text. (Matejka and Pomorska 1971: 95, in Weir 1994)
> The second voice, once having made its home in other's discourses, clashes hostilely with its primordial host and forces him [sic] to serve directly opposing aims. Discourse becomes an arena of battle between two voices. (Bakhtin 1984: 193)

Brian's *wife* and *women* become synonymous in the discourses - by challenging Fay he challenges the discourses of women which have been constructed as a constraining force upon him. Negotiation of discourses of sex takes the form of constructing constraints upon Brian as a *man*. Brian feels that he does not benefit from being a man. Whilst men as a sex have the *socially* dominant positions of power, Brian does not experience this *personally*. This is played out by challenging the *one* domain that discourses of sex legitimise as appropriate for women - the home. It involves utilising discourses and *material* resources - home spaces and the family car. Control of one legitimises and accesses control of the other.

A) THE CAR

The family car acts as the most important symbol of power and control in Brian and Fay's relationship. Brian is careful to downplay its significance, moaning that it is simply a "boring family saloon". However, its possession is very important to Brian; he expresses deep resentment over Fay's control of the car and consequently of him:

> *Brian:* She always gets the car. I only get it at weekends when it needs cleaning and the petrol put in it

which only happens "if she's in a good mood"; she drives him to work in the morning. The significance of the role of the car in the formation of 'masculine' identity and social power should not be underestimated. Driving as symbolic of 'male power' has been widely commented upon, whilst Cahill (1994) reports that male ownership and access to cars are a significant contribution to sexual inequalities. In this light, Fay's 'control' of the car has added importance, and Brian's comments about "traditionally male" things are falsified:

> *Brian:* she likes to do things her way. So if she's doing the cooking and the shopping she wants to do it the way she wants to do it. The inevitable thing is that I tend to get to do some of the more traditionally male things. I wash the car. She just drives it, I wash it.

For this is actually the reverse of the 'norm': rather than being "traditionally male", Brian is cast into a 'feminine' subject position - the 'masculine' position would be to drive the car, not to wash it. "Traditionally male" is placed in a subjected position. He / men have to do things for women (wash the car) and suffer from this (no access to the car) - the 'masculine' is characterised as exclusive of power. Brian constructs himself as in a denigrated, inferior position. His resistance is to use the car as a means of control himself as a 'bargaining tool'. Brian 'rewards' Fay when he has the car, for instance by doing the shopping:

> Brian: Although maybe if I am *allowed* to have the car, some days, I'll give her a ring and say 'since I've got the car is there anything that you would like me to pick up on the way home?' [Emphasis added]

By having the car it enables Brian to suspend Fay's "control" - of the car, of mobility, of decisions about shopping (reiterating the control-dependency relationship of Ned and Norma). The car brings mobility and dominance (as it determines the other's mobility) and decisions over shopping. Whilst Fay controls the car, Brian constructs her as in control of his sex role: he has to do the negative, 'masculine' things such as physical jobs (washing the car) or paying for it and the petrol. At the same time, this discourse places the car as upholding Fay's 'feminine', powerful domestic role - able to do (and control decisions over) the shopping, cast as a benefit to her. Brian says that Fay does the food shopping because she disapproves of the things he buys when he does it - too many "treats" and not enough "sensible stuff" - that implies his skills and knowledge of shopping are inferior. However:

> Brian: So, on the whole, she controls the shopping, but sometimes I will go and do it as it were under her directions. She'll make a list. Like last Friday, she was fed up, the idea of doing the shopping, so I went and did it under her direction.

That Fay was "fed up" with doing the shopping does not accord with Brian's discourse that doing the shopping brings the power to control him.

B) SPACE IN THE HOME

A great deal of the conflict between Brian and Fay centres around the 'feminine' space of the home. The 'resistance' is multifarious and again exemplifies 'double-voiced' discourse. Brian positions himself as subordinated in the kitchen and garden by constructing Fay as 'in charge' of him doing negative, 'masculine' physical tasks. In the case of the bedrooms and the study it appears that Brian occupies a dominant position, but this is downplayed by him to maintain the image of him as 'inferior'.

i) The kitchen

The kitchen forms the key site of contest and resistance in the home. It is constructed as 'feminine' - a "woman's room" - but it is a construction which is challenged by Brian:

> *Brian:* I think the one we've had the most difficulty over is the kitchen. Which is traditionally seen as a woman's room, right? And, which I, I suppose, ... I find difficulty accepting, cos I .. I do a lot of the cook, I actually do a lot of the work in the kitchen, in terms of washing up, cleaning up, but not as much cooking as I used to.

As an expression of resentment, Brian's narratives try to disrupt the feminisation of the kitchen space by emphasising the work which he does within it. Brian's "difficulty in accepting" the gendering reflects resentment that as a man he feels the kitchen cannot be under his control. By highlighting his work input, there is an attempt to destabilise Fay's 'legitimate control' of the kitchen. Resistance manifests itself in arguments over the right to decide how the kitchen is ordered:

> *Brian:* she has her way of arranging things in the kitchen which is different to my way, so that's where we get sort of little disputes like 'why haven't you put this back where it's supposed to go?' Nothing too dramatic.

Such decision making struggles may appear petty, yet they form an important strategy for demarcating territorial control. Again, Brian self-constructs his role in the kitchen as an undesirable one where Fay's controlling position leaves him to do unpleasant, 'masculine' tasks such as washing up or emptying the bins:

> *Brian:* I put the bins out on Monday night, so the result is that she's started taking it for granted that I will do it. The expectation develops that I will do the bins.

The emphasis is upon the unpleasantness of his tasks and his lack of choice, and not upon Fay's obvious greater domestic commitments - shopping, cooking and child care.

ii) The garden

The discursive construction of the sexes is spatialised in the garden as well. Once again, Fay is constructed as the controller of decisions - choosing the enjoyable aspects of garden labour - and Brian is constructed as forced to do unappealing jobs: the physical, subservient 'masculine' tasks:

> *Brian:* she likes gardening, and almost resents me sometimes going out in the garden. So again the little division of labour that has grown up there is that she is the grower and I'm more the one who trims the hedges.

There is a construction of them in dichotomous positions: Fay as the introducer of nature ("the grower") and Brian as the tamer of nature ("the trimmer"). This can be read as symbolic of their "home maker" / "breadwinner" roles - Fay attends to the reproduction of plants and children, whilst Brian takes care of the longer term, 'masculine' duties of provision and production (labouring) for the plants and children.

Fay's position is portrayed as the more attractive, a role which she polices by resenting Brian when he tries to involve himself in 'her' work.

iii) The bedroom

In the case of the bedroom, Brian appears to hold a tangible control over its use, but his dominance goes unacknowledged. This maintains the self-portrayal of detachment from the choice, control and freedom that Fay is constructed as possessing. It emerges that their shared bedroom is characterised by his 'markers' so that the room is more 'his' than 'hers':

> *Would you say the bedroom is jointly yours and your wife's space, because I've found a lot of times that the bedroom is more one person's.*
> Brian: That's interesting, she thinks, yeah. She sees it very much as mine, this is why she likes to have her own room, where she's got sewing and painting stuff that she likes, her books and everything, yeah.
> *But you don't see it as*
> Brian: Erm, yeah, I think she's probably right, but I think that's just sort of convenience. [...] I agree with her on that.

Brian's control of their shared space is mediated by the insistence that Fay similarly has control over her own space and therefore that neither has any more personal space than the other:

> *Does your wife have what you would call her space?*
> Brian: Yes. Yes, yeah. Yes. As I say, the house is quite small, but we've got a sort of tall thin building. .. Yes, she's got a room as well. Well, actually it's what we call the guest room. She's turned it into what is effectively her room, yeah. ... And the boys each have their own rooms.

Importantly, however, the room is actually named the "guest room", Fay's control of it is not reflected in ability to label it as hers. She seems to have adopted the guest room because the bedroom is "very much" Brian's although this is explained by him simply as "convenience". The shared bedroom is actually dominated by one partner.

iv) The study

Brian's control of space is further exemplified by use of the study. Brian not only controls the bedroom as his space but he also has a study which is exclusively his own:

> *Is there anywhere in the home which is physically your space?*
> Brian: Yeah, I have a little room about half the size of this one actually with a desk, computer, which is mine, my little study. Which I will retreat to when there is a family argument. Yeah.

Having the study as a "retreat" constitutes a considerable privilege at this particular time. Brian explained that there are currently many domestic arguments, quickly adding that they are not of the "family breakdown variety", which may actually reflect that they are quite serious. Brian regards them as the worst aspect of home life:

Brian: My god ... family arguments I suppose. Some sort of blow up. It takes a while for the feelings of that to dissipate.

The study is therefore highly significant for Brian, providing him the ability to escape from familial problems. The study is also an important physical marker of the "breadwinner" discourse and Brian's 'masculine' role as wage earner and family provider. He has the study in order to undertake the academic work which positions him as "breadwinner". This amounts to a transgression of Brian's discursive construction of appropriate separate spheres for the sexes - the 'masculine' work space is imposed on the home, so destabilising the construction of the home as 'feminine'.

These examples illustrate a complex structuring of discourses and counter-discourses. The construction of gendered spheres and the positioning of the 'masculine' as exclusive of power relies upon Brian's denial of both personal choice and spatial control or decision making. Previous illustrations had shown that discursive constructions of differences between the sexes served to justify the exercise of power: sexual inequalities were constructed as the product of 'natural', sexual differences. In Brian's constructions, 'differences' are not invoked to justify men having better jobs or being in a dominant position in a relationship, but rather to position the 'masculine' (and, therefore, himself) as denigrated and devoid of power. The 'feminine' and 'feminine' spheres are portrayed as spiritually and materially benefiting women, whilst the 'masculine' and 'masculine' spheres are constructed as positioning men's lives as uncontrollably structured and dictated by women. Women are also portrayed as benefiting further from appropriation of the 'masculine' sphere of work although, contradictorily, constructing the 'masculine' as weak had meant positing paid work as undesirable.

These discourses form the justification for Brian's challenges of his self-constructed positioning as powerless and dominated, articulated in a contest of Fay's typification of the 'feminine'. Significantly, the construction of Brian / men's inferior positioning at home and at work is contested by Brian only in the home. Work disgruntlement is perhaps less easy to challenge - women / 'feminine' are less tangibly to 'blame' for his 'powerlessness'. Brian also has no workplace authority. This probably accounts for the home as the site of 'resistant' counter discourses. There, Brian's relational position in the discursive framework allows the mobilisation of exercises of power in the home (financial and spatial control and only limited involvement in domestic work)

to self-construct an alternative position of 'powerlessness'. This construction is then purposefully drawn upon by Brian. Whilst engaging more actively in the domestic economy would not be desirable to him - he admits that he has "had enough of home for a while" - Brian is able to construct himself as willing to participate, but not "allowed" to by Fay. Work is discussed in terms of its personal 'costs' as "breadwinner" and not in terms of its material benefits - financial control and spatial control in the house (the study is his space as "breadwinner") or its personal benefits: the job brings a good deal of enjoyment. It was not until asked to consider the prospect of becoming a househusband that he reasoned:

> *Brian:* no, not because I'm against it, but because I enjoy my job too much [...] my job is more than about filling in time or earning money.

The constructions are therefore reliant upon the suppression of benefits from "breadwinning" or the disadvantages of the "home maker" position. In this way, the success of Brian's deliberate counter-discourses can be measured by their 'failure'. To justify Brian / men's challenge of the 'feminine' requires the continued discursive construction of Brian / men / 'masculine' as subordinate to Fay / women / 'feminine'. In his specific case, Brian downplays the significance of his control of the bedroom and study by stating that it is equivalent to Fay's control of the guest room. The discursive construction of the 'masculine' as weak forms the "stock of knowledge" that justifies Brian's on-going challenges of Fay's control.

These constructions and 'struggles' parallel ideological features of the "men's rights movement". Its organised form in contemporary Britain has been as the *UK Men's Movement* which campaigns for equality for men with women based on the construction of women as the dominant sex following the changes in society created by feminism:

> Many men have always opposed feminism, of course, but what is new and distinctive about the men's rights movement is its attempt to position men rather than women as the primary victims of gender. (Baker 1994: 11)

Its "factual" argument is laid down in Farrell's (1994) *The Myth of Male Power* which posits men as the powerless, "disposable sex". Its arguments mirror Brian's constructions. Power is conceptualised as "control over one's life" (xii) as it is by Brian - how can he be powerful when he *feels* powerless? (see Kimmel 1994 for a comparison). Farrell argues that men and women are forced into accepting "traditionally male" and "traditionally female" roles, with men as "slaves" to their "breadwinner" role - Brian's main contention. It is argued that there exists patriarchy *and* matriarchy, with women dominant in more areas of life. Farrell's comment that men feel like "visitors" in "their wife's castle ... a woman's home is his mortgage" (18) is

again mirrored in Brian's account, where the home is the place his wife controls, but which he pays for through a job he does not like and is trapped into doing - what Farrell frames as men having burdens and women having options: "multi-option women" and "no-option men" (xii). Finally, Farrell believes this unjust situation is typified by the forcing of men into the army for money and to protect women, a point also made by Brian.

This ideology was also alluded to in the interviews with Steve, which serves to illustrate the growing acceptance of these discourses. Of most concern is the drawing upon quasi-feminist arguments. Feminism has successfully illustrated the general "oppression" of women in "patriarchal" social systems, positioning women as the 'victims' of gender (although this is not to deny the active opposition to gender inequality taken by women in paid employment as illustrated, for example, by Walby 1986). Campaigning has led to the implementation of legislation aimed at removing sexual discrimination in employment. "Men's rights" ideology reverses these feminist discourses to argue that men are similarly 'victims' of socially constructed gender and that legislation has 'tipped the balance' in favour of women (reflected in figures that showed in 1995 more men reported sex discrimination in employment than did women). Surficially, there are commonalities between "men's rights" and feminism. Steve recognises that there have been changes in the sexes and gender relations over the last three decades and that there is now sexual *equality* (apparently based in changing sexual composition of the workforce):

> *So, would you say that maybe men have changed in recent years or whatever?*
> *Steve:* I think that both sexes have changed, to be honest. I think that men have seen this gradual .. ego busting theory 'men's the best thing since ...', you know, 'men go out to work and that's it'. That's all gone. Sexual equality now. The women now, I'm sure - we've had a woman prime minister - I'm sure that come the year 2000, you'll see more women in the top jobs within British industry than you've ever seen before. And I'm not against it, because I think there's a lot of women out there who are quite capable of doing those jobs and I'm all for women going out to work and not slaving over the kitchen and I think it should be equal rights. I can't see ... any disadvantage in that. We're in a modern society, a woman should be able to do what she wants to do.

These statements generally accord to a liberal feminist position, recognising the rights of women to seek paid employment and not to be constrained by expectations as mother / home maker. Have these challenges and changes to men created sexual equality? Having a woman prime minister is used by Steve to illustrate equality, as it was by Derek:

> *Derek:* Look at Margaret Thatcher. 'Have a *woman* prime minister?' We have! [Laughs] Yeah, yeah.

However, many of Mrs. Thatcher's actions as prime minister were practices of masculinity, perpetuating sexual inequalities. This reflects a problem (at least in its popular interpretation) of feminism as a movement of and about women's experiences. It is used to justify practices of masculinity: Margaret Thatcher is taken as exemplifying sexual equality for all women and, similarly, *all* women are taken as beyond reproach of complicity with masculinity. The experiences of *individual* women are used to illustrate the 'success' of *all* women. This problem may be reduced if feminism were seen as a political movement to achieve particular aims irrespective of sex.

The assumption of the existence of equal rights is perceived as having negative consequences: any future gains for women will be regarded as at the expense of men. Steve believes that men's rights are becoming less than those of women:

> *Steve:* what I think you've seen is that the male dominance has been eroded away. You're going to reach a level, which I don't think you're far off now, where you've got more or less equal footing and .. there's certain areas where a woman's rights and a man's rights have, a women's rights are up here [raises his hand] and a man's rights are still down here [lowers his hand], and I think that's probably an area that needs tightening up a lot.
> *What sort of thing, what sort of areas?*
> *Steve:* How did I know you were going to ask me that? Well, let's look at the criminal side of things. I think a man gets a much more severe penalty than a woman does on the criminal side. And if we're on an equal footing, and they're both as bad as each other, then I think, this is not being sexist or anything, but I think women do get away with a lot more. I think there's some areas there that need tightening up. There's room for improvement. What I think you've reached, you've reached a level, but there are peripherals out there which need to be brought into light. How you go about that I don't know.

This highlights the dangers for a sexual politics based in an ideology of "rights" for a particular sex. I would contend that the objective should not be an equalisation of opportunities for either sex - "gender equivalence" (Forbes 1996) - but for the end of particular discourses which construct the sexes as "different" and the expectations of those discourses, such as "breadwinning" or "home making". Hence, there is a necessity for a political movement for women's rights utilising feminist insights to argue against a political movement largely mobilised around "breadwinner" and "home maker" as identities. This augers towards a more practice-based "sexual" politics. Emma, for example, expressed attitudes which could be labelled feminist, while actually expressing opposition to feminism; her practices (debatably) could be said to contribute to a feminist politics by trying to counteract discourses of the sexes.

GIVING UP THE FIGHT: THE SUCCESS AND FAILURE OF NEGOTIATING HOME AND WORK.

The home and work situations of Emma illustrate how discourses of the sexes can be challenged. However, resistance manifests itself in specific spaces, being much easier in the home than at work. Emma has practically and discursively countered the construction of her as a woman as home-centred. She has successfully challenged her husband Scott's discursive construction of her as appropriately placed within the home and as providing for him in that space, and of himself as the paid worker and as serviced at home, traits which Emma classifies as "chauvinistic":

> *Do you think you could see your husband becoming, I don't know what the term is, a househusband?*
> *Emma:* Oh no, he would never do that, he'll not give up his job. He's very chauvinistic: 'The women's place is in the home ... not out at work'.

When the couple first started living together, Scott's "chauvinistic" attitude was expressed in an assumption that Emma would do all the work around their home:

> *Emma:* He hardly did anything, he were terrible. He didn't know what a hoover was or anything like that. He'd watch me washing pots and that, then he'd go and get his shower and that was it. That's what he used to be like.

Emma believes Scott's opinions stemmed from his parental home life where his mother had always done everything for him and where he never had to do anything for himself: he had developed the expectation that a female life partner would assume the role of his mother. Emma, however, was not willing to fulfil the expectations of home-maker; she ensured that an alternative division of labour would prevail in their household. This challenge took the form of refusal to be taken for granted in this way, and centred around one incident:

> *How did that division come about?*
> *Emma:* It just happened. One night we sat there and he says: 'This carpet needs hoovering'. So I said, 'Why don't you hoover it then?' I said, 'I work just as much as what you do, you'll just have to help me'. And he did. He didn't like cooking at first, he wasn't very good at it, but I mean, he's getting there now, he's getting quite good.

Emma has managed to force Scott to change his practices (although whether his attitudes have changed is unknown, and Emma has still internalised this role to an extent - his role is still to "help" her fulfil what is predominantly her own: "I said to him, 'If I wasn't working then I wouldn't expect you to do anything'"); now he shares equally in the domestic economy:

> *How does the housework or whatever get divided?*
> *Emma:* He does it all! [Laughs] No, we share the responsibility. Scott takes care of all the hoovering, I wash the pots and he dries the pots, I cook tea when I come home from work. He cooks tea when he's on nights, ready for me when I come in, and then I wash and wipe pots. I do all the washing and ironing, he mows the garden, cleans the car [...] he takes the bins out, empties bin in't kitchen, and we do the shopping together.

Emma also challenged her discursive role as 'mother'. She had always made it clear within this relationship that she would not have children. If the occasion did arise that they had children, then she was not going to fall 'naturally' into being a mother at home:

> *Emma:* ever since we started courting, I've always said that 'I am going back to work, whether you like it or not, I am going back, so you'd better get used to the idea now before we get married or anything'. [...] If we have a baby then we will share the responsibility, he'll have to. I'm not looking after a baby and doing all the cooking and the washing.

Hence, it is clear that Scott upheld the dominant discourses of women as mothers and appropriate to the home sphere, and that this stemmed from his experiences of his mother 'servicing' everything for him there. The discourses which he agrees with have been questioned and re-defined in his relationship with Emma, who is not prepared to live up to the expectations for women that such discourses prescribe. Her practices express counter-discourses which have led to a tangible change in their home situation: there is an equal divide of the domestic work and both engage in paid employment and contribute fairly equally to the costs of the home - both have assumed the "breadwinner" role.

However, at SYMP Emma is still (she feels) regarded in the home-centred discourse, as the examples in Part Three show: she is expected to deferentially carry out the orders of male managers and be treated like one of Richard's children. She has "won" at home, but changing the situation at work has proved unsuccessful. Emma has managed to change power relations at home, but cannot at work; she is taken out of the re-powered home space into one where power is not exercised just between interacting individuals but is backed up more tangibly by work policies and authority. At home she had to make her husband re-think his behaviour, and at this she was successful. Her resistance (for whatever reasons) brought about changes. At SYMP the discourses are much more entrenched, and instigating changes is more difficult: Emma has many more people's attitudes and behaviours to transform, and this appears intractable. To succeed, she has necessarily to convert colleagues to think more supportively of equality between the sexes (whilst their discourses are simultaneously pressuring her to accept her 'natural' role as a woman). Her progress at home may reflect her husband's love and respect for her and so a desire to change. This is not present at work. Emma is subject to continued and repeated practices of masculinity which position her as incompetent, stupid and / or subservient. Within the workplace, she has minimal ability to influence modifications. The predominant discourses at the company expect women to be career women or mothers, and even

career women are limited in what work they are deemed suitable to undertake (because of their physical "inferiority" and "different" perceptions, attitudes, bodies and 'natures'). Emma is already positioned in the regulatory framework as inferior and subsequently it is particularly difficult (even futile) for her to challenge the construction of her as a "woman" and the expectations made on her because of this. Additionally, Emma has no sanctioned authority which could improve the chances of having the version of discursive constructions which she supports accepted - she is an assistant to male bosses (Derek and Richard) who have are able to instruct her what to do. They uphold discourses of the sexes which are not amenable to the changes that Emma would like to see (and are illustrated in Part Three).

Emma's inability to positively affect discourses at work is beginning to have consequences for her at home. In fact, the obstructions she has faced as a woman at SYMP have 'worn her down' - she has, in the words of Margaret in the Department, "given up". Emma has always objected to the assumption that women will bear children and work for men in the home, and she has taken her views into the workplace. This has been expressed in her solid work focus:

> *Emma:* I wanted a career, I wanted to be a career woman.

Work has been the dominating aspect of Emma's life, she has been very ambitious and has wanted to succeed in her career, by getting promotion and maybe moving into management. This situation has now changed:

> *Emma:* I was particularly ambitious about three years ago, but now I'm not very ambitious, I don't want to go any further. [...] I'm not too interested in management now.

Emma has been frustrated by the lack of opportunities for promotion at SYMP, and particularly for women hoping to move into management; she feels that she has been treated unfairly and has not been shown any trust because she is female:

> *Emma:* I think that it's about time now that I started getting that respect and trust that I've worked hard for over the last five years. [...] You can count on the back of your hand how many women managers there are. There's about two on the company that are in a responsible position.

Emma accounts for this by the construction of women as mothers and home makers in the company:

> *Emma:* I think it's because we have kids. [...] Once you've married and got your children, they think that's it, they're going to finish now, they don't want a career, they can't handle a career when they've got children. [...] Women can't win either way they turn, because it's deemed their responsibility to look after a child.

The consequence of this and her inability to gain promotion has been a change in Emma's outlook on work, home and life more generally. Emma no longer wants to make a career for herself and have to work very hard for very little recognition at

SYMP; she wants to move to a job where she will not have any responsibility and where the expectations on her will be lower, perhaps as a secretary. She has also been pushed back into a home-centred discourse at home: she is no longer a "career woman" because her lack of work success has forced her to re-assess what she regards as important in life:

> Emma: I've got different priorities in my life, I'm getting married, I've got a house to think about.

Within the last month before her marriage, Emma has changed her mind about having children in the future; she suggests that she is now going to become a "mother" and she regards her new priorities as less "selfish". It is possible to say that the discursive framework in the SYMP workplace has led Emma to a position where she is having to comply to a discourse which she had always resisted and rejected. She had always wanted to follow a career and not become involved in childcare and domestic work, but because the men in authority at work did not accept these discourses, she has been 'coerced' into the subject position that they have created for her: she was not able to prove herself to them as a "career woman". The construction of women as mothers and home-centred produced by their words and actions will now be reinforced by Emma's apparent conformity. Emma will be self-presenting herself as 'feminine'.

> As we have argued elsewhere (Holland et al 1992) young women, in producing themselves as feminine, enable men to exercise power over them. (Holland, Ramazanoglu and Sharpe 1993: 33)

It has been already suggested that women are pressured into accepting 'feminine' subject positions which result from (and further facilitate) the exercise of power from the 'masculine' position. However, it must be remembered that the 'feminine' is a consequence of power. In Emma's case, it seems that despite presenting herself as not 'feminine' and even as 'masculine' (as the description above and the outline of her 'personality' in the Precursor showed), she has been constrained by discursive constructions of women. They position her (although she has not conformed herself) as a mother, as a home maker appropriate to that sphere and as a servicer of men. This has finally pressured Emma into acceptance because she cannot win: it is not just that 'femininity' allows the exercise of 'male power', but that the exercise of 'male power' facilitates its future exercise by unequally positioning individuals within the framework by creating femininity. Emma's situation reflects how constraining the regulatory framework can be - despite all her intentions, she now feels forced into "complicity" with masculinity. Non-dominant discourses, such as those articulated by Emma's practices, still have to be played out and negotiated within this discursive, regulatory framework, and this framework has more "weight" behind it in affecting how people act etc. than counter-discourses. Although not everybody lives out dominant

discourses, they are discourses which still structure most people's lives and create knowledges which have to be negotiated.

The discourses through which masculinity is articulated amongst the study participants - reproduction, breadwinning and home making - emerge as highly constraining forces in the structuring of individuals' lives and the "performance of gender". Despite recognition of these constraints, disgruntlement towards constraining discourses and concerted efforts to produce counter-discourses of gender, it emerges that achieving successful change in the discursive framework is difficult and problematic. Emma has "given up", whilst Margaret 'grins and bears it'; Brian's contestation serves to reinforce them, and Steve and Claire are beginning to conform to discursive expectations. It is difficult to exist outside of these powerful discourses, and tactical negotiation of them - 'bending the rules' - appears much easier than transformation of discourses - 'breaking the rules'. Discourses are more than (and are more important than) just 'what people say'. They help determine the structuring of lives, creating the "rules" within which subjectivity and practices have to be played out. It has become clear that discourses of reproduction are particularly important - they form the central point around which other discourses of the sexes and the division of gendered spheres are based, and serve as the pivotal process which 'naturalises' discourses. There are other discourses which contribute to the discursive framework, some of which are more actively constructed in everyday interactions where 'masculine' and 'feminine' subject positions are created. Important to this is the sexual objectification of women by men.

3. DISCOURSES OF SEXUAL OBJECTIFICATION

It is widely noted within academic discussions that a key aspect of sexual inequalities in society is the sexual objectification of women by men (for example, Metcalf and Humphries 1985, Collinson and Collinson 1989, Brod 1990, Davidson 1990, Ramazanoglu and Holland 1993, Wight 1994, Connell 1995): Willis's (1977) study of working class young men found that in conversation "girls are afforded no particular identity save that of their sexual attraction" (43). Such discourses were revealed in many of the interviews in this research, although conversations had focused upon home and work and only occasionally explicitly discussed sexuality. Sexual objectification de-values the object of the gaze (Kappeler 1986, Parker 1990, Rose 1992, 1993a, Nash 1996); the gazer is positioned as the judge of value of the object according to its sexual attractiveness - there is negation of individual subjectivity and dismissal of self-worth on the grounds of perceived sexual unattractiveness, of which

there are codes and conventions of attractiveness which individuals feel pressured into conforming to.[5] The effect of objectification is to equate the object as possessed by the observer. This process was reflected by David, when he talked about the characteristics of his ideal partner. The two most important were listed as "attractive" and "good looking". Heterosexual objectification was most starkly revealed through a comparison of good looking women with expensive cars:

> *David:* Well, it's probably the same way that people drool over exotic cars and things. Wouldn't it be nice to have a Ferrari or something? And that's something that you can achieve because you can save up, you can buy a Ferrari, drive it, and then you can sell it again. Couldn't necessarily save up, get Kim Basinger and then get rid of her when you get tired of her. Without an expensive matrimonial settlement anyway. [...] You drool over these things but they're not always as practical and sensible when you've got them as you would wish them to be.

Both are constructed as objects of fantasy to "drool over", classified as commodities and accessories in a 'designer lifestyle'. Given this analogy, maybe David's status symbol car (a BMW) serves as an accessible way of 'showing off' a 'possession' as attractive.

The effect of sexual objectification is devaluation of the objectified person and the placing of the gazer in a superior, 'masculine' position. It is important to note that this devaluation is the same whether performed by a man or a woman, because they are both based in the same discourses and both have the same effect (a similar argument is discussed at length by Forbes 1996). The action progresses from the belief that it is acceptable to reduce an "object" purely to sexuality. The particular problem that feminism faces concerns the moral acceptance of women reducing men to (hetero)sexual objects: women are now considered, it is argued, to need "the socially recognised space to appropriate for themselves the robustness of what traditionally has been the male language" (Raymond 1993: 168). This process is witnessed through elements of popular culture, with television programmes such as *The Girlie Show* and *Man O'Man*, the proliferation of women's 'erotic' magazines, such as *For Women*, and advertising campaigns created by women, such as *Wonderbra*. These media do not radically change discourses of sexual objectification (and of the sexes more generally), but rather reverse masculinist discourses and apply them to men. The result is not the end of pornography and the sexual objectification of women, but the sexual objectification of women and men, thereby proliferating masculinist discourses that are morally justified as giving women equality with men - "gender

---

[5] For detailed discussion of conventions and social expectations of attractiveness see Dworkin 1981, Bartky 1990, Faludi 1992 and Richardson 1993, and Namaste 1996 for the performance of gender conventions.

equivalence" (Forbes 1996: 185). Women may achieve the opportunity to occupy the 'masculine' position as 'objectifier', but this does not undermine sexual inequalities fundamentally based in this same discourse:

> Any promise of sexual equality for women based on a male model of sexuality has fundamental problems. A 'me too' model of sexual rights, offering women what men have had, cannot be achieved because of the historical context in which women's sexuality has been constructed. (Forbes 1996: 186)

For dominant discourses of (hetero)sexuality position women as only ever of value in relation to their sexual attractiveness. This was reflected by Terry, who constructed the value of women in terms of their sexual attractiveness to the objectifying gazer in the 'masculine' position - in this case, men. The consequence is the devaluation of women into an inferior subject position; the effect is to construct discourses and expectations where women, by conforming to their own sexual objectification (measured by attractiveness to men), are nominally given greater value. Crudely, attractive women are regarded as more valuable than unattractive women. However, the effect is still to leave women generally in an inferior position in the regulatory framework and therefore detached from power. In Terry's experiences as a younger man, black females were never valued because they were not considered "desirable". As a consequence Terry could never imagine himself involved in a sexual relationship with a black woman; he could only regard them as like his "sister" and not 'women' (and presumably estranged from the 'feminine' subject position). His outlook has now changed because there are 'role models': black "supermodels" who are regarded as sexually attractive. Terry commented that black women are now on an equal footing with white women because men display equal sexism against them:

> *Terry:* I've stood out there and I've actually heard white guys talk derogatory, or sexist terms, about black women as they do about white women: 'I could give her one' about black women, which is different to my experience. A black woman was never, has never been desirable.

In this way, black women have become more highly valued in discourses of sexual objectification because they are desirable: they have become "women" in the ways that white females are, matching up to ideals of 'masculine' sexual objectification. Their increased 'value' is retained purely within masculinist discourses. This means that women who willingly try to conform to masculinist versions of attractiveness are complicit in the maintenance of sexual inequalities (for discussion of women's 'complicity' in their own 'oppression' see Jeffrys 1990, Jackson, S. 1995).

A CASE STUDY OF SEXUALISING DISCOURSE

Andrew provides an interesting example of the sexualising of discourse and the expression of sexual objectification of women (and reflects underlying discourses inherent in many other accounts as well). Andrew's self-conscious avowal is to break away from the sexualisation of male - female interactions and he insists that such relationships can be devoid of sexuality. However, the discourses disclosed in the conversations were conversely saturated with sexuality. This surfaced when talking about what an all-male Department would be like:

> *Andrew:* it's going to be fairly different working environment because you're not going to get social conversations where you have Christmas dinner or a common room or whatever, you're not going to have conversation of a different perspective. You're not going to have someone say to you 'I can't go swimming tonight because it's that time of the month'. You're not going to have conversations between the male members of staff, chauvinistic as this may seem, 'oh that member of staff is quite sweet', and 'that member of staff is pretty ugly' or whatever just as a deflection from the work you've been doing, something else to talk about, you see your secretary, 'oh, you're very smartly dressed today', or whatever, those kinds of things are not going to prevail if you have just a male dominated environment.

Andrew indicates knowledge of a "right thing to say" by apologising for his statement potentially appearing "chauvinistic", affirmed by his following statement which sexually objectifies women. The value of a mixed sex environment is regarded as allowing men to talk about whether female colleagues are "sweet" or "pretty ugly" as a "deflection from the work that you've been doing". This attaches no intrinsic value to women, only to their aesthetic appearance in as much as it takes men's minds off their work. Andrew bemoans the possibility of an all-male environment - there would not be the opportunity for him to comment on the way his secretary dresses. The emphasis is that a mixed work environment brings sexuality into the workplace, and that the opposite sex adds an element of sexual attraction which would not otherwise be there. Andrew believes that what he is saying is true and he is not ashamed to say these things, despite reducing women to aesthetic objects for men to talk about. There is certainly no recognition that an all-male department would reflect the dominance of male power and the suppression of equality of opportunity. There is also an assumption that women in the workplace refers to secretaries - there is no mention of female lecturers. The effect of invoking such discourses of the sexes "introduces the view of women as sexual beings in the workplace" (Gutek 1989: 60). The workplace becomes defined in this account by sexuality (compare with Hearn and Parkin 1987 who found similar situations in their studied workplaces and Hearn *et al* 1989). These discourses strictly differentiate the sexes. The experiences of men are considered the "norm" from which women are different - they add a "different perspective" and "social

conversations" to otherwise all-male situations. Biology is a key reference point: the different perspective which Andrew believes women bring is related to menstruation: "I can't go swimming tonight because it's that time of the month". It is assumed that women bring their 'nature' into conversations, which men lack. These statements reinforce the construction of women as appropriately ancillary to men - their value (as men's sexual objects) is to bring something additional to all-male settings.

In the discourses being disclosed, each sex has little importance to the other beyond heterosexual attraction: all women are attributed as sharing Andrew's views that interaction with the opposite sex involves evaluation of sexual attraction:

> *Andrew:* likewise if it was an environment totally dominated by females. They're not going to have those sort of comments, I don't think we need to fool ourselves by saying that it is only males who do that, because they do it all the time. In having those sort of conversations and have those sort of interactions, as a deflection from the normal day to day work.

Whilst these discourses saturate interactions with sexuality, Andrew explicitly claims that interactions can be devoid of sexual intent and that, specifically, his relationships are. Andrew frequently commented that the job of lecturer can be a lonely one, forcing you to get to know the people around you - colleagues and students - to prevent loneliness:

> *Andrew:* if you don't take that two or three steps back to assess it broadly, then I think you really do fall into the trap of looking at yourself as an alienated, protected world, and I'm not necessarily sure that that is a good view to take. [...] if you don't try to forge a relationship which may eventually turn out to be emotional, you're going to be fairly lonely in this world.

There is nothing inherently bad in these comments and the situation may well be true. However, Andrew repeatedly dwelt on this point during the interviews, saying that you have to get to know students and colleagues or else you will be lonely. However, by mentioning that the union (AUT) and colleagues warn against such relationships, there is a reintroduction of sexuality into the discourse:

> *Andrew:* you've got to be careful, in a sense, because as in all workplaces, things can get, or the picture can get, distorted, of your efforts to socialise. Because, either deliberately or inevitably, people will want to, people often misinterpret, a social interaction. So, if you go with a friend to the cinema, or a colleague to the cinema, or if you play badminton with a colleague who happens to be a member of the opposite sex, maybe because there is no one else in the department who can swim or, or, or play badminton, or doesn't know about it, then the picture may get distorted. And you find, 'oh she's .. a loose person' or 'he's a lad', or whatever, that's the danger there.

The final comment is most curious. People may assume colleagues meeting outside work are in a relationship, but less likely to pronounce this promiscuity as Andrew infers (thereby labelling sexually active women as "loose" and sexually active men as

"lads" with its implication of moral disapproval of female sexual activity and approval of sexual activity of men). Andrew's disagreement with this viewpoint is surprising given his earlier conflation of women with sexuality. This suggests that the attitude Andrew credits to others is rather a reflection of his own discourses (and is, therefore, another example of the 'double-voiced discourse'). The sexualisation of interactions is posited as the opinion of colleagues, one which Andrew divorces himself from. Given this, it can be assumed that Andrew himself regards potential "emotional relationships" with students as sexual, not purely social, interactions. This is supported by the discussion of Andrew's hobby, swimming. Again, the attitude that he criticises of other people - the discursive construction of women's primary value as sexually attractive to men - is congruent with his own. Andrew says that he "chats people up" in the swimming pool, then expresses astonishment that people assume there is an allusion to sexuality in such actions:

> *Andrew:* I tell some colleagues of mine I chat up people in the pool, I talk to people, just everything really from apologising for giving them a big whack in the pool to going for a drink after that. And to some people that is just out of this world, because they would never ever dream of talking to someone in a pool. But my view is that, well, what is so different to talking to someone in the pool and talking to someone in the supermarket or talking to someone in a football stadium? I'm not sure if I can see the real difference there. Some people are going to say, well, 'you're wearing nothing apart from your swimming trunks and swimming costume' and so on, well, I think that's only because people have a sort of forethought in terms of sexual inclination and so on. That's when you begin to see that, 'ooh, swimming costume is just one layer to the next thing'. But I think if you transcend above that .. I don't think that argument holds really.

Therefore, Andrew is denying that masculinity is being practised through sexual objectification and the consequences of his actions. He is fully aware of the reasoning behind the interpretation of such interactions as sexual but refutes that he could be interpreted by those he chats up as sexually motivated. The context of the interaction is constructed as immaterial:

> *You said about meeting people, like in a swimming pool or wherever. Do you think it's easier for you to say talk to people in a swimming pool because you are a man than say you were a woman?*
> *Andrew:* I can't answer you on that unless I was a woman. What, how, I mean, how do you frame that question, in what aspect?
> *I suppose because society's idea is that maybe men do the chatting up, so if you're a woman, say*
> *Andrew:* but that's again the preconception, which have this, I'm trying to find the right descriptive word for it, erm, hetero approach, if you like, hetero conversation. But that's not necessarily true. I mean, I don't, that's not for me, because I have homo conversations as well, you know? I talk to men, not just women, so .. yes, I take your point that there's prima facie evidence of the sexual inclination if you were just talking to women or vice versa, and so on, yeah.

Andrew appears to be in denial of his own intentions and constructed discourse, and the meaning of his practices. His stated intention is that interactions with the opposite sex can be devoid of sexual inclination; his discourses of women are conversely loaded with ideas of sexual attraction, whilst his practices ("chatting up") are definitely interpretable as sexual propositions. These practices are potentially disturbing - swimming pools are notorious for attracting "weirdoes", peeping toms and voyeurs, precisely because "you're wearing nothing apart from your swimming trunks and swimming costume", and can contribute to the gendering and sexualising of public space (note Valentine 1993, Namaste 1996). In his actions, Andrew reproduces discourses of masculinity which he argues are actually removed from these discourses.

The discourses disclosed in the interviews with Andrew positioned both space (as the setting for social / sexual interactions) and personal relationships as power-neutral - no recognition was made that individuals are differentially placed in the discursive framework or workplace hierarchies. However, power is inherent to these relations, and its exercise is evidenced by analysis of situations where masculinity is practised in the active forging of gendered subject positions.

4. SITUATIONAL CONTINGENCY OF MASCULINITY

This section focuses upon the active construction of discourses and practices of masculinity - the formation of 'masculine' and 'feminine' subject positions - which differentially influence power relations for individuals involved in an interaction / on-going relationship. It illustrates how one person may forge a subject position for another actor, and then distance themselves from this position by proving that they do not match this discursive category. In this way, masculinity takes the form more of *defining* an opposite as 'inferior':

> By masculinity I refer to those sets of signs indicating that a person is a 'man', or 'not a woman', or 'not a child'. (Hearn 1987: 137)

Disregarding the generalisation of masculinity to men, this quote illustrates a process key to the construction of the 'masculine'. It is defined in distinction to another subject position, from where the power to have discourses accepted as 'truth' is defined. Hence, *situational contingency* is very important to the understanding of masculinity. Over-generalisation of masculinity may neglect many subtleties and nuances of practices from the analysis of power, with the result that gender relations are frequently considered in terms of *all* men having power over *all* women at *all* times. This clearly

fails to account for situations where women are not completely powerless and where men are not able to exercise power, and why actions which comprise an exercise of power at one moment may not in another situation. The emphasis, therefore, must be upon a *dynamic* notion of masculinity. Situational contingency conveys this fluidity. By disentangling masculinity from identity, the focus is shifted from individual psychology to relational interactions. The discursive construction of the 'masculine' takes on different forms in different spaces and at different times. These time scales span from the historical to the more instantaneous where they change configuration situationally during the day. Thus, masculinity can be defined as a configuration of factors which at a particular moment comprise an exercise of power. Unfortunately, this research only included a limited degree of participant observation and it is therefore not possible to illustrate this specifically in as much detail as would be preferable, but the following sections (and further illustrations in Part Three) present some brief examples of the practice of masculinity in direct forms in interactions.

TALKING DOWN

> *Kate:* with men conversation is a competition. You've got to grab your turn and make your point.

This section focuses upon the active discursive construction of gender in the conversational interactions of Norma and her husband Ned. It will show how Ned influences power relations with his wife by constructing a dominant 'masculine' subject position for himself while positioning Norma in an inferior one, through setting the agenda for the conversation and by introducing reminiscences which embarrassed Norma by portraying her as incompetent. Particularly pertinent is the drawing upon of discourses of the sexes that pressure women to fulfil particular 'roles'. This has a dual effect - it measures Norma as a 'failure' against 'feminine' norms and pressures her to internalise and conform to these expectations.

When Norma was discussing her job in the SYMP canteen, Ned interrupted to question his wife's behaviour towards the customers:

> *Ned:* Do you think you're friendly and polite to them?
> *Norma:* I think I am, yeah. I don't know if they think that, mind.
> *Ned:* There were one day, there were telephone call, to this chap to go to phone. He goes to phone, and what do you do? She took his meal away!
> *Norma:* I have done that once, oh, I, oh, I did apologise and I did go back, and I asked one of bosses if I could replace it, because it were my fault, and he says 'of course you can'. He weren't mad or nothing, he was really polite about it, but I really thought he'd finished, that's one thing I've got to watch.

The dominant subject position is taken by Ned by showing Norma as inadequate within the discourses of women as servicers of men; not only is this a subjugated discourse, but Norma is shown as unable to fulfil it properly. The construction is further enforced by Ned dwelling upon this mistake even after Norma's explanation. The original incident has formed a bench mark against which Norma's future actions are measured, and her response has been to play the role of servicing men more conscientiously:

Ned: But now they keep saying [cradling an imaginary plate] 'Is she here?'

Norma: Yes, I did take his meal away didn't I? I can remember that. If they've left their dinners, I'll wait a bit, because you never know if they have gone to phone or toilet, I think I'll leave it a bit, and just make sure, same if there's any cups of tea.

Ned: She takes plates from underneath you!

Norma: You know, but I usually ask them now, and they're stood there talking, and I ask them 'have you finished?', and they'll say, 'we're finished', but we'd better make sure, we don't want that happening again, it were really embarrassing. But lucky he weren't nasty about it.

Norma has therefore become much more self-reflective - she constantly checks her actions to make sure she is "performing" her role properly.

Ned: It all falls back on't husband, you know. 'Is she here?' 'No, not today, you're all right.'

Ned's comment has the consequence of constructing him in a more important role as a husband, explicitly, therefore, as a man. Dwelling upon Norma's mistake has become the subject of on-going humour between Ned and other men.

Norma [seriously]: But they do it in a joking manner, don't they?

In this way, they are passing judgement on Norma and enforcing a regulatory framework on her through "humour".

These comments were made neither in a hostile or obvious manner; indeed, the subtlety is a vital component of this practice of masculinity, as is reiteration. Similar incidents frequently occurred in our meetings, always focused on the stupidity or embarrassment of something Norma had done wrong or inadequately or how she should be fulfilling the expectations of her as a woman more convincingly:

Norma: Yeah, we've done quite a few of gardens for bosses. You see what they're really like then, you know, with 'em from work. I mean, they've got to be a bit strict because it's a firm, ha'nt they? But when you're wi'em, on their ground.

Ned: Have you told him about the hygiene course?

Norma: .. What?

Ned: You haven't been on one. She hasn't been on a hygiene course.

Ned's comments reinforce a discursive association of women with cleanliness (shown in Part Three to be important to the gendering of work at SYMP).

Norma: ... No, I haven't been on one yet.

Ned: But, you should, you should be on one, shouldn't she? She should go on a hygiene course.

Again, Ned constructs his dominant position by illustrating Norma's apparent failure to fulfil her discursive role - she has not been on a hygiene course yet.

I don't know much, anything about it.

Ned: Yeah, I think if you're working in a canteen, everybody should go on a hygiene course. Full stop. I know you are hygienic, but a lot of people don't know that you're hygienic.

Attending a course would have the consequence of showing those around Norma that she is "clean" (and so conforming to the women as clean discourse). Because it is Ned trying to structure Norma into the woman discourses, he discursively constructs himself as arbiter of "appropriateness".

This exemplifies the "performativity" (Butler 1990a) of gender - the strengthening of constructed subject positions by restating, emphasising and continuing the identities until they are embodied (Ned as the superior 'masculine', Norma as the inferior 'feminine'). The extent to which Norma has adopted this identity is reflected by her self-conscious maintenance of it by what Foucault (1977) terms "self-surveillance". This is the self-regulation of expectations created by others. Norma's embodiment of the discourses of women is particularly important in the work context: she is performing - and therefore strengthening - the construction of women as 'feminine' in an otherwise male dominated environment. By not challenging the discursive position within which she has been placed, Norma has become complicit in the practice of masculinity against her; she now plays her own part in positioning herself within the discursive framework. Like Emma (above), Norma now produces herself as 'feminine' (Holland, Ramazanoglu and Sharpe 1993).

Not only is the construction dependent upon the reiteration of Norma's inadequacies, but also the active positioning of Ned in a superior position. This is achieved by him depicting himself as competent and knowing better than Norma to justify his dominance of the relationship. Ned portrayed Norma as dependent upon him, financially and for mobility:

> *Ned*: I've got to take her to work, I bring her home every day when she's working. Bus fares, don't cost you nowt, do they? She lets me buy the petrol.

This is extended to the rest of the family (he "subs" their daughter) and family discipline: whilst Ned says Norma "is as soft as a brush" with the children, he is authoritarian and makes sure they do what he says while they are living in his house. Ned continually asserts control over the direction of the conversation (particularly noticeable given that the interviews were arranged only with Norma), introducing his answers to questions directed at her:

> *So what would the worst thing be?*
> *Ned*: Fighting.
> *Norma*: If anyone gets a bit upset or starts arguing, I don't like that.

chipping in with comments before Norma has had a chance to speak

> *What tends to cause the arguments?*
> *Ned*: No, he's talking to you.

and bringing in irrelevant topics:

> *Ned*: It's self-service, isn't it, have you told him that? It's self-service.
> *Norma*: It's self-service.
> *Ned*: They serves themselves.
> *Norma*: They do serve themselves, yeah. But as I say it's when they start coming in when they shouldn't, you know *etc. etc.*

The overall effect is a negation of Norma's opinions and the casting of her into a secondary role, achieved situationally.[6] This is an interesting example because it illustrates the complexity of power relations and the contingency of discursive frameworks. These conversations were 'controlled' by Ned and he was able to construct a dominant 'masculine' subject position for himself in relation to Norma, and both constructed Ned as the boss at home. But at SYMP, as Ned said himself, he is "the lowest of the low". In this different situation it is Ned who occupies an inferior subject position. His job entails servicing everyone as handy man and gardener and I observed Ned to carry this out with extreme deference. Ned has also done tasks such as cleaning which he constructs as 'feminine'. But by drawing upon sex discourses he is able to influence power relations with Norma (at home) and (as shown in section two) power relations with some of the men he works (at SYMP). Hence, the practising of masculinity is not restricted to interactions between men and women; it is equally

---

[6] This was also found to occur in an interview with another married couple. Mave had answered questions openly and directly until Len sat in and began to dominate - Mave hesitantly answered and looked to him for "permission" to speak.

important to affirm superiority in relation to other men. This is still based upon the construction of a superior 'masculine' position and an inferior.[7]

CONCLUSIONS

Like the majority of academic expositions of masculinity considered in Part One, Part Two has taken individuals as the study focus. However, it has attempted to go beyond this scale by trying to contextualise individuals within gender relations, and hence it included investigation of both men and women. This has constituted an attempt to move beyond somewhat uni-dimensional accounts of individuals' life histories (for example, Roberts 1984, Messner 1990a) and (quasi-psychoanalytic) autobiographical accounts of the formation of individuals' masculinity (such as Seidler 1989, Jackson 1990, Jefferson 1996a). Consequently, it has been suggested that it is more productive to examine how discourses of masculinity are lived out, practised, negotiated and sometimes challenged or acquiesced, and has placed less importance, therefore, upon self-theorised intentionality behind actions. Like Connell's (1995) study, the focus has been upon individuals with common, shared experiences (that is, of working together). Whilst Connell uses his material to label their experiences as a particular, distinct masculinity (such as a "green", "gay" or "rational" masculinity) within a framework of multiple masculinities, Part Two has alternatively attempted to locate *practices* of masculinity and assess their contribution to the structuring of participants' everyday lives. It has not categorised aspects of individuals' lives as specific 'masculine identities'.

Part One highlighted the preoccupation in the literature with the "crisis" of masculinity (such as Horrocks 1994). This suggested that men feel a need to re-construct their masculine identities as traditional expectations of men have altered in response to the changes experienced in women's lives. This crisis was alluded to by some of the

---

[7] The mechanics of the construction of 'superior' and 'inferior' positions were illustrated in the interviews with George (reflecting issues of positionality discussed in Schoenberger 1991, 1992 and McDowell 1992b, and gender issues involved in men interviewing, such as Back 1993, Herod 1993). On many occasions, George actively 'inferiorised' me. Like Ned with Norma, George frequently employed techniques of control, such as interruption and asking for clarification of even the simplest questions. He answered four consecutive questions with "insh'allah" - an Arabic term: he said that he had not realised that I did not speak the language (it transpired that neither did he). He openly criticised questions, adding that he ought to wait until the second interview to "lambaste" them. His manner was consistently hostile and aggressive. The interviews illustrated the achievement of the active construction of 'superior' and 'inferior' positions, which I experienced through twitching with nerves and leaving the first interview nearly in tears. The consequence for me was a passive compliance to George's aggression in the second interview, such that I began to perform an 'inferior' role; 'giving in' was my strategy to avoid more active inferiorisation through put downs and snide comments.

research subjects discussed in Part Two. In particular, disgruntlement and resentment was expressed in relation to expectations of "breadwinning". Brian, for example, constructed them as seriously infringing his quality of life compared to his wife who benefits from the changes in her life. However, these examples failed to locate any serious attempts to 'give up' the "breadwinner role" - Steve was going to become a 'househusband' but changed his mind (his work was too important to him), Tim had contemplated it but economic circumstances prevented him, and Geoff has never considered it because he would not be very good at it. It appears that remaining in paid employment and 'providing' for the family brings too many benefits for these men to give up "breadwinning", not least that there is enjoyment attached to going out to work. This role is played out in a constructed context of "equal rights" between the sexes and the portrayal of women as becoming empowered at the expense of men. It was suggested that Brian and Steve, for instance, reflect the intellectual arguments of the "men's rights movement", where the "crisis" in masculinity takes the form of resentment towards a general loosening of control-dependency relationships between men and women.

It is important to reiterate that the presented examples should not be used to suggest that these dominant discourses exist everywhere and at all times. Rather, these were the dominant discourses that arose from these people in these two workplaces. They emerged as the primary discourses that contribute to the structuring of the participants' lives, and are discourses of masculinity: the dilemma of women to choose between a career and children is a discourse of masculinity because its consequences (however unintended), and the choice itself, still perpetuate sex inequalities. These examples have also illustrated continuities in the discourses of masculinity between the two workplaces - they transcend and transpose space(s). The expression of the discourses may not always have been the same between participants, but the content of those discourses was very similar, in relation to reproduction, paid employment and sexuality, and "roles" that everyone feels pressured into performing. However, the negotiation of these discourses was shown to be contingent and often unique to particular situations and personal circumstances and relationships. Discursive expectations are played out or negotiated on a micro-scale - the everyday and situationally contingent. In this way, "roles" constitute the overall "strategy", but the operation of the strategy is dependent upon situation. Hence,

> we must conceive discourse as a series of discontinuous segments whose tactical
> function is neither uniform nor stable ... a multiplicity of discursive elements that
> can come into play in various strategies. (Foucault 1978: 100)

The "strategy" - maintenance of inequalities between the sexes, advantaging the 'masculine' position and at a societal level, men - is articulated through discursive roles. But its "operation" - the everyday practices of masculinity - may at times be in contradiction with these. Circumstances are acted upon to construct the 'masculine' as superior which may not always be harmonious with the strategy (such as the cases of Sally who occupies the 'masculine' position as a woman and Ned who is variously constructed in the 'feminine' and 'masculine' positions at work): "there can exist different and even contradictory discourses within the same strategy" (Foucault 1978: 102). Foucault calls this interplay or discontinuity "double conditioning":

> one must conceive of the double conditioning of a strategy by the specificity of possible tactics, and of tactics by the strategic envelope that makes them work. (Foucault 1978: 100)

The idea is that strategy needs precise and tenuous relations to act as a "prop and anchor" (100); there are not two different "levels" - the "micro-scopic" and "macro-scopic" - but a continuity, a whole, which may not appear to be homogeneous. Hence, it is best to view masculinity as the practices of both sexes and not to delimit the actions of one sex as "bad" and of the other as "good". It is important to analyse *similarity* of practices.

Part Three builds upon this analysis, explicitly focusing upon the practice of masculinity within the organisational context of the two case study workplaces. It emerges that institutions are very important in determining gender relations. They set different situational conditions to the regulatory framework and provide an important setting for interpersonal gender relations; the following section re-emphasises the importance of understanding situational contingency for the understanding of masculinity.

PART THREE: MASCULINITY AND ORGANISATIONS

PART THREE

Part Three of this thesis turns its attention more directly to masculinity at an organisational scale, that is, within the two case study workplaces - the university Department and South Yorkshire Metal Products (SYMP). In Part One it was suggested that generally there has been neglect of the study of masculinity within institutional contexts. Despite calls to acknowledge masculinity's existence above and beyond the level of personality (such as Hollway 1984, Connell 1987, 1995, Segal 1990) and the individual, in practice very little attention has been given to this scale:

> Apart from discussions of the family, the intermediate level of social organization is skipped. Yet in some ways this is the most important level to understand. (Connell 1987: 119)

The organisational scale of masculinity is very important, and it is one which should not be overlooked:

> power relations are organizationally grounded and are not simply the conduits of power or stratifying systems which exist outside any specific organization. Hence in order to understand forms of gender inequality it is essential to see how organizational forms structure and are themselves structured by gender. (Witz and Savage 1992: 8)

Therefore, the practice of masculinity as the exercise of power exists at the scales of individual, institutional and the social, but it is important to understand their co-existence, where there is co-dependency between the scales and where there is contradiction (and the significance of any contradiction). In this way, the workplace provides the setting for *individuals* to assemble within *institutions* where expectations and assumptions constructed by *social* forces are brought together. In this respect, focus on the workplace is very important:

> the significance of the construction of gender identities at work - the development of particular versions of masculinity and femininity appropriate to success in particular occupations - has been neglected at work. (McDowell and Court 1995: 231)

The workplace is "a major site of sexual politics" (Connell 1987: 36). The institutionalisation of masculinity has been identified as an important process; Jeffords (1989), for example, discusses the institutionalisation of men's dominance of women which she concludes has the effect of making women's "disposition" appear "natural" (see also Game and Pringle 1984, Connell 1987, Walby 1990, Witz and Savage 1992). Halford (1992) locates the cause to be that institutions are the products of *unequal* social struggles, and that they therefore reflect unequal social relations. The first section of Part Three examines the "institutionalisation" of masculinity by focusing upon discourses of masculinity at the organisational scale and how they are articulated by the sexual divisions of labour in the two workplaces.

5. SEPARATE BUT "EQUAL"?: THE DISCURSIVE CONSTRUCTION OF SEX "DIFFERENCES" THROUGH TYPES OF WORK

In Part Two, discourses of reproduction and of "home making" and "breadwinner" were shown to have particular importance for the study participants. It was also suggested that discourses construct women as appropriately *ancillary* to men. This section gives attention to the discursive construction of work and examines the gendering of types of work in the two workplaces where the 'feminine' position is *ancillary* to the 'masculine'. This is achieved by the 'naturalising' of important work duties as appropriate to men and of women as *physically* inferior to men. The stressing of 'differences' between the two sexes has the consequence of creating and maintaining sexual inequalities - the 'masculine' jobs are better paid and more secure whilst the 'feminine' position is devoid of opportunities to challenge the dominant discursive constructions: occupation of the 'feminine' position reinforces its construction.

a) THE SEXUAL DIVISION OF LABOUR AT SYMP - THE 'MASCULINISATION' OF PRODUCTION WORK.

The construction of 'natural differences' between the sexes is revealed at SYMP through the workplace division of labour. The types of jobs undertaken differ according to sex. This was explained by respondents primarily through reference to the physical natures of men and women. More than just physicality, there are discursive constructions of women as supplementary to a male 'norm'. Rather than women occupying jobs which they are 'naturally' suited to, they are jobs which they are discursively constructed as appropriate to do. This invocation has been commonly observed in employment cultures (note, for instance, Cockburn 1983, Game and Pringle 1984, Pringle 1989a, 1989b): distinctions are drawn between "men's work" and "women's work":

> jobs are not gender-neutral; rather, they are created as appropriate for either men or women. Jobs and occupations themselves, and the set of social practices that constitute them, are constructed so as to embody socially sanctioned but *variable* characteristics of masculinity and femininity. (McDowell and Court 1995: 233)

This reflects the situation at SYMP where there are dominant constructions of work appropriate for either sex, but which have been subjected to change and negotiation as a result of the company's changing functions and focuses.

The construction of 'masculine' and 'feminine' positions is dependent upon the company's labour processes; the work almost exclusively carried out by men is

constructed as important ('masculine'), whilst the work primarily done by women is valued as less important and ancillary to 'masculine' work ('feminine'). As a manufacturer, SYMP's objective is to produce metal goods, such as garden fencing, wire, reinforcements for the construction industry etc. The manufacturing and labour processes of metal production have radically altered since the recession of the early 1980s: the workforce has halved to less than a thousand in this time as the company has moved towards an automated production line system and because of cost-cutting rationalisation. The firm's two factories cover over one hundred acres of land. In Factory 'A' the metal rod is treated and receives its first processing - "cleaning" with hydrochloric acid and "cold" smelting. Tasks of workers include winching metal rod, transporting rod on fork-lift vehicles, checking that machines are carrying out functions correctly etc. The factory operates under very humid conditions and some aspects of the process produce large amounts of dust. Factory 'B' deals mostly with processed metal and is where it is made into finished products; the processes involve a combination of hands-on jobs, such as lifting and cutting metal sections, and less direct tasks involving machine operation. Factory 'B' is more open plan and less humid than 'A'. In both factories, safety measures are paramount: every worker has to wear protective clothing, footwear and goggles (the job involves getting dirty), and has to walk along colour coded safety paths. Accidents are still quite common (although the last fatality was ten years ago) and almost all are caused by human error. Outlying the company site, there are a series of small office blocks and a large administration block, which also house middle-management and corporate heads. There is a clearly defined division of labour: practically all of the shop-floor workforce is male (estimated to be at least 99%), all bar two of management are male, whilst administrative staff are almost exclusively female. There is also a canteen run by two men and staffed by largely part-time women workers. Hence, the heavier and dirtier work valued in production is occupied by men whilst the less valued clean and light administration work is largely performed by women. There is a marginalisation of women which extends to being "hidden" from view; Steve notes that women are 'invisible' in the company, making men appear dominant:

> Steve: I'm saying there's a hundred percent males on shopfloor from the visual side of things, I'm not saying there's not women on the shopfloors, there's females, we've got medical people who are females, that's a profession where women generally appear in. But I'm not saying that there's no women on the shopfloor.

The 'image' of SYMP is *visually* male; women are peripheral to the male business - *physically,* by working in the administration blocks at the fringe of the site, and *symbolically* as production work is given greater importance and is the focus of the

company. SYMP reflects the common occurrence of male-dominated shop floor work (note Willis 1979, Grey 1987, Collinson 1988, Bradley 1989, Devaney 1991).

The various types of work undertaken are unequally valued. The work in the administration block is viewed as marginal to the company's raison d'être to manufacture metal products. The aim is making finished product: it is everyone's job is to ensure that production is continuous and that the factory does not have to close for any reason. The importance of factory work was revealed when interviewees talked about their jobs in terms of production and work conditions of humidity and muckiness despite them having no personal direct input into production or the factories:

> *Steve:* I couldn't imagine a woman wanting to work under the conditions that *we're* having to work in 'A' factory, with the humidity and everything what goes off there, the muckiness of it.
> *Tom:* There are females out on the shop floor, but they do different types of jobs. Less, say, strenuous, the cleaner, cleaner environment, and they're not lifting some of the heavy loads that *people* are. [emphasis added]

These comments also highlight the discursive gendering of types of work at SYMP. By referring to the conditions "we're" working in and the heavy loads "people" are lifting, Steve and Tom conflate the experiences of some men as the 'norm' for all men. Neither are involved in production themselves. Conversely, women are referred to as external to the 'norm'. This differentiation reflects unequal valuing of the tasks of women: whilst all men are categorised as involved in the centrally important roles of production, women are cast as involved in less important, ancillary tasks:

> *So what sorts of jobs at SYMP do the women tend to do?*
> *Tom:* Certainly the administration side, the sales organisation, secretaries, as I say there's two nurses, there's females in the laboratory, certain women out on the shop floor, probably at the product presentation end rather than the heavy end of it. Quality control, there's females in there. We've female cleaners. There's quite a good spectrum. We don't have any female managers as such out on the, in the workplace, but there are female managers in the administration block.

The only women managers are in administration with the result that women are absent from the product factories. The only appropriate role for women in production is constructed as in "product *presentation*", associating women with aesthetics and the way things (including themselves) look. The discursive gendering of production work as 'masculine' and ancillary work as 'feminine' is reinforced by the construction of production work as 'naturally' men's work and ancillary work as appropriate to women because of their 'nature': the sexual division of labour is 'naturalised' (cf. Adkins 1992).

Hence, the differential valuing of 'masculine' and 'feminine' hinges upon the construction of women as incapable of shopfloor work, that it is "men's work" (note

Mills 1989). An extrapolation that *all* women are physically less capable than *all* men is employed to explain the absence of female production workers; their sex means they are unable to do 'masculine' work:

> *Emma:* women are perceived as not being able to do the job with men on the shopfloor. 'They can't lift, they're quite heavy jobs', but there is jobs there for women, it's just, .. I just can't understand it, because I suppose some women can do their jobs. [...] I think they just don't like women.

In John's construction of the situation, any production which women can do must be suited to them as a sex: they have particular 'skills' which are useful for certain jobs:

> *Are there any women in the production side at all?*
> *John:* There are a few, working here. Yes.
> *Is that a recent thing?*
> *John:* No, no. There was one department at one time that used to employ purely women, but that was a skill that was needed in that particular department.
> *So what sort of skills, how were the jobs different?*
> *John:* Well, I think it was a more, I suppose it was more of a repetitive type of job, they're more used to that type of work. It was like a knitting process for knitting wire. There aren't any in 'A' factory, there are certainly some in 'B', ladies working there.

This constructs women as *ancillary*, having *additional* skills, such as being able to do "repetitive" work (also identified as a 'female' skill by Glucksmann 1990, who similarly noted the discounting of women's skills as 'natural') that can be used to supplement men's skills and places "women's work" as less valuable. Frank's construction similarly suggests that any production work which women can or have done (such as barbed wire production which is no longer made at SYMP) is sex appropriate:

> *Why were there many women working in barbed wire?*
> *Frank:* Well, it's a light job really. It's a light job barbed wire. Just a process going through a machine, packing them and off with them.
> *So the men did*
> *Frank:* more heavy work.

The decline in the number of female employees is explained by the closure of the barbed wire factory, where the work was constructed as appropriate women's work as it suited their characters - a "light job" simply requiring "packing" - and hence low skilled and simplistic. "Women's work" is something other than the work which men perform at SYMP.

The definition of appropriate work is constructed by emphasis on the functions and characteristics which supposedly reflect 'natural' features of each sex, consequently confining the sexes into certain roles. Associations are drawn between women and cleanliness and men and dirtiness to account for the division of labour between men in production and women in administration. It was commonly stated that it was difficult to imagine women wanting to work in "muckiness". Explaining the absence of women,

John invoked a notion of "men's work" as physically beyond women. He accepted this as a false construction, then brought in the women-cleanliness association:

> *Why do you think there are more men than women here?*
> *John:* I suppose it's the manual type of work, heavy lifting. You can ask why in retail there's no men, it's all women. It's the work. The type of work. Having said that, you go along a car production line, you see a lot of ladies making cars. Have you been on a production line?
> *No.*
> *John:* They work in teams, you'd be amazed at how many ladies are in that particular team, assembling cars. So, my particular argument doesn't stand up. I think it's a lot more cleaner, works is not as clean a job as assembling cars.

It was conceded that women are capable of physical work, rendering the need for another reason for the absence of women. That car work is "cleaner" is used to suggest it is more attractive to women: they are considered "clean". It is put forward that the work itself determines the sex of the worker it attracts (compare with McDowell and Court 1995, above): because of the heavy lifting, workers at SYMP are predominantly male, whilst retail work on the other hand requires women (although it is not explained why). The suggestion is that this is a 'natural' inclination. Similarly:

> *Derek:* there's a variety of reasons why we haven't got a higher proportion of ladies working in production areas, there's a variety of things. One of which is the nature of the work. It's reasonably heavy and dirty, right?

This leads Derek to suggest women are attracted to jobs where they can "dress smart" even though these jobs pay less:

> *Derek:* Yeah, ladies will tend to go across there [shopping malls], that sort of work, dress smart, and that's got to appeal more even if the money's bigger here.

"Women's work" is therefore constructed as clean, less strenuous and suited to their physical incapacity, but also related to women's appearance. A particular interpretation of 'cleanliness' and 'muckiness' is presented. It is not suggested that women cannot work in dirt, and it is deemed perfectly acceptable for women to have jobs as cleaners - clearing up mess. However, what is constructed as appropriately 'masculine' is getting *oneself* dirty, not cleaning up dirt for others (servicing someone else) again recalling Ned's construction of cleaning work as 'feminine'. Suggesting that women like to "dress smart" personalises the link with cleanliness, it is about women being clean themselves. Appropriate men's work involves getting dirty, appropriate women's work is being clean and well presented but cleaning up men's dirt: an ancillary role. (This recalls Norma's 'feminine' subject position discussed in Part Two).

Other examples suggest that women can do precisely the types of job that their 'nature' is discursively constructed as incapable of doing. There is variability in the construction of 'masculine' and 'feminine' at SYMP, illustrated by redefinitions of men's

work and women's work as labour processes have changed. McDowell and Massey (1984) found that in the nineteenth century cotton industry men took over women's work and redefined the skills to fit their own conceptions of masculinity. Similarly, at SYMP work which is now constructed as 'masculine' has previously been undertaken by women. Ned and Norma's ideas of "men's work" and "women's work" have been challenged by their experiences at SYMP. In the past Ned has seen women doing hard manual labour at the company:

> *Ned*: it's going back some time now, but one department used to have women bouncing up and down with their feet [Ned imitates the action, which involves running up and down on the spot]. All day, I mean, fancy getting home and just trying to calm yourself down from doing that eight hours a day. It's bloody hard work, it's hard work.

The last decade has seen a big fall in the workforce at SYMP, and the production workforce is now almost entirely male:

> *Are there many women working at SYMP?*
> *Frank:* Not now. There used to be a hell of a lot at one time. I think it's down now to about four or five, in the factory. Office work, obviously, there's plenty of them.
> *So why has there been that decline?*
> *Frank:* Well, they've cut back and cut back. They've gone to automation and what have you. Computer. They used to have a lot of women all over the factory. But now they've gone.

It appears that women in particular have been made redundant by automation and rationalisation of the company, suggesting that they occupied the less valuable and most disposable positions at SYMP. These examples draw clear distinctions between "men's work" and "women's work", but do highlight that the constitution of 'masculine' and 'feminine' at SYMP is flexible and changing: women have been employed for certain jobs, even though in other circumstances it is argued that these required skills are held only by men. These constructions appear to be means of protecting male employment (cf. McDowell 1991); a similar finding was suggested by Cockburn's (1983) history of the printing industry which described how women had been successfully excluded from the profession by constructing the skills required for the work as possessed only by men. As the industry modernised and the hot metal system gave way to one requiring keyboard skills (traditionally defined as "women's work") the male exclusivity was threatened. This demanded a re-construction of existing ideas of gender. Keyboarding ability became redefined as a facet of masculinity in the workplace, facilitated by the introduction of a non-standard keyboard system.

Current changes at SYMP are beginning to increase female employment in production. However, they are still based within the same discursive constructions that exclude

women from 'masculine' work. They proceed from the construction of women as appropriate for 'clean' and less strenuous types of work and, importantly, as naturally more concerned about the appearance and presentation of themselves and their environment. The changes are occurring in one factory department, Decorative Metal Products (DMP). The department has been traditionally operated by men, both in management and on the shop floor. Women are now starting to replace men:

> *Norma:* you wouldn't expect to see women on't wire
> *Ned:* They're taking men out of DMP and putting women in DMP
> *Norma:* and you don't expect to see them there, well I wouldn't have anyway, because I thought that it can be a heavy job that, wire, and what have you, but they put women in. But like he says, it's equal rights now isn't it, so ... but I wouldn't have expected to see women on't wire where you usually see men on.

Indeed, the only female production manager in the company works in DMP. This transition can be traced to discourses of women. To counteract the threat of low-cost overseas competitors SYMP markets itself on the strength of product quality, of which the looks of the product are vital (*SYMP promotional film*). There is growing emphasis on presentation. Women are increasingly being employed in DMP because of the discursive connection between women and presentation. This is perhaps contributing to a challenge of the discursive constructions of gender in the workplace by moving women back onto the shopfloor. Should this new form of employment for women be regarded as positive or negative? Norma calls this "equal rights": women are taking over jobs previously constructed as 'masculine', thus breaking down the numerical dominance of men on the shopfloor. However, are there changes in the discourses of the two sexes? Women are still constructed as concerned with 'presentation' and although women are coming onto the shopfloor, DMP is still relatively marginal to the production process: it is concerned with the presentation of the finished product, not its production.

These examples have illustrated that women are generally excluded from 'masculine' production work in the SYMP workplace. This is the consequence of the discursive construction of women as naturally, physically less capable than men. The 'masculine' position is theoretically open to either sex: 'masculine' work could be carried out by some women, just as it could not be done by some men. However, the discursive construction and expectations of both sexes 'justify' and explain the exclusion of women from production. In relation to discourses of reproduction it was explained that women could attain the 'masculine' position by adopting the "career woman" identity. However, in the construction of 'masculine' and 'feminine' work at SYMP there does not seem to be a comparable identity which women can adopt.

b) THE SEXUAL DIVISION OF LABOUR IN THE DEPARTMENT - THE 'FEMINISING' OF TEACHING

In the Department, the construction of women as ancillary does not take as obvious a form as at SYMP, and therefore the inferior status of women and women's work is less conspicuous. However, it is again reflected in the sexual division of labour. It was shown that women at SYMP are equated as 'naturally' ancillary to men because of their physical 'inability' to do heavy work. In the Department, where there is obviously no demanding physical work involved, the division of labour is still structured around 'nature' - the discursive construction of women as mothers has helped create and reinforce the teaching aspect of the job as "women's work" and as an inferior aspect of the job compared to research and (to a lesser degree) administration.

Table One illustrates the discrepancy in the ratios of male to female professors, readers and senior lecturers, as much as nine to one:

	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL OF STAFF
PROFESSORS	9	1	17.9%
READERS	3	1	7.1%
SENIOR LECTURERS	6	0	10.7%
LECTURERS	1	2	64.3%

Table One: Breakdown of the lecturing staff by sex and status (as ratios).

This occurrence is common throughout the university system (Scott 1984, Ramazanoglu 1987); universities

> are male in their hierarchical power structure, where women feature in large numbers in the bottom tiers, in conventional female roles in cleaning, catering, and secretarial work, and as undergraduate students but are conspicuously absent from the ranks of higher administrative and senior teaching posts. (McDowell 1990: 323)

It is only at the lowest scale, lecturer, where women dominate, outnumbering men by two to one in the Department. This is despite an almost equal number of men and women. This inequality has been noticed by some members of staff:

> *Sean:* you could look at the numbers of women professors and it's obvious - women are discriminated against.
> *Brian:* most of the professors are male, right? Most of the people in the more senior positions in the department are male. [...] I can't think of a female who has an administrative position.

> *Valerie:* I think we feel that the management of the department are predominantly male, and it would be better if there were more women, especially at the higher levels.

Valerie has worked in places where concerted attempts to combat sexism have resulted in dismissals, and she feels a lot more could be done in the Department to prevent discrimination: the practice of masculinity leaves teaching constructed as 'inferior' and it is women who bear the bulk of the teaching load.

The feminisation of the teaching component of the job in the Department is brought into focus by the creation of the Vocation Course, which offers students the opportunity to gain the professional qualifications needed to work in private practice. The recruited lecturing staff have been employed on teaching-only contracts with a lower profile and a lower pay-scale to those of the Department 'proper'. Nine of the ten new lecturers are female (and thus account for almost one half of women lecturers in the Department as a whole). The teaching load of the Department is disproportionately undertaken by women with the consequence that teaching becomes visually 'feminised'. This division has even become spatially inscribed - the Vocation Course is taught in the building's basement, literally separating women from the (men's) world of research upstairs. This 'feminisation' is reinforced by the employment of half-time workers. Although men could be half-time workers, in the Department all the half-timers are female (reflecting the national situation where the majority of part-time workers - 84%, Green and Cohen 1995 - are women). Half-time contracts are not teaching-only, but the emphasis upon these workers is to undertake teaching; for example, Kate reported that as a half-time lecturer she experiences far fewer pressures from the Head of Department to produce research. Overall, approximately three-quarters of female staff have positions of teaching-only or that are teaching focused.

In the Department, it is teaching that has become constructed as the least valued, 'inferior' aspect of the job since it is the least important for promotion: it is less valued in promotion criteria and because the Department views research as its primary function:

> *Geoff:* The discrimination is in the favour totally, or very largely, on research. So someone could become a reader or professor through research even though they are appalling at all other aspects of the job.

This primarily relates to external funding issues; staff felt that there is greater importance attached to research (it is a "research-led" department) for financial purposes (although the majority of its income comes from teaching, based on student

numbers). In the "Teaching Quality Assessment" exercise the Department receives the same money whether rated "Excellent" or "Satisfactory" (and because the Department has no problems in filling all vacancies on its course with students), whilst income derived from research is dependent upon the level of output and the quality of published research. Research income is therefore less secure, and increases in research funding have to be actively sought and worked at. The emphasis on research has led to its discursive construction as 'superior' and thus as 'masculine', which is reinforced since it is men who undertake the bulk of the Department's research (given that the women are in teaching-only posts). This makes it very difficult for women to gain promotion to higher status, higher paid positions since to fulfil the criteria for promotion demands staff to be actively engaged in research and responsible for a major administration task other than time-consuming teaching administration[1] and there will be no promotion for Vocation Course teachers who do not or cannot fulfil university promotion criteria for research.

The 'feminisation' of teaching and the construction of women in the 'feminine' position extends beyond funding. For aspects of teaching are more actively constructed as 'inferior'. One obvious aspect of teaching is interaction on a personal level with students, and this reinforces an association of women with "pastoral care" (which is also a consequence of discourses of reproduction which associate women with providing care and attention for young people). Hence,

> *Paul:* The whole ethos of university promotions procedures in the past have emphasised the research end of things rather than the teaching, pastoral care end of things. At the risk of stereotyping there is a tendency for women to be better at the latter than comparatively with men.

In the Department there is a construction of women as student "nurturers" which becomes reiterated ("performed") as teaching forms the bulk of "women's work". Such work is actively inferiorised (by those occupying the 'masculine' position as researchers):

> *Jane:* departmental meetings tend to be dominated by men and the women who do talk regularly have a bit of a reputation for fussing a little bit, that if they raise an issue it tends to be a kind of nurturing issue, generally pointed to the students, something like that, and sometimes you can hear, almost physically hear, 'oh my god'. That sort of ripples around the department meetings. It is women who can have that reaction as well as men.

This is again tied into issues of promotion; in Margaret's construction, work involving students (teaching) is de-valued because there is no formal appraisal of it as a skill which aids promotion:

---

[1] The consequences of TQA / RAE are discussed in greater detail later.

> *Margaret:* People will say 'jolly good' but it doesn't actually get ticks in boxes. I find that difficult myself because you can't measure it, and because everything is always measured.

Those people who undertake the bulk of student / teaching work - women - are marginalised into a position ancillary to that of people doing the bulk of research - men.

This gendering of the work is explained and reinforced by drawing upon discourses of reproduction: women's occupation of teaching posts is discursively constructed as a reflection of their 'role' as mothers. Although there is some recognition that there are inequalities in the status of men and women in the Department, it is suggested that the cause of this is external to the university and therefore beyond its control:

> *Brian:* it doesn't necessarily indicate direct discrimination, I think it often comes about because of the wider role of women in society.

The discursive positioning of women as child carers is invoked to explain why women are less 'successful' than men in the workplace. The influx of women into the Department (twelve of the last fourteen appointments have been female) is related to the construction of women as family raisers (as was illustrated in Part Two):

> *Sean:* I think we're getting young women to staff it who are some way disenchanted with the rigours of being in private practice. [...] certainly this job fits better with being a mother and raising a family than being in practice. [...] It's a good job for a woman, with a family.

Again, a discourse is being raised that *all* women want to or will have children and that this dictates what job they can or should do. Sally believes women have come out of practice because universities are considered more practical and accommodating places for women to have children, and that the Vocation Course is very different to the department itself, again perpetuating the spatial and metaphoric exclusion of the Vocation Course. Teaching is being constructed here as appropriate to women - "women's work" - because it is a job where you can have children. The job is constructed as a good position for women with or having a family and women are constructed as wanting to have families above having a job or a career. This reinforces teaching as 'feminine' because (as has already been discussed) reproduction is not valued either.

It emerges that discursive constructions are doubly discriminatory against women in the 'feminine' position. The construction of, and expectations upon, women are that they are primarily defined by their reproductive abilities and that all women will have children at some point in their lives. The discussion above has illustrated that as a consequence women are directed into less valued jobs. Those women who do fulfil

discursive expectations of women - they do have children - then find themselves in an even worse work situation:

> *Paul:* there is very overt sexual discrimination in the university's staffing policies, both in terms of its promotions policies and in terms of other things like the treatment of half-time colleagues. [...] half-time members of staff are treated in a number of ways less favourably than full-time members of staff.

All the half-time workers in the Department have undertaken this form of employment to facilitate the combination of paid employment and primary child care. It is the discursive positioning of women as child carers, therefore, which is being discriminated against. The option of half-time employment positions enables women to have jobs and fulfil their 'role' as mothers, a discourse again exclusive of men. This has a tangible consequence: men have less need to be half-time to fit in with child care provision as they are not discursively positioned with direct, everyday childcare expectations. The "career woman" / "mother" dichotomy is reinforced. Fulfilling the discursive expectation of her as a woman to look after her child personally, Kate went half-time. This has effectively ended her career prospects: her new position was no longer research-focused and therefore devoid of promotion prospects. There were / are no provisions to aid the combination of caring for children and having a career: the university provides no direct child care facilities such as crèches or a nursery. Career has to be sacrificed for child care. In Margaret's construction this is a reflection of the Department's lower valuing of the career potential of women (/ "mothers") compared to that of men. The construction is that only women who occupy the 'masculine' position will be given any encouragement:

> *Margaret:* There are no structures, there's nothing there in place to help them [mothers]. They're just expected to manage that bit of their lives as well and there's nothing there which would help them do it. [...] my own view of this department is that people are selected to be helped along. Now that may not relate to their sex, but I can think actually of two delightful bright young colleagues, women colleagues, coming up at the moment, and they're doing very well and heaped with praise. If one of them, neither of them is married or living with a partner, if one of them were to have a baby, I do not think this department would be willing to protect that person, to help them through that stage, and to keep them on. 'Oh well, that's nice', and there'll be flowers and presents. But it wouldn't be treated like something which you've really got to watch very carefully.

As these examples show, the career path does not appear openly equal to males and females of equal talent. The discursively constructed expectation that women will be a child's primary care giver is made into a 'reality' because from the moment of having children, there are very few structures which enable any alternative to be followed. The institutional discourse and the discourses of the individual academics converge: the expectation of women is that they will provide any child care. Obviously, this also

has the consequence that any man who wants or needs to engage in child care encounters structural difficulties in doing so too.

Therefore, in the Department the gendering of types of work is strongly influenced by external forces - the distribution of government funding. The consequence is to reinforce the construction of teaching as 'inferior' work and the channelling of women into teaching posts, which is justified by invoking discourses of the sexes. Teaching is an essential component of the Department's work, but research is constructed as more important. Financially, research is increasingly regarded as important, whilst for individual lecturers research can lead to prestige and promotion. In this way, the 'feminine' teaching position (primarily occupied by women) is constructed as fulfilling a supplementary role to the 'masculine' research position (primarily occupied by men). This practice of masculinity is created and maintained as much by female researchers as by male ones.

NEGOTIATING DISCOURSES OF WOMEN AS ANCILLARY

The discussion above suggested that the sexual divisions of labour at SYMP and the Department are the products of dominating discourses which construct women and "women's work" as less important and ancillary to 'masculine' work primarily undertaken by men. The two examples below illustrate different negotiation of these discourses: Mave, a canteen worker at SYMP, accepts and reinforces the discursive position she finds herself within; however, Margaret, a senior woman in the Department, recognises her marginalisation as a woman but feels unable to challenge, or rather *successfully* challenge, the role decided for her. Margaret illustrates how despite being a 'success' in her career, the regulatory framework still positions her as a woman without 'authority'.

The lesser valuing of 'feminine' work appears internalised by Mave, or at least reproduced by her. Mave accepts the positioning of women as 'of service' to men, constructing this inequality as the product of nature. There is a reiteration of the discourse of men as physically superior to all women:

> *Mave:* Women can't do a lot of work that men could do, heavy lifting work, and women can't do a lot of men's jobs. I know we're supposed to be equal and what have you, but I wouldn't class myself as equal anyway.

There is recognition of discourses that suggest the existence of equality between the sexes, but Mave constructs herself as of less value than men on the basis of male physical superiority (reflecting the discursive structuring of employment at SYMP):

Why's that?
Mave: Well, I couldn't do heavy lifting. I mean, if it were a really manual job, I couldn't do that.

This construction seemingly conflicts with Mave's actual abilities - her own job is primarily manual, consisting of cleaning, storing stock and clearing tables. The positioning of men as possessing physical superiority forms the basis for explaining their stronger employment position - it makes them "more flexible" and able to do any job at all:

Can you think of any things that women do that men can't do?
Mave: I suppose men are a bit more flexible. I don't really know. I mean a man could do what I'm doing at work I suppose, quite easily. So ...

Men's work becomes perceived as more important - not everyone can do it - unlike women's work which is constructed as doable by anyone: women's work is considered purely 'ancillary' to men. For Mave, this ancillary position "feels right ... catering for their food", for it is the role of women to support men:

How do you feel being like a woman in SYMP's man's world?
Mave: I don't really think of it like that because I think in canteen - I know we have two chefs - but otherwise we're women and it seems to be the right place for us to be, to cater for men's foods and what have you. So, I don't feel out of place there, no. As I don't actually work where they're working. We're only feeding them.

This moral approval of the lesser value of women is reflected by a self-deprecating view of women's work ("we're *only* feeding them") and is spatially inscribed: being separated from the workplace of men is constructed as women's "right place". These constructions uphold inequalities between the sexes, supportive of the role of women as an extra dimension or complementary to the 'masculine' position of men's work.

The discursive expectations of women are played out more in the form of challenge than acceptance by Margaret. In Jack's comments, there is a discursive positioning of women as ancillary: the role of women is constructed as reflecting their qualities which are *additional* to those of men; these are presented in terms of 'inevitability', generalising this expectation to all women. Talking about the possibility of an all-male Department he notes:

Jack: I'm not sure that it would be that different actually, I'm not sure that generally speaking, apart from the inevitable ... just, just look, it's duller, isn't it, for a man, I think, this isn't meant to be sexist, sitting at a table full of men than if there is some women there. I mean mixture is nice, I think, actually, it's, it's, there's a sort of, .. refreshing, refreshingness. If it was all-male it would be a bit more boring probably. More boring.

This explicitly values women in terms of how they "refresh" the "dull" and "boring" scenarios produced in all-male occasions, what they additionally offer men. Women's presence is valued, but as men choosing it, not that it may reflect a woman having earned this position (and thereby echoes the gazer-gazed discursive positions

172

discussed in Part Two). This construction accords with Margaret's experiences. Even with those men who she shares the same status and theoretically the same authority, Margaret experiences marginalisation to the central issues of concern to men:

> *Margaret:* I sometimes feel as if I'm on a different planet. It's not about what I think is important and valuable, yet I know, because I've got professor status, I've proved that I can do it within the system, but I still feel frustrated, I still actually feel kind of junior. Yes, I'm useful for some things, but no big policy things, you've always got this great group of men patrolling it and you feel as if you're actually maybe talked to as if you're kind of ... I think it's they don't understand.

Like Mave she perceives to be positioned as of service to men, but Margaret does not experience this as her playing out her 'natural' duty as a woman. Rather, it is something to be resentful of and something to struggle against because her work is de-valued by male colleagues due to the discursive expectations of her as a woman. The consequence is that she is prevented from achieving workplace authority and so occupies this theoretically 'masculine' work position differently from men.[2] Margaret does not theorise herself as being discriminated against but rather as being placed in a position which makes it difficult to prove 'worthiness' to occupy the 'masculine' position. In other words, Margaret constructs a situation where she (and women more generally) are structured into conforming to 'feminine' expectations and consequently unable to display 'masculine' qualities:

> *Margaret:* the other side of me thinks they don't actually want women to be put in the positions where they would almost have to follow what you said. You just don't get the opportunity to show, erm, they look in promotion for things like signs of leadership, but they don't give you the opportunity to demonstrate it. I can do it a lot more outside because of my social position. I can run important committees, chair meetings and things like that, but I think in this department you're not really seriously, no I guess if you asked my Head of Department, this is because they want to protect me and don't want to put any more pressure on Margaret, so there's always more than one way of looking at the same thing, and I think it's partly because they don't think that you can do certain jobs, which .. And, you're also not brought into discussion about whether you think you can do it really.

This constructs male colleagues as not wanting to be recipient to authority from women, achieved by constraining opportunities where women can display leadership qualities - Margaret has proved herself capable of 'masculine' authority outside of the workplace. Margaret perceives that male colleagues are trying to "protect" her by keeping her from authority, but also that they feel she is not capable in the same way they are because of their expectations of her as female. The result is the perpetuation of inequalities between the sexes. This situation appears to be reproduced at every status level in the Department, where the superior 'masculine' position is occupied by

---

[2] It is also important to be clear on the suggestion that the occupation of 'masculine' and 'feminine' positions are mediated by sex. More accurately, they are mediated by a discursively sexed body and hence the discourses and discursive expectations that create that sexed body.

men. David is the only male lecturer on the Vocation Course. Despite this, he constructs himself as a man to be the judge of what is important or insignificant. He constructs women as having less important priorities than men:

> *David:* women in a group react differently to men in a group, they get uptight about things which we might not regard as being too significant. So, yes, we do have our occasional problems, but it works all right.

This constructs the approach of men ("we") as superior and not concerned with trivial matters; women are "occasional problems" (to men) because of their different way of thinking. Jack commented of women that "they'll get there", that it is only a matter of time before women hold positions other than those of "lecturer". However, Margaret's constructions posit promotion as more difficult for women and that even upon promotion their role is devalued and so inequalities remain: women are "junior". She feels she will personally never progress any further in her career. Perhaps Margaret's role is to provide "refreshingness" for male co-workers, to be ancillary.

Concluding comments

The examples presented in Section Five do not accord with Spain's (1992) categorisation of women's and men's work. This holds that typical women's jobs are "open-floor" (communal working conditions such as factory work or secretarial duties) and typical men's jobs are "closed-door" (jobs where men have offices, usually to themselves). At SYMP it is men who are more conspicuously in "open-floor" jobs on the shopfloor, whilst in the Department both sexes are in "closed door jobs". SYMP may reflect a common construction of appropriate men's and women's work, but this construction should not be considered universal; the discursive construction of the 'masculine' and 'feminine' are variable and dependent upon individual circumstances - the construction of the 'masculine' as superior at SYMP takes a very different form from that of the Department. The 'feminine' and 'masculine' positions are generalised within these workplaces - they are applied to *all* women and *all* men, creating a dominant expectation of what each sex is like and the sorts of work that they do. This makes it difficult for members of either sex to 'prove' themselves different or to get jobs other than those defined as sex-appropriate. Game and Pringle's (1984) assertion that 'skilled' work is defined as "men's work" is not supported by the situation at SYMP where the shopfloor work is largely unskilled (although one respondent did suggest that labour processes at SYMP are 'jargonised' - using complicated technical terms - in order to make it sound skilled) whilst in the Department a division and prioritising of different skills forms the basis for gendering work. The foundation for the construction of sex "differences" at SYMP is predominantly in discursively constructed physical

differences, capabilities and capacities, and in the case of production work these attributes are possessed only by men. Cleaning, administration, nursing, product presentation, packing and repetitive jobs are deemed suitable for women (and vice versa), tasks which are subsidiary to the company's most important function - to manufacture products. This job falls to men. In this way, women's work is constructed as ancillary to the tasks of men. This is similar to the Department where research is constructed as the most important aspect of the job in relation to 'feminised' teaching. Therefore, overall, both workplaces have a sexual division of labour, created and upheld by discourses of masculinity. Of particular significance is the official sanctioning of these practices by the organisations themselves (despite official Equal Opportunities policies) - there is no challenge of this sex discrimination and thus there is approval of these sex inequalities.

However, the objective of Part Three is not solely to discuss organisations and the process of "institutionalisation" of masculinity, but to highlight the workplace as the context for social interactions, and to examine the effect of the case study workplaces upon the discourses and practices of masculinity. As Halford (1992: 183) comments, organisational structures are not only *reflections* of social relations but they also contribute to *shape* gender relations. In Pringle and Watson's (1990) Foucauldian conceptualisation, the state is not thought of as an institution but "as a set of arenas and a collection of practices which are historically produced and not structurally 'given'" (Watson 1992: 186). In the remainder of Part Three, more importance is attached to an "ascending analysis of power" (Foucault 1977). Whereas Foucault neglected individuals in his empirical studies of institutions (Dwyer 1995), the material presented here is an attempt to understand masculinity / institutions from a primary focus upon individuals. The aim is to focus upon individuals and interactions between individuals in these workplaces, but to place them within an institutional context - to locate those points where the three broad scales of masculinity (individual / institutional / social) 'intersect'.

Particular emphasis is placed upon examination of two "important personalities": Richard Brown at SYMP and Peter Collins in the Department. The analysis highlights the discourses of sex disclosed by these two men and the form of their disclosure, following through these discourses to the practices of masculinity they make. It becomes clear that the discourses which Richard and Peter act upon do not necessarily correspond to those of the institution as defined by workplace policies

(such as Equal Opportunities programmes). As individuals they are able to implement their own agendas within their everyday interactions in the workplace. The material highlights the competition between discourses that occurs. Discussion is therefore based on how and why this is able to happen, and contemplates the consequences for these institutions and their employees. Comparison shows the two workplaces to be, in many ways, 'opposites' - SYMP is predominantly male and does not operate any progressive policies for its workers, whilst the Department has an equal mix of male and female staff and an Equal Opportunities implementation. However, despite these differences, a similar scenario results - practices of masculinity contribute to the creation and the continuation of inequalities that generally benefit men and disadvantage many women (although individual women can 'succeed'). Therefore, 'informal' discourses of the sexes can have more significance or restricting consequences than *formal* policies and remain relatively independent of material circumstances. Overall, this suggests that there are gendered effects to apparently gender-neutral policies or even pro-women policies. It is contended that this results from the maintenance of particular discourses of the two sexes (which are played out in everyday life). It also argues that this is the result of particular discourses becoming dominant, namely those produced by individuals who retain a more 'tangible' exercise of power (in the form of workplace authority), with the consequence that co-workers are influenced by discourses they may not approve of but feel unable to change. It is concluded that what is observed is not so much the *institutionalisation* of masculinity in these work organisations as the practice of masculinity within an institutional context - the relational power of interactions has consequences which affect one's ability to work and negotiate discourses of sex within the institution.

6. MANAGING MASCULINITY IN THE SYMP WORKPLACE

The section above illustrated how distinctions are drawn at SYMP between "men's work" and "women's work", where men's work is considered heavy, dirty and factory-based and women's work is conceived as light and clean to match their physical "incapabilities" compared to men. It was concluded that higher value was attached to men's work (which was seen as central to the company's industrial function), whilst women's work was viewed as fulfilling an ancillary, servicing role outside of the key business of production. Whether or not one agrees that women are incapable of undertaking this manual work should not affect the relation between the sexes within managerial roles in the company. The tasks of management - interactions with people, non-production work, less strenuous jobs not involving lifting, work in a clean

environment, principally office based - fit the construction of women's work at the firm. It could be anticipated that non-production jobs in management are dominated by women. However, there are only two female managers in the whole of the company, of whom only one has any interaction or influence on the shopfloor (the manager of Decorative Metal Products).

> *Emma:* you can count on the back of your hand how many women managers there are. There's about two on the company that are in a responsible position. Why that is I don't know.

Emma's explanation is that the male bosses at SYMP "just don't like women".

Whereas the absence of women production workers was explained by recourse to women's 'natural' incapabilities, alternative discourses have to be developed to account for the management situation. It emerges that the male managers interviewed in this study (Richard, Derek, Tom and John) construct series of discourses that serve as explanations and justifications of the exclusion of women from management positions. They invoke discourses of the sexes that justify the exclusion of women from management and the promotion of those people (men) who conform to these discursive criteria. The practice of masculinity is facilitated by individuals' occupation of positions of workplace authority. As the discussion on power in Part One emphasised, not everybody is placed equally within power relations. When in the workplace, employees are more explicitly located in a place-specific hierarchy where their ability to influence the relationships and the discourses which become promulgated in this work space are reduced in comparison with their bosses. This idea is not in conflict with Foucault's notion of power as non-possessable and as invested in all relations. Whilst Ramazanoglu and Holland (1993) argue that the weakness of Foucauldian conceptualisations is that they dismiss the concept of individual people as "powerful", to the contrary it is evident that Foucault's work does make allowance for this. MacCannell and MacCannell (1993) subscribe to the view of power as characteristic of every relation and utilisable by every actor. Yet they clearly illustrate that these are not in conflict with the recognition that individuals are differentially able to draw upon sanctions - "violence" (physical, bureaucratic, verbal etc.) - and influence power relations with others. Acknowledgement of the ubiquity of power does not have to mean the rejection of the idea that people are not equally positioned to resources to exercise power in more tangible forms, such as through authority. However, analysis of authority does rely upon more traditional conceptualisations of power to explain the apparent situation of 'winners' and 'losers'

in power relations, such as Huczynski and Buchanan (1991) (as explained in Part One).

Authority refers to one's ability to have somebody do something at one's behest, officially countenanced within an organisation (such as, in these examples, a departmental head or manager, a vice chancellor or a company owner). A person in authority is able to support their command with sanctions which encourage or force their recipient to comply - potential dismissal or even just unpleasantness in interactions. The link between authority and power was recognised by Ros who expressed incapability in "bossing people around" because of a lack of workplace authority:

> *Ros:* power can only really be exercised when the person you are exercising it upon recognises the authority of the position you are in. And power only stretches as far as the ultimate sanctions that you are able to use [...] it's very much a function too of the personality. If you are uncertain of yourself, if you're uncertain of the power, you're going to have a problem exercising it.

Similarly,

> *Sean:* I'm a professor now but I don't have any more power. Authority yes, because I see authority as more personal.

Therefore, although the Foucauldian conceptualisation of power presented in Part One refuted the possibility of 'possessing' power, authority does increase the individual's ability to influence power relations. As these statements suggest, it is invested in personality and a person's position within a workplace. Those in positions of authority are more able to "exercise" power through the discourses they articulate achieving ascendancy and acceptance. Hence, the managers at SYMP have workplace authority which gives them greater ability to have the discourses that they promulgate accepted as "truth": within the regulatory framework of discourses, they are positioned more favourably in the hierarchy. As will become clearer, being in an inferior position in this framework (as are the managers' underlings) makes it more difficult to pose counter discourses which gain any acceptance. The discourses of those with the most workplace authority are therefore particularly important, and the consequences of their discourses more wide-reaching.

"IMPORTANT" PERSONALITIES I - RICHARD BROWN

This becomes evident when related to Richard Brown. He exemplifies the importance of particular individuals in workplaces and, more generally, highlights the direct practice of masculinity, the contradictions that exist between intentions, discourses and practices and illustrates the situational contingency of masculinity (and the disclosure

of sex discourses across the spaces of home and work). Richard Brown has control over many personnel issues (including some staff recruitment) and his job involves liaison with a large number of staff members (especially those in administrative positions, who are mainly women). His views are highly significant - he is not only reflective of, but also actively shapes, the discrimination by male management in the company. Taken with those of other male managers at the firm, Richard's discourses seem fairly typical of SYMP's 'middle management' (those employees charged with day-to-day decision making and the instructing of workers and who are, therefore, endowed with a significant level of authority). Together, they have a great deal of influence and it emerges that the discourses they create are those which dominate within the workplace. Their discourses are particularly relevant contributions to the regulatory framework which determines the 'rules' for the 'performance' of gender at SYMP.

Richard plays out his discourses at work, but they draw upon his spatialised discourses of the sexes and the home (and so exemplify arguments presented in Parts One and Two). These discourses have material effects on those he works with (and, more generally, for those who could work at SYMP). It becomes clear how the successful implementation of these discourses is aided by a series of justifications which Richard uses to explain, 'naturalise' and justify inequalities between the sexes. Consequently, these exonerate himself and the company both from actively encouraging this situation and from needing to take any measures to counter it. Therefore, the discourses and practices disclosed during the interviews with Richard Brown and observational material from visiting him at work, at home and during an induction tour of SYMP will be focused upon. Firstly, there is a lengthy discussion of examples of discourses of masculinity disclosed by Richard in conversation. These are compared with discourses and situations expressed by other workers at SYMP (especially other managers). This leads into the examination of how these discourses are utilised in the construction of the sexes as "different" and in the justification of the sexual inequalities between workers based upon the existence of "differences". It is shown how Richard employs distinct discourses of the home and work and then illustrated how and why his practices vary between the two spaces and their significance.

Richard is in his fifties; he has worked for SYMP for three decades and has held a management function for approximately fifteen years. He believes that he shows no

bias between men and women and feels that he holds the very "enlightened" opinions which embody a "modern" approach - everyone should have equal rights. Richard describes himself as a "relations with people person" and as pursuing the ethos that "management is less, people involvement is more":

> *Richard:* you've certainly got to have some ability to move in all circles. Be able to go down to the shopfloor and be able to communicate with them effectively.

He feels that he carries this over into the way he treats men and women:

> *Richard:* I am absolutely, not in any way biased between men and women. In fact, I am the other way, I'm constantly pushing for women's equality and rights.

However, these opinions contrast with the discourses revealed in his conversation and actions at work. In fact, Richard's discourses form an ideology that there are natural differences between the sexes in physicality and physical capabilities which explain why, for example, men and women are found in different jobs within the company. These differences are considered to carry over into distinct psychological sexual characteristics, where those related to women are implied to be inferior or supplementary to those of men. A "separate but equal" philosophy develops where there is an unquestioned understanding of spaces as neutral. "Spaces" where women are more predominant are conveyed as carrying as much social significance and access to power as those spaces where men dominate. These discourses manifest themselves in Richard's practice through the placing of greater importance upon the words and actions of men, the use of patronising language to women (calling them "flower" and "love"), the treatment of women as household servicers, and an excessive interest in women's appearances and sexuality. Together, Richard's words, actions and attitudes present discursive practices which construct men and women within an unacknowledged hierarchic relationship and which, therefore, have direct consequences for those people he lives and works with. They are discourses of masculinity.

The transcription below is of continuous dialogue between Richard and myself in the first interview. The analysis on the right hand side of the page pays particular attention to the disclosed discourses and indicates how Richard constructs appropriate identities for each sex.

Is there any sort of work which you would call, I don't know, men's work or women's work?

No. There are jobs which women can't do, and there are jobs which are difficult

It is being claimed that there are jobs which women *cannot* do, whilst men only have *difficulty* doing some jobs. A discourse is also

180

for men to do, but 50% of the population is female and you're an utter idiot if you cut that half off and say that they're somehow or other different to us.

So what sort of jobs would you say that women couldn't do?

The very physical jobs, where, I mean, they are constructed differently, and there are jobs where ... you only have to look at the differences in sports. You don't divide men and women's sports for sexual reasons you divide them for physical reasons because it would be unfair to expect women to compete on a synch with men. And any jobs like that. In the old days, mining wasn't just divided because it was wrong for them to go down the pit, it was wrong because they physically couldn't go down the pit. There are the odd woman, odd women who can, but I mean, there are physical jobs that are difficult. And on the male side, there are jobs which are difficult for them to do. Can you imagine a man as a corseteer, fitting old ladies with corsets? They can do it, but there are difficulties in that they get accepted in doing it. They propriatise the victim to the, erm, erm, whatever. So, they're very extreme, there are only a few things which men can't do, and a few things which women can't do, but generally speaking, my answer to the question is 'no', there's no difference at all. Utterly no difference. To some extent women are more, more hardy, most probably

being constructed where men are placed as the selectors of the work that women should do; they would be "idiots" to exclude women from working, but there is no suggestion that women should have as much right to work as men. Women are also being positioned as "different from us", a male 'norm'.

The "difference" of women is constructed as physical *inferiority* to men, so it would be unfair to expect women to compete with men equally. 'Difference' is equated to 'inferior'. It is argued that this is how it is in *sports* and, therefore, this should be carried into the *workplace* and the types of jobs each sex is suited to. Yet, taken further this reasoning would not explain the absence of women from management posts at the company.

Thus, the sexual and spatial division of labour is explained by the sexes' physical adaptability to certain kinds of work. Richard says that women are physically *unable* to go down a pit (until the 1842 Mining Act forbade it on moral grounds, both women and children had worked underground at collieries), whilst men would have difficulty gaining *acceptance* in doing some jobs, namely as a corseteer.
The result is that mining ("men's work") is constructed as more important because only certain people (men) are able to do it, whilst "women's work" (such as being a corseteer) is valued less because it can be done by anyone. Men's and women's work are further hierarchised by the choice of extreme professions to represent them. Whereas mining has traditionally been nationally important economically, industrially and socially, corseting has never been of such significance. The consequence is the portrayal of men's work as important and women's work as trivial.

Yet Richard states that his examples prove that generally there is "no difference at all" between the sexes and that he would not differentially value men's and women's work.

more reliable to some extent, there are different characteristics of the sexes which show in jobs. They have difficulties that arise because they by their nature have to have children, so as they go through that child bearing age, men tend to steal a march on them in terms of promotion, and it's difficult for them to get back in again. How you overcome that is the argument.

In terms of numbers, SYMP *seems to be pretty much a male*

male dominated place. Yeah, I think we have these stereotypes of what's men's jobs. I gather you understood from my answers that I am absolutely, not in any way biased between men and women. In fact, I am the other way, I'm constantly pushing for women's equality and rights, mainly because I think they are an asset to have in business. I have been interviewing for two years now for modern apprenticeships. I'm sure you understand the TEC and the careers teachers are equally unbiased in their desire to sell a job equally to either sex. I have had one application in something in about 28 that are female. She was totally unacceptable because of her educational qualifications, nothing to do with anything else. I would have liked to have .. tried to have got a female YT, sorry a female steel modern apprentice. I didn't have the opportunity to do so, to the best of my knowledge no-one else has in the district. So, that's why. It isn't

Again, the types of job performed by each sex are constructed as reflections of 'natural' traits of biological maleness or femaleness. Discourses of reproduction are used to classify women as different from men because they "have to have children" (although there is recognition that this is a problem heightened by the *organisational* lack of child care facilities). Once more, men's experiences are constructed as the norm from which women vary - men are excluded from the discourses of reproduction and child care.

Richard now states that there are stereotypes of men's work, but he distances himself from this view by asserting how unbiased he is between the sexes. However, even if he does agree with equal rights and a sexual equality of opportunity, this belief is based within the discursive construction of women as different by *nature, as child bearers / rearers*, and essentially *all being the same*. Hence, his "*intentions*" contradict the *discourses* of sex he has constructed.

The problem of women not working in the steel industry is posited not as the consequence of possible discrimination but as reflecting women's *choice* not to work in the industry. The assumption is that women have certain types of work to which they stick, and that they do not wish to pursue a 'male career'. Women are positioned as not accepting the efforts of employers and careers advisors to recruit women into steel companies.

a question of us saying, our people of saying, 'you're male, you're female', it's a question of being perceived as a man's profession and women just don't apply for it. Now, go back probably twenty or fifteen years or maybe even ten years, and to some extent I admit it's there today with some people, there is this tendency to say, 'look, you're a women, you can't be an engineer'. It's becoming increasingly less prevalent.

You said about women being an asset. In what way would you say that?

Women are an asset because they have another, apart from the fact they've the same brain size, the same abilities as a man, body size for body size, the same abilities as a man. They have also, they have something to add, they tend to be more thoughtful, their nature is less aggressive, they don't have to prove things quite so much as a man. They're going to be more catty. But on balance they bring objectivity to discussion. Most discussions with a woman present in business is better, they bring objectivity into it. They bring, they often have this knack of bringing in another angle to the argument. They think differently, by the nature, the sex affects the way you perceive, relationships, for example. The way you perceive threats, or you perceive problems, and they have this, they bring this different viewpoint in, and therefore of course anything which widens your viewpoint improves your

Richard concedes that traditional attitudes are partially accountable, but he suggests that any feelings amongst men that women cannot be engineers have, by and large, disappeared. This claims that the way is clear for women to enter the profession without fear of discrimination or of any personal harassment.

Physicality is again invoked to explain 'natural' differences between the sexes: Richard states that women have the same abilities as men *proportional to each's body size*, thus less than men's.
"Nature", in this construction, assures that women are innately more thoughtful and less aggressive than men and that they do not have to prove things as much as men naturally have to. They are also catty. These characteristics perpetuate "common sense" (Connell 1995) discourses of sex: "natural" sexual characteristics.
The role of women is constructed as *ancillary* to men: their value relates to what they can add to what men already believe - they should be "present" in otherwise all-male discussions. This makes it possible for Richard to argue that, in business, taking on board women's perceptual viewpoint helps men view situations holistically.
Interestingly, Richard claims women add "objectivity". Objectivity is conventionally constructed as 'masculine' (see Seidler 1989 for a history of the gendering of reason, objectivity and knowledge). Richard does not necessarily construct objectivity as 'feminine', but as only achieved by men when they consider the perspective of women. Hence, it is constructed as dialectically produced, but where 'masculine' and 'feminine' are not of equal value: the 'feminine' is supplementary. The sexes are constructed as having "different" viewpoints, and again constructs a "separate but equal" discourse explicitly, but implicitly "difference" is equated as 'inferior' - women are different from men, they add something supplementary to men.

chance of making the right decision. That's the asset. And they look good!

So would you say that there was any like discrimination, maybe not necessarily discrimination, but things stopping women, or anybody, really, getting promoted?

Yes. Yes. I think that there is still a traditional view in. If you have a management structure which is predominantly male, then it's rather like, it's a rather like a self-fulfilling prophesy isn't it? We are predominantly male, therefore predominantly males are good, and you look for ways of proving that it's a good system. They are natural, there are still prejudices in all organisations. I don't believe in positive discrimination. I think it does them, women, a dis-service. Education is the answer. The schools have got it right. The youngster leaving school now understands far better the equality of men and women than my generation when we left school. When we left school, boys did woodwork, girls did housekeeping. We went to different schools. Girls stayed at home and did soppy sewing things, boys went out and did the work. Nowadays, kids leaving school, they don't see those differences, so when they are managers, hopefully, those days will have gone. But the people in management today are still the people like me and my generation, but not necessarily with my wonderful

The add-on statement reduces women to the value of their appearance - of sexuality - a point reinforced in a similar fashion later. It undermines Richard's claims: it is a point of revelation, where "intentions" of equality are uncovered as practices of difference.

This is an acknowledgement of a self-fulfilling prophesy, where (in this example) men reproduce men as bosses on an assumption that men are superior because they are bosses. (This point is examined in more detail in relation to the Department). However, by contributing to discourses which regard men as superior to women, Richard is no less a culprit of doing this. He and his colleagues - as managers - help to maintain this scenario. Additionally, by expressing awareness of criticisms of male management reproduction, Richard is implying that it does not occur at SYMP and, therefore, that women have not proved themselves as sufficiently skilled to enter management.

The suggestion is that sexual equality now exists, at least amongst "youngsters". There is a generalisation that young men and young women do not suffer beliefs of sex differences and distinct roles, precisely the discourses Richard discloses. The implication is that women have as much chance of employment success as men; if they do not succeed, this must reflect that they were not capable of achieving their goals. Positive discrimination is opposed as insulting to women since they are not in need of preferential treatment - both sexes receive equal treatment in society.

enlightened views. [I laugh -
inappropriately?]

I went to an all-boys school, so maybe
it's not going to happen quite so soon.
All-boys schools are not bad, it's what
you teach them. It's all right, all-boys
schools, providing you tell them that all-
girls schools, you tell them to look up to
girls, not for feminist reasons, but to look
up to them for intellectual reasons as
well. Providing you recognise what they
can contribute in terms of their
intellectual abilities, that's fine. There's
nothing wrong with all boys schools
providing you come into contact with
girls, and you do it in the right way, that
they are your equal. They might be
good in bed, that's fine, but intellectually
they've got to be your equal as well.
Can you imagine what SYMP *would be*
like if it was say completely all-male, or
even completely all-female?
Worse. Worse, not as efficient. Not as
efficient. It's like cutting off your left leg
and saying can you imagine if everybody
in the world hopped on one leg.
Everybody would be hopping at the
same speed, but it would be much
better. In the kingdom of the blind, the
one eyed man is king. In the kingdom of
the one eyed man, the two eyed man is
king. The kingdom where all the women
are in one company and all the men are
in the other, the company with the men
and the women is better than the
company with either one or the other.

Since my laugh was received with silence,
perhaps Richard does believe his views to be
"wonderfully enlightened".

The divorcing of 'feminist' from 'intellectual'
indicates feminism is based upon physical
femaleness.

This portrays all boys and all girls as the
same; there is no mention that some girls
may be some boys' intellectual superior (and
vice versa). The assumption is that every boy
is as intellectually developed as any girl
compared to them.

Again, it is an add-on comment which
emphasises women as sexual objects.
Richard is sanctioning that it is acceptable for
males to view women as sexual objects
providing that they recognise that women
have "abilities" too.

It is said that a company will be more
efficient with men and women: however, the
earlier discourse assumes that this means the
men doing "men's work" and women doing
"women's work": their complementarity
makes them the unit, and having women's
presence makes men all the more efficient.

185

Got to be, got to be. You're cutting off half your bloody assets.

Are there any areas where the men and women do work together at SYMP?

Some of the women that are capable of going on to higher levels feel they're held back by prejudice. If you were to speak to somebody called Rosalind, for example, she would tell you that SYMP is sexist and it holds you back. There's an element of truth in that, except she is not capable of going much higher than she is. There's another young lady, who has been brought up over a male colleague, and is currently running a department, Decorative Metal Products. She is actually being developed and trained in preference of putting a male colleague in charge of the department. Because she has got the capabilities. A lot of women will hide behind the prejudice, the same way a lot of blacks or coloureds will hide behind the fact that they are black, as an excuse for them not achieving something, when in actual fact that the decision has been made without any thought of discrimination. Now, a different argument is why they are less privileged, maybe the education system was at fault in the first place. I would go along with that, maybe we've got big problems with the ways we educate and treat our coloured youth and our Asian, black minorities in our education system. We haven't got the same problem these days with female,

Women as ancillary aids men reaching their 'wholeness'.

In the case of the two women managers (and they are the only two women managers in the whole company), the example of the woman who did not appreciate her own potential and was promoted above a male colleague is invoked to prove that there is no discrimination at SYMP. However, this was the case for *one* woman in a firm of nearly one thousand employees. All the decisions, and the woman's promotion, have been decided by men, who it seems retain the ability and authority to promote or halt in their tracks the career of any individual. This makes the personalities of those individual male managers even more important in the determination of people's career paths in the company. As it will be shown below, Richard's discourses of women and practices have direct and tangible consequences for those women he works around. Additionally, the department which the promoted woman heads, Decorative Metal Products, is defined as the only space on the shop floor suitable for women. This is because the work is "lighter, less strenuous, and about product presentation", those characteristics which are associated with women. The discourses which are constructed and drawn upon to justify women's exclusion from "men's work" are utilised to justify women's exclusion from managerial positions too.

It is being claimed here that women use prejudice as a shield to hide their own inadequacies (reiterating the earlier claim regarding positive discrimination). It is again suggested that there are no inequalities in the education of boys and girls (although many studies, such as Holland, Blair and Sheldon 1995, clearly show this is not the case), and so women who do not succeed have nothing or no-one to blame except themselves. This point is reinforced by the acknowledgement that racial inequities do exist - Richard is not saying that educational equality exists for everyone, just that it does between the sexes. The suggestion is that women are manipulating discourses on discrimination in order to gain an advantageous career position for themselves.

with women in the education system. A lot of women will blame prejudice, prejudice still exists, but a good woman will overcome it. She shouldn't have to, but she could. At SYMP we've an example of one woman who thinks she could do better, and in actual fact she couldn't and blames prejudice, and in the other case, of a woman who has actually been dragged beyond what she thinks she's capable of doing, because we know she's capable of doing it.

"*we* know she's capable of doing it" - men know that this woman is capable of meeting their criteria of appropriate standards. It is men who decide the career progression of the women in the company. The woman is portrayed as less knowledgeable than men, even about her own abilities. It is suggested that male bosses are doing everything they can to "drag" women beyond their own expectations, and therefore exonerating SYMP from any blame for the differential working conditions that women and men find themselves in. Male managers are constructed as knowledgeable and as appropriate arbiters of all women's abilities.

Richard claims he believes there are no differences between the sexes and that he supports that equality of opportunity for either sex must be (and is being) enforced. Yet his discourses also construct men's experiences as the 'norm' from which women differ by 'nature'. Nature dictates that women are reproducers (the bearers and rearers of children) and dictates that women are physically inferior to men. He counterposes that men are more aggressive and that nature makes women less aggressive, more thoughtful and more catty and affects their perceptions. Women are also referred to in terms of their sexual attractiveness to men. The consequence is that rather than there being no differences between the sexes, a discourse of complementarity emerges. It is one where women are ancillary to men and men are positioned as legitimate arbiters of what work women should do: men's work is important whilst women's work is of secondary importance. These discourses help keep in place the regulatory framework which unequally positions men and women, and their abilities to exercise power. Therefore, despite stating attitudes of pro-equality and support that no distinction should be made between the sexes, Richard's contribution to a progressive sexual politics is purely surficial: he clearly does hold the sexes in differential regard. Richard distances the discourses he creates from his self-presented attitudes. This way of thinking has been identified as a general social trend:

> Once patriarchs openly proclaimed that women were not welcome in certain spheres of life; now they are more likely to deny that any barriers to women exist. The patriarchal ideology shifts from open exclusion of women as 'naturally' different, to one of denying that women's slight 'underachievement' is a result of discrimination. (Walby 1990: 108)

Walby is suggesting that there is a recognition amongst many people (primarily because of the campaigning of the feminist movement) that it is not acceptable to

openly voice opinions such as 'women are naturally inferior to men' or 'women should be excluded from certain spaces or activities'. The result has been the modification of opinions which would be considered openly sexist; this is particularly true within workplaces and company policies where employment legislation forbids discrimination by sex, race or religion. Richard proves that just because discrimination by sex is not explicitly endorsed, this does not mean that discrimination by sex does not occur. There is not an open admittance amongst male managers that there is any discrimination being practised against women.

This is contradicted by the differential treatment of male and female workers at SYMP, with men occupying the positions of managerial responsibility and the highest paid jobs in shopfloor production (paying approximately twice the salary of administrative positions). It is not only the company's discourses of the sexes (in the form of its hiring policies and division of labour) which help structure this 'performance' of gender at SYMP. It is also dependent upon interactions between employees who simultaneously draw upon these dominant discourses and reinforce their construction. As the examination of Richard's discourses showed, there appears to be a 'policing' system by middle-management of who 'succeeds' and who does not. Richard displayed how he and other male managers are in positions of authority to select who is promoted and he constructed them as the appropriate "wonderfully enlightened" arbiters of this judgement. It was shown in Part Two that Emma has been frustrated by inability to progress up the company hierarchy. In her construction, this management policing is to prevent women from acquiring particular posts, reflecting reticence to confer authority on those women who they discursively construct as inferior and ancillary to men:

> *Emma:* I think middle management mainly are narrow minded, they're not very, in my opinion, they're not open minded, they need to be more open minded to see things in a different light, see that women are capable of it. I think a lot of men are frightened of women and them having that authority. Maybe they would do a better job than men [...] there's two women in management, and it's very frustrating to see that there isn't those opportunities there. [...] on the management side they could employ more women or give women the opportunity to go further. They just, like, 'that's it, that's as far as you can go', boom, boom, that's the end of your career. [...] it don't come very easily to women, promotions don't, they're not handed to you on a plate, we have to work very, very hard for them.

In this construction, women are positioned as having to "prove" themselves to the male managers who decide promotions. In this way, discourses create material reality by structuring career progression. This contrasts with Richard's construction of men

"dragging" women up the hierarchy as they are unable to judge their talents themselves.

Instead of recognition of the existence of discourses, practices and policies which structure expectations and working lives according to sex at SYMP, the absence of women from management is accounted for by male managers by 'blaming' women. This 'blame' is built into the discourse of women - that women choose not to work there. John constructed the production side of the work as "men's work", acknowledged that there are not women in management positions, and then suggested that women *choose* not to work in certain types of job because it is dirty and that this is *because they are women* (which affirms the similar point raised by Richard). This constructs women as deliberately choosing not to work in management despite the best efforts of male managers. Coupled with the construction of the existence of sexual equality and equal opportunities this transfers the locus of explanation away from SYMP as an employer that practises masculinity.

> *So why is SYMP dominated by men?*
> *Tom:* The main reason, the predominance of the male population at SYMP, is out on the shop floor, and I would suggest it's not the sort of job that a female would want to do anyway.

More explicitly, Derek explains the absence of women from management by reference to the lack of interest shown by women in posts at the company, placing the onus for the lack of female applicants completely onto women. The dominance of men is therefore accounted for by women's lack of "desire" to work there, not the employer's responsibility. Like Richard, Derek (who holds a very important position in SYMP's industrial relations, personnel matters and staff recruitment) refuses to acknowledge that he or his colleagues differentially value men and women workers. However, he does state that this is because it is *illegal* to do so, before actually drawing distinctions. Despite being a discussion about women in management, Derek again employed the physicality debate that is used to explain women's absence from the shopfloor:

> *Derek:* we certainly don't preclude females from applying and eventually getting a job. Suitable, capable. I would think that because of our nature, sometimes you've got to be careful. I know there should be no distinction between female and males, it's illegal, but you got to look at .. er .. in some jobs there's a physical limitation. There's some jobs I couldn't do, and I'll openly admit it. So, you can argue that there's some jobs that ladies couldn't do. Equally so. It's not because of their sex, it's not because they are female, it's because of the physical limitations that there may be there. Probably.

The absence of women is therefore constructed as women not being "suitable" or "capable" for these positions. But the dominant point is that women choose other

work. Derek returns to the discourse that women choose not to work for SYMP, and like Richard complains about the total lack of female applicants for jobs:

> *Derek:* out of two hundred applicants, we never had one female. The advert didn't say 'males only', you can't do that now. Even if you could we wouldn't. [...] We do not preclude women from any applications at all, right? If you go through those application forms, the bulk are from men.

Derek suggests that if women try hard enough they will succeed. They only have themselves to blame, therefore, if they do not:

> *Derek:* But if a woman has got a huge desire in her, she'll get there.

Whilst the dearth of applications from women continues, any prospect of change in the position of women at SYMP does not look promising. The company apparently sees no need to change its recruitment policy, and it is not taking any measures to counter the male dominance. The situating of the explanation for the absence of women with women themselves is thrown into doubt by the company's recruitment policy:

> *Would you say SYMP does anything to encourage women workers, because you say there may be jobs women wouldn't want to do, but would SYMP want more?*
> *Tom:* If a vacancy arises, and it's very rarely that we now advertise externally, it always goes out as an internal vacancy, and anybody can apply, everybody is always given an interview, male, female whatever. They're judged on their own abilities, but, mainly people will sell themselves here to the male.

With most job appointments being made internally to the company, SYMP only occasionally advertises the posts externally. Since men make up the majority of the workforce, it will obviously be men who continue to get any jobs which arise. This will make it even more difficult for women to break into SYMP. There is no active attempt by the firm to break down the traditional monopoly and dominance by men. There does not appear much prospect of transformation of the dominant discourses of the sexes whilst this scenario remains, and so the sexual and spatial division of labour is likely to be continually reproduced. This is reflected in Tom's acknowledgement that amongst the managers the discursively constructed characteristics of men are regarded as of greater value than those of women and that there is a conscious choice made to hire men for employment. This suggests that there is a deliberate effort to reproduce management as male because women are constructed as less capable of undertaking these jobs. The consequence is dissatisfaction amongst women; this feeling is recognised by SYMP, but it is not acted upon:

> *Are there many women in the world of metal products?*
> *John:* Yes, within the administration there's quite a few ladies around, yes. Very few in managerial posts, that's the problem.
> *Is it seen as a problem?*
> *John:* It's a problem as far as they're concerned, they feel like they're second class citizens, second rate. This is a problem.

This suggests that women in the firm experience an 'inferiorisation', that men and the 'masculine' are more highly regarded than women and the 'feminine'. The problem for

SYMP is constructed as women *experiencing* this preference for the male and 'masculine', not the actual absence of women from management.

Overall, these examples have emphasised the importance of particular personalities within any organisation. Richard, especially, and Derek, to a lesser degree, have workplace authority which makes the acceptance of their discourses more likely. It would be easier for them if they believed in sexual equality (as is claimed) to pursue this in practice by exercising equality in their interactions with women and by, for instance, not discriminating against female applicants for jobs or by pursuing an active recruitment of women into the workplace. They have the opportunities to shape discourses and practices within their workplace. As it is, their positions of authority uphold and reinforce the dominant discourses of the sexes which perpetuate sexual inequalities. As will be shown, in the Department it is again one influential individual's (Peter Collins) authority that enables particular discourses of women which run contrary to the official university policy of Equal Opportunities to dominate because of his influential positioning within the framework's hierarchy. In this way, the "institutionalisation" of masculinity is embodied by individuals in authority through the interactions and relationships between men and women on an everyday basis. When discourses continue to construct women and men as "different" (and therefore continue to position them differently within the regulatory framework) are not challenged but are upheld (whether actively or through passive complicity), there is no possibility of movement towards a progressive sexual politics of change.

LIVING AND WORKING WITH RICHARD BROWN

Therefore, it has been illustrated how management's discourses of masculinity affect the division of labour within the company and, more specifically, how women's careers are structured by these discourses. Male managers appear to 'police' the 'masculine' position from occupation by women. However, Richard's discourses of masculinity as a manager have other significant consequences. The articulation of discourses of masculinity by Richard is apparent in his everyday interactions with colleagues, notably female colleagues. It emerges that their form (and success in gaining acceptance) differ between home and work and are mutually constitutive. His discourses of women at *home* provide the foundation for his interactions with women at *work*. In the latter it again appears that workplace authority increases ability to influence power relations. Therefore, Richard Brown exemplifies both the situational contingency of masculinity and the spatialisation of sex discourses. In playing out discourses in the workplace, he

actively constructs 'masculine' as superior and 'feminine' as inferior and so reinforces the dominant discourses which prevail at SYMP.

Paradoxically, the first interview with Richard (on work) took place at his home whilst the second was held in his office and centred upon home life. He stated that he felt he was different in some ways when at home and at work:

> Richard: At work, I think I'm pretty sharp, whereas at home I do tend to be more laid back.

This 'dual personality' was noted by Ned who commented that once he is outside work Richard is "a completely different person". Richard's personality and actions at work seem to be derived from, or reflected in, the home. Richard is positioned as "the breadwinner" in relation to Anthea (his wife) who is clearly defined as "home maker" in his constructions. He takes charge of the family finances and sees to all the household budgeting, whilst Anthea does almost all the domestic work (constructed as internalised by her):

> So what about everyday shopping, food shopping, who tends to do that?
> Richard: Anthea takes responsibility for it. In fact, she feels very strongly that that's her role [...]
> What about things like housework, how does that get
> Richard: Housework? She stops me doing it because she doesn't like to think her husband's doing housework. She almost thinks it's an implied criticism.

Anthea is constructed as having self-defined her "role" as the household worker, which she perpetuates by preventing Richard doing domestic tasks. Richard does not appear to challenge Anthea's characterisation and he seems happy to let this situation continue; she does almost all of the domestic work despite being a night worker (and although Richard is a qualified chef):

> Richard: She feels slightly criticised as though I'm implying it's dirty and she should have cleaned it. Now, though that's not intended, I can't get over that. [...] But if we ever fall out over something, it's that.

Richard defines himself as the 'ruler' of the family: he prides himself upon being authoritarian with his family, that they have to do things because he tells them:

> Richard: I'm a bit old fashioned, I think quite rightly so. I lay down rules and standards and I'm not afraid to say 'I say so because I'm your father and that's the reason it's got to be done'. Because I believe, despite being a very modern person - I believe in equality of women and men and I believe to some extent in the equality of young people to be able to hold views and opinions of their own from quite a young age - I still believe a good slap round the legs of the little kids. I will box their ears if they need it. I will bawl and shout to create order in my home, and I will exercise almost Victorian parental decision making powers if I think it is in the interests of my children, but I will never do so over my wife, but in the kids, as far as I'm concerned, they are my children and while they are in my house, they will do as I say. Whilst I give them tremendous scope, if I decide that that is going to be done, no arguments, I say so, 'it's my home, my house, I'm you father, it's going to be done that way.'

At home, where he feels a lot more relaxed and less sharp, Richard exercises control over his family who must do as he says because he says so and because the house is *his* home. This is a non-negotiable relationship. For Richard this is congruent with his self-definition as "a very modern person". Again, he stresses his belief in equality between the sexes, but his practices are tangential to his intentions and they uphold his discourses by affording the 'masculine' greater value than the 'feminine'. Richard creates and perpetuates this construction through actions which inferiorise women and construct them as subservient to him and other men. There is a precedent set from his home, therefore, that Richard is in control of himself and those around him and from his wife that it is women who undertake domestic tasks which includes catering for him as a man - women do jobs for men. This household 'ruler' role carries over into SYMP: Richard has both his wife and Emma running round after him.

Emma experiences the discourses of masculinity revealed by Richard and other male managers' practices to draw directly upon the construction of women as servicers of men and with home-centred identities. Emma's belief is that women are confined to a role: at home they are expected to take charge of men's domestic requirements, whilst they are expected to carry this role into the paid workplace by occupying ancillary and servicing positions. This is played out in her relationship with Richard. In Emma's construction, this is reinforced by men's treatment of women in the workplace as inferior and subordinate and as present to service them and carry out their orders:

> *Emma:* you find that the men managers and supervisors treat you as though you are there to do as they say, as though you're there, they've got the attitude that you're in their household. 'I want this done, and you're going to do it now', so to speak. And they treat you as though you haven't got any brains, you're just stupid.

Emma experiences the treatment of women to be based within the discourses of women as appropriately placed within the home and as undertaking tasks which are the appropriate concerns of women - the work which is not men's work, things which service men. This means being treated as "stupid" and as there to service men:

> *Emma:* They treat you so like you're their lackey, as though you've got to do as they say, and nobody else is important. It gets quite upsetting at times. [...]
> *So how do you cope with that?*
> *Emma:* Ignore them. Ignore them. You have to. I could get into a right latch if I didn't ignore them, because I've got a bad attitude.

The consequence of this for Emma is an uneasy working relationship with Richard, with conflict revolving around his treatment of her. She feels treated like a child and not credited with having any intelligence - she is readily dismissed:

> *Emma:* Richard and I haven't got, I mean we've got a good working relationship, but we've also got a bad working relationship, like a clash of personalities, and I'm very, I've got a lot upstairs, and I don't need to be tret [treated] like a child, and I

seem to get tret like a child. If they tell you to do something they go through it literally word for word, and I'm like 'yeah, yeah, I can do that'. It annoys me. [...] they like to think that they treat you like an adult, but they don't. If your face fits here, you're well in.

Being "treated like an adult" seems to mean being treated like a man and those who are not men - women and children - are similarly constructed as 'inferior' and to be submissive to men. Emma feels that because she is a woman she is treated like a child - as less intelligent and as learning from adults (men) - which broadly corresponds to the ways Richard treats his own children. In these discourses, being a child automatically positions one as subordinate and inferior. Treating women as if they were children has the same effect - de-valuing. Without the same workplace authority, Emma's discourses are unable to take precedence in relation to Richard's in the "clash of personalities", thereby reducing Emma's ability to influence the power relations between the two of them.

I attended an induction meeting led by Richard and Emma that consisted of a brief talk about the firm's history, the main labour processes involved in the manufacture of metal products and the changes which the company is embarking upon. This was followed by a tour of the factories. Richard presented the induction, but Emma has been trained to shortly to take over the task from him. On a number of occasions Richard directed his presentation explicitly towards Emma rather than the audience. During these asides Richard continually referred to Emma as "love", which appeared to greatly annoy and offend her; she finds such language patronising:

I've noticed when I've been around that women tend to get called 'love' and that.
Emma: Yeah. They think they're being friendly though don't they? Some women don't like it, others think it's lovely. I don't.
I noticed Richard Brown the other day calling you 'love' a few times.
Emma: You get used to it.

When Richard received a call on his bleeper, he asked Emma whose number it was, which she knew. He then ordered her to return the call, which she did begrudgingly - she is not directly responsible to Richard. Apparently it is common for him to make expectations such as this on women - Emma experiences this as reflective of his lack of respect and trust for women and of a more general treatment of women as inferior to men at SYMP. There is an expectation that women will do jobs for men:

And he expected you to take his phone call for him.
Emma: Yeah, he's very, very dictatorship. That's the sort of relationship which he has with women. With men he's totally different. It's a long process, it's took me four and a half years to get respect from people, for people to trust me, and that's quite a long time. That should develop over two years, not four and a half years, and there still isn't that trust there or respect and you still get tret as their rag cloth or whatever. It's a very, very slow process.

Clearly, Richard moderates his behaviours according to whether he is interacting with women or men - by activating discourses of men and women as 'superior' and 'different' masculinity is being practised situationally. The dictatorial set-up that reflects Richard's home life is carried over into the work setting as well: this ensures he retains a position that leaves him 'in charge' and able to control those people around him, whether family or work colleagues. The ideology which Richard adopts to permit his dominance of his family is the same as that employed during the day with fellow employees. Richard is able to draw upon *authority*, and this provides him a "tangible" power which he can utilise - he and whoever he interacts with are differentially positioned with the framework's hierarchy.

Richard tried to make Emma look incompetent and less knowledgeable than himself (and thus forge himself as superior) on other occasions during the induction. Richard led the meeting and created a superior subject position for himself and an inferiorised one for Emma through his actions. During the presentation he often spoke directly to her saying "you won't know this". When he put up a slide on the overhead projector of a map of the factories and local transport routes he questioned her knowledge by wrongly saying: "You haven't seen this slide before have you?" to Emma's annoyance. A few minutes later he added "You haven't seen this video" at which point she looked *very* annoyed and insulted. Her only response was a change of subject, which seemed to act as a way of taking pressure off herself: "Is that pop for us, Richard?" "Of course it is, love." After a brief video about the company's history, Richard went to another meeting and left Emma "in charge" - waiting with us until the tour guide arrived. In many ways, the session had been conducted as if the staff inductees had not been present and was centred more around their interaction than around an introduction to the company. Richard seemed to be trying to "score points" over Emma. In these practices (of masculinity) there is a reinforcement of men and the 'masculine' as superior by being in charge and giving orders, and women and the 'feminine' as inferior through being put down and made to be of men's service.[3] They involve the active construction of differentially valued subject positions. I observed many of Richard's interactions of women to hinge on a treatment of them as stupid, of little value and as the subject of humour. After the induction tour, I went back to his

---

[3] On another occasion, Emma was put into a situation where her boss (Derek) tried to portray her as incompetent. During one interview Derek came into the office looking for a file, which he could not locate on his own. He commented that Emma's filing system has a "secret code". In fact the system was perfectly fine and she found the file for him in exactly the place it should have been. As he left, she gave him a V-sign.

office for an interview. He invited me to sit down even though he was meeting someone. I felt uncomfortable sitting in on this person's conversation. Richard was talking to a woman from the canteen, who he frequently called "love". She was asking him for career advice about vocational qualifications; he told her that she must be computer literate (he had said to me that he cannot use computers and so gets a secretary to do all his typing) and asked did she have a computer at home? She did not. When she asked him for another appointment this week, he said to her very sternly:

Richard: bad, bad, bad. Four o'clock, tomorrow. Wednesday. Okay, love. No matter, flower, not to worry.

He then made fun of her and mocked her to me when she attempted to use his recoiled OHP 'pointer' thinking it was a pen - he told her that she will have to do better than that. She left red-faced. Richard then turned to me and said "I'm trying to think of that girl's name, it'll come to me in a second" - the use of the word 'girl' had the effect of 'infantilising' a woman who was only a few years younger than him. In this situation I felt I had acted as a means of reinforcing this gender construction by being encouraged to laugh at the woman's mistake. By not challenging Richard's actions I was complicit: my 'maleness' was being used to support the forging of women as inferior to validate this inequality.

Despite Richard's obvious exercises of power, this is not to suggest that they go unchallenged or that they are passively accepted. The discourses of masculinity which are revealed are met with strategies of resistance and other 'survival' mechanisms. Emma's way of coping with Richard's instructive style is to get in "a right latch", to be moody and give out visual signs of disgruntlement and so show that she is not morally approving his manner if not openly defying it. Its success, however, is less easy to discern - Richard has not changed his practices and Emma still experiences a lack of value nearly five years into the job. Her 'resistance' may not change these practices, but it does allow Emma to manage her anger and resentment and to 'survive' this environment. During the interview with Richard in his home, Anthea challenged his actions on a couple of occasions by telling him off for talking down to her. This provides a comparison of Richard's interactions with Emma and other women and the form resistance against them takes. Clearly, he regards women as subordinate and calls them patronising names and treats Emma, for example, as his dogsbody. His attempts to do the same with Anthea are received with a more open reaction: telling him off. As his wife, perhaps Anthea has more capability to "fight back". The workplace status and authority which sanction his actions at SYMP mean female

employees are less well positioned to have any recourse, whilst although he considers himself the home 'controller' Richard has much less tangible authority to back up his attempts to determine power relations in the home setting. With his children his dominance is dependent upon the reasoning 'you'll do what I say because I say so' but supported by the threat of physical intimidation and a financial control-dependency relationship, and this is either not used or not accepted by his wife. In this way, utilising a discourse of women as home-concerned in the workplace is more successful than practising his workplace inferiorising of women in the home. Therefore, it illustrates further the contingency of masculinity and again highlights the importance of the location where power relations / interactions take place.

Summary

The focus upon SYMP has shown Richard Brown's personality to be an influential force in shaping the gender relations in that workplace. It was shown that although his publicly stated attitudes were pro-equality, his discourses and practices were founded in (and perpetuated) sexual inequalities and therefore reflected the "exercise" of masculinity. It was argued that the institution's failure to recruit female members of staff was probably caused by a policy of internal promotion, which effectively reproduces the company's numerical male dominance and prevents an infusion of 'new blood', particularly of women. Managers within the company accounted for this dominance through a construction of women as choosing to seek employment elsewhere, particularly in environments which suit the previously outlined discursive constructions of women.

Focus was then placed more explicitly upon practices within individual interactions that revealed discourses of masculinity, with particular attention given to the relationship between Richard and Emma. It was shown how the 'feminine' was actively situationally constructed with attempts to embarrass or cast her as stupid or incompetent (similar to Ned and Norma earlier). It also became apparent that the constitution and negotiation of discourses in space is important in the practice of masculinity. Richard practices the same discourses in both home and work spaces and manages to construct himself as superior to those around him in both; the success of this is facilitated in the workplace by his authority in relation to other staff. As shown in Part Two, Emma's resistance to discourses of women appears easier in the home where she only has to convey her views to her husband than in the workplace where discourses which place her as a woman to be less valued are much more deeply

embedded in institutional structures and in the sanctioning of the discourses of male managers through their workplace authority. This again emphasises the situationally contingent practice of masculinity and its resistance; the exercise of power and counter-strategies are dependent upon particular conditions and relationships. The institutional context makes the creation and acceptance of counter-discourses much more difficult.

Richard regards himself as an upholder of equality and egalitarianism. Therefore, his *intentions* are stated to be pro-women and pro-equal rights, a belief in breaking down barriers across sex, race and class. This contrasts sharply with the *discourses* of sex which he actually constructs and is implicated in, and his behaviours - the *practice* of masculinity. The interviews highlighted those inconsistencies between theory and practice which allow masculinity to be practised 'unconsciously': the contradictions in the intentions-discourse-practice nexus similar to those discussed in relation to Sean in Part Two. This underscores an important part of analysis - understanding the *result* of the construction of any one discourse, not exploring *why* a discourse was originally promulgated; that is, placing less emphasis upon intentionality and more upon consequences of practices.

> That *they* [members of the London Fire Brigade] see them [their discourses] as truth, which they undoubtedly do, should be taken to indicate the close connection between rhetoric and experienced situation, not their essential truth. (Salaman 1986: 82)

The contradictions in the nexus contribute to the success of the exercise of power:

> the success of power is proportional to its ability to hide its own mechanisms ... for its secrecy is not in the nature of an abuse; it is indispensable to its operation. (Foucault 1978: 86)

More than just disguising power, the "disguise" is itself the effect of power; in Richard's case, he and SYMP are constructed as pro-equality, yet both utilise discursive constructions that justify the existence of sexual inequalities. Thus, caution needs to be exercised in the interpretation of the words and actions of study participants (and, indeed, everyone who is encountered in life): they should not be accepted at 'face value'. The intentions-discourses-practices nexus also cautions analysts of the difficulty in judging *change* (or at least positive change). Richard and Sean express a belief in equality and (although one seems far more genuine than the other), they both reproduce dominant discourses. Their 'changing' attitudes reveal nothing about their practices.

The concept of *conformity* also emerged from these examples. Dominant discourses pressure conformity to certain expectations of what is an appropriate identity, type of work or 'personality' for one as a man or a woman. In interactions with Richard, the expectation created for Emma is to willingly accept his orders and instructions and to acknowledge his self-positioning as 'in charge', which she does generally conform to. All the male managers I spoke to in this study can be said to be conforming to a 'management' expectation. This involves distancing oneself from discourses of women ('non-managers') to display the likemindedness which they share with others positioned as managers in the hierarchy. Emma has met with various expectations upon her as a woman - to mother her husband at home and to be of service to men at work. It appears that after on-going resistance to these expectations, she is now conforming to these discourses by taking the home as her first priority in life and giving up on conforming to the "career woman" model which accesses occupation of the 'masculine' position. Pressures to conform are as apparent in the Department as at SYMP. However, the form they take is different. In the Department, the pressure is to match a certain way of working which helps secure promotion to higher status and higher paying positions. At SYMP the pressure is much more directly to conform to discourses of sex first and then to the discourses of appropriate gendered work. Therefore, the situation is reversed in the Department - the pressure is to conform to a way of working which is apparently gender-neutral, but which has gendered effects in perpetuating sexual inequalities.

Section Five showed how the "sex differences" which form the basis for the further exercise of power are created and perpetuated in the Department. The consequence of the discursive construction of sex "differences" is the maintenance of inequalities between the sexes, even direct discrimination in job appointments, starting salaries and promotion. However, its appearance remains disguised because of: an apparent numerical 'equality' between male and female members of staff; denial that it could exist when there is an Equal Opportunities policy in operation; and the explaining of any inequalities as the expected consequences of 'natural' differences between the sexes. In fact, policies and actions, such as the Research Assessment Exercise / Teaching Quality Assessment and Equal Opportunities programmes, which appear to either be gender 'neutral' or designed to remove sexual inequalities, actually maintain and reproduce these inequalities, thereby institutionalising masculinity.

7. DISGUISING THE PRACTICE OF MASCULINITY

Thus, it is proposed in this section that masculinity is practised in the Department, but that its occurrence is not obviously apparent. Its "disguise" (Simpson 1994) is reflected by the academics' blindness to discriminatory practices - there was very little acknowledgement of any sexual inequalities in this workplace. It will be argued that this invisibility is because the causes are not acknowledged as sex-based. Their causes are:

- gender-specific consequences of apparently gender-neutral policies (such as the RAE);
- the assumed 'naturalness' of sex differences;
- the construction of discursive expectations as the 'natural' consequence of these sex differences.

Therefore, they are not conceptualised as practices of masculinity by the majority of the academics who were interviewed.

The approximate numerical equality between male and female staff (unusual in any university department) forms an important function in the disguising of masculinity - it has taken 'sex' off the political agenda:

> *Paul:* sex, gender, I suppose, is not an issue because there is roughly equality.
> The only thing there's not equality in is senior staff.

This constructs inequalities in status which are a vital component of practising masculinity in relational interactions (and which were shown in Section Five to favour researchers, primarily men, in the Department) as less important than the presence of women in the workplace. Numbers of women are constructed as less important than inequalities in professional status which determine positioning in the discursive hierarchy. From this construction, Jack is able to dismiss any inequalities as a temporary situation:

> *Jack:* On the whole, they're the more junior partly because a lot of the females are relatively new staff. They'll get there.

However, it was shown earlier that women are unlikely "to get there" (echoing the phrase used by Derek at SYMP) because their opportunities for promotion are constrained by the teaching focus of their jobs. Although many of the female staff are new to the Department, others have been unsuccessfully trying for promotion for many years:

> *Margaret:* I can certainly think of one person who has just left who was very dissatisfied and I thought she was shabbily treated. She didn't get upgraded, I thought she should have had a chair before she left. She left as a senior lecturer and I can think of another colleague who has been here an awful long time. When

I look upon it, she is a very good teacher, but you have a sense that she's given up [sighs].

Like Margaret's construction of one or two women having "given up", Kate suggests that there is a "glass ceiling" to women's careers which is effectively a "brick wall" (which Margaret says she can testify to as one of the most senior women in the university). Kate also commented that a recent common room discussion had revealed conflicting opinions on sexual inequalities - whilst newer female staff did not perceive any bars on them as women, longer serving women told them to "wait and see ... you have a lot to learn" (Kate). Sally is typical of newer staff, and although she is aware of sexual inequalities in terms of status, she rejects that she will be affected:

> Sally: There's only four or five female professors in the university, there must be something holding them back. Whether it's subconscious, I don't know. [...] As far as my promotion is concerned, my promotion will be to senior lecturer, I have no doubt that there will be no discrimination against me.

Again, it appears that numerical equality is assumed to suggest equality:

> Valerie: Maybe it's because we feel more comfortable that we don't feel we have to be particularly radical because there's enough of us, because there's a reasonable balance, so we feel that we don't have to be particularly radical.

Similar reasoning was expressed by Roger who argued that there is no discrimination on the grounds that "the majority of our staff are female I would say". Others suggested that numerical equivalence reflected the university's position as an 'equal opportunities employer'. However, this can serve as a "disclaimer":

> This statement has consequences both for applicants and for existing women staff who seek promotion because, in the absence of substantive activities which lead to the implementation of policies that clearly *would* equalize the position of women in relation to men, the *claim* to practise equality of opportunity is actively damaging to women. This is because the statement comes to be accepted by men as a representation of the truth. (McAuley 1987: 162)

From these constructions, it appears that the numerical equivalence which is invoked to exemplify equality may actually perpetuate sexual inequalities, encouraging acceptance of a status quo and obscuring a consequence of masculinity.

The lack of recognition of inequalities is not related solely to staff numbers. There is dismissal of the existence of any discrimination:

> Jonathan: I haven't come across any. [...] you only know that it's there when you come into contact with it

For Paul, discrimination means "discriminating on the basis of a distinction that doesn't exist". This was exemplified when talking about international students who are treated less favourably because their cultural background is different: "I wouldn't call that discrimination in any form". However, what constitutes "a basis that does exist"? Is the hiring of women on an unfair salary scale justifiable on the grounds that women vary from the 'norm' (the experience of men) just as international students do to home

students: "on the basis of a distinction that does exist"? The suggestion is that there are 'natural' differences which exist between people and which account for inequalities. This provides the justification for inequalities which result from the practice of masculinity (and constitutes such a practice itself). Paul went on to comment:

> *Paul:* I'm a great believer that it's always impossible to get away from unintentional discrimination.

Thus, whilst Paul recognises women's lower professional status, the reason is morally approved as the expected consequence of 'nature': he explained the situation as resulting from women's child care responsibilities which make it difficult for them to compete for promotion and maintain the high level of work required to do the job. There is awareness that this situation could be analysed as a practice of masculinity; Jack recognises its occurrence as a "political issue", but constructs intentionality as central to the creation of sexual inequalities:

> *Jack:* I don't think there is any discrimination here. It is a very difficult political issue of course, and some would argue that the things that I might do as a male which do discriminate, I may not intend them, but they may do.

Similarly,

> *Sean:* There's no woman who's not been promoted because she's a woman [...] there's not a malicious sexism, there's not a sort of strong misogyny.

This underestimates the extent of some deliberate acts of discrimination and, even if true, highlights that intentions and practice are not mutually connected or complementary. Masculinity's practice does not have to be "malicious" or intentional. It should be measured by its consequences: masculinity is a discourse which perpetuates sexual inequality. Throughout this thesis it has been emphasised that practices and the maintenance of underlying discourses of masculinity are perpetuated by even the most trivial of acts, attitudes and behaviours. Foucault (1972) termed this "intentionality without subjectivity": in this example, practices which have the consequence of perpetuating sexual inequalities are analysable as masculinity whatever the intentions behind this action.

It was also put forward that rather than there being any discrimination in the Department, particularly against women, it is women who are advantaged:

> *Roger:* there's obviously differences, but often that's because people treat the job in different ways. An ambitious female gets on just as well as an ambitious male, if not better. [...] I think females sometimes when they're not getting what they want, they think it [sex] makes a difference.

This implies that, if anything, it is easier to get on as a woman and that sex discrimination is adopted as an excuse for women not progressing as quickly as hoped in their career. This is similar to SYMP, where Richard suggested that equality

between the sexes does exist, and that any woman who claims to have experienced any form of sex discrimination is doing so to excuse her own failures. The promulgation of this discourse has the consequence of further widening inequalities by dismissing the grounds on which anti-discrimination is based and stimulates inactivity by suggesting there is no problem upon which to act. Differences are explained as 'natural': women are mothers therefore they cannot compete for promotion, men are physically more capable therefore they have the best paying jobs at SYMP etc. Trevor recognised the absence of women from senior status positions and indicated that this is possibly a reflection of discrimination, but felt that the senior women did not deserve their positions in the first place. It was proposed that they have succeeded because of personal friendships and having people willing to do things for them (unlike him who has always been without such support). This constructs a discourse within which any discrimination actually favours women, despite the recognition that there are inequalities in the Department between men and women and that it is men who occupy almost all senior positions.

INTERNALISATION OF PROMOTION CRITERIA AND THE GENDERED EFFECTS OF 'NEUTRAL' POLICIES AND PRACTICES.

A significant cause of these inequalities relates to the consequences of certain policies which, as an organisation, the university is party to. The most significant is the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) but also Teaching Quality Assessment (TQA) and to some extent the inefficacy of the Equal Opportunities policy. In recent years there has been a radical transformation in the duties of university lecturers. There are three key reasons: reform of university resourcing has hugely increased student numbers without corresponding funding increases; the implementation of semesterisation and modularisation has increased workload, particularly administrative duties; most significantly, the introduction of TQA and the RAE has created competition for resources between universities, departments, and lecturers. The effect is increased by a general internalisation of the criteria set down by these policies. The institutional objective is the same as those of many individuals who want promotion - production of high quality research.

Staff reported that the result has been a massive upsurge in the amount of work which they have been expected to complete:

> *Ros:* It's changed the speed at which things have to happen a lot, and it's produced, not just for me, but for everybody in the entire place, an enormous extra strain [...] There's no more time for anything to go wrong, there's no slack.

These pressures have increasingly structured lecturing jobs and led to a new set of work expectations. Many have found these changes difficult to adapt to given little ability to moderate their work and expectations upon them because the forces of change are *external*, originating from university and government policies:

> *Paul:* the university's changed dramatically since I've been here in terms of the expectations and the type of job that you do.

This is especially true because the job had previously allowed a degree of individual flexibility. The RAE, for instance, has heightened the relative importance attached to production and publication of research. This is a significant change in the Department as there is now considerable pressure upon everyone to consistently produce research:

> *Is it important to you to be successful?*
> *Geoff:* More so now than at the start of my career. At the start of my career there was absolutely no pressure upon you at all to publish. Nothing whatsoever. Some might in fact have looked down on it. Nowadays there's all kinds of pressure upon you to write, publish widely, write in scholarly journals, refereed journals, which will push up our ranking. That I find quite a strain.

The objective is to improve the research rating that the Department will be awarded in the next round of the RAE. The consequence is that those wishing to get promotion are under pressure to produce high quality research, consistently. Kate, for example, acknowledges her chances of promotion have been curtailed by her transfer to half-time status because of its teaching focus:

> *Kate:* because I'm half-time I have a fairly realistic view of my promotion prospects which aren't very high, so I'm probably less worried about what people think about my research level than perhaps other people who do full-time.

The institution and individual have become mutually reinforcing - there is institutional pressure to conform to the Department's emphasis on research and this plays into individual academics' desire to gain promotion, which has been made contingent upon research:

> *Sally:* You have to change your work in order to get promoted around here. [...] The longer you stay here it seems the less important is your teaching, and the emphasis falls upon your administration and your research. It's all driven by promotion. If you want promotion there are certain things that you should be seen to be doing. [...] So more emphasis is upon research, research in good quality journals, and developing your name in an area. [...] Promotion is the only thing which makes you do certain things in a certain way.

Not only has pressure developed to do research and to get promotion, but the way that promotion is gained has also been influenced and it is a point where practices of masculinity become particularly evident.

> *Sally:* if you want to be promoted, you have to play the game, and there it is important to take into account *what people say about you*. Promotion rounds occur about now and you have feedback from the promotions committee, head of department has a little chat with you and says 'the committee thinks you should do x, y, and z to be promoted'. If that's the committee that's going to be looking at you

in a year or two years time you'd be a fool not to take it on board. I want to be promoted, so I take that into account. [emphasis added]

As Sally comments, success in gaining promotion requires a degree of *conformity* by members of staff to standards and objectives set by those in authority. Not only does this mean emphasising the role of research in one's work profile and to formal procedural objectives, but also to *"personalities"*. There is also a 'spin-off' effect that the academics feel they are becoming chronically over-worked; although over-work is 'gender-neutral', it has consequences which affect the discourses of the sexes in the workplace.

i) Overworking and its effects.

Achieving promotion invariably involves working exceptionally long hours. A survey by the university staff union the Association of University Teachers (AUT) reported that university staff averaged a working week of 55 hours, with female professors averaging 65.5 hours per week (AUT 1994). A quarter of this load was found to be undertaken in staff's "free time" of the evenings and weekends, whilst forty percent of all personal research and scholarship "which are vital for achieving academic excellence" were found to be done in this time (AUT 1994). Hence, the aspect of the job most important to promotion - research - is largely pushed into one's 'unpaid' time, creating a choice between work / promotion and 'leisure' (in whatever form), which also creates personal stress:

> *Kate:* I would be very surprised if you came across anybody who said they never did any work at home. It's the nature of the job. It's a bit like war, moments of boredom and moments of complete terror.
> *Margaret:* it can move very quickly from the job being enjoyable to suddenly it becoming so stressful, I just think about walking out and chucking it in.

This situation is perceived as worsening, particularly compared to just a few years previously:

> *Jane:* Since I've been here it has definitely changed and the pressure has upped considerably. When I first came here I thought I was almost on holiday, because when I'd been working in practice it was more stressful and frenetic and the pressure there was tremendous. I now feel I'm actually working harder than when I was in private practice.

The work patterns found by the AUT are reflected by Trevor who stated that you need "a fantastic amount of energy" and "lots of ambition" to succeed, adding that:

> *Trevor:* if you can work fourteen hours a day, seven days a week that's basically what you need to be able to do it.

This is precisely what he does, with the consequence that he spends very little time with his family:

> *Trevor:* when I go home at night, the chances are that my family won't see me apart from just around dinner time and late afternoon.

Trevor is working like this with the sole intention of attaining the goal of his life - getting promotion.

The increasing number of work hours has left Geoff feeling that he is failing in life both as a "family man" and as a lecturer since he never has as much time to spend with his family as he would like:

> *Do you have any hobbies or pastimes?*
> *Geoff:* This again is a worry. Not really. I could say, you know, the wife and children.

The increase of the workload infringes the "free" time of members of staff in the Department. This will obviously have a differential effect upon staff according to the level of child care that they engage. [This may not necessarily mean that women's lives will be more pressured or that they are a child's primary care giver, but it is the case that the discourse of women regards women as predominantly concerned with family care interests, and indeed pressures them into fulfilling these expectations and that it is a fact that men spend less time on child care than women]. It is common for work to affect home life. Jack, who himself works from 8am until 6pm in the office and at home in the evenings and at weekends, gave an account of a former academic colleague who "retired" from family life:

> *Jack:* the academic basically retired from family life in any real meaningful sense because he locked himself away in his study at home and worked most of the time. He had very little to do with the bringing up of his children.

Jack does not spend very much time with his family, and expresses regret that he had children and married someone who did not share the same job. Perhaps the situation Jack describes is not very different from his own. Brian recognises that working late and long hours will have a detrimental effect on families, and that for someone to be able to work under these conditions and have a family requires someone being "lumbered" with the children, invariably the wife / female partner.

> *Brian:* if I told my wife 'oh god we've got a departmental meeting, I'm not going to be home till seven o'clock on Friday' or whatever, what the hell does that say about equal opportunities? I'm saying to my wife you're lumbered with the kids right? [...] I realise that there are a lot of women who work in academic life, but it seems to me that it must be particularly difficult for them, as well, if the expectations are that you're going to be working till seven o'clock on a Friday night.

Brian's construction positions women as responsible for child care, as does the Equal Opportunities policy. The university's Equal Opportunities policy is operated for students and staff and its objective is the elimination of discrimination, whether by sex, race, religion, class, sexuality. However, the policy actually institutionalises masculinity though appearing to do the opposite: it perpetuates sexual inequalities and distinct discourses of the sexes despite its stated intention to equalise inequalities. It also

reproduces the inequalities between the sexes which exist at a social scale. It treats everyone as on "a level playing field" (Margaret) and is designed to prevent discrimination in the workplace. However, there are no measures to equalise inequalities outside the workplace which ultimately affect inequalities in the workplace. That there are no child care provisions and that it is assumed women will undertake direct care giving obviously advantages men (like Brian) at work:

> The achievement of equal opportunities requires the position of men to be subject to scrutiny and change. The corollary of equal opportunities and responsibilities for women is equal responsibilities and *opportunities* in family life for men: work and family both involve burdens and pleasures, which more equally shared would benefit both sexes, adults and children. (Moss and Fonda 1980: 16)

Therefore, the requirement is conditions which enable joint and equal involvement and opportunities in the home and workplace for both sexes. All half-time staff are women who have reduced their hours in order to be their family's primary child care giver. Effectively, this action means that they practically work full-time but have their evenings free:

> *Kate:* The fact that I'm half-time just means that I work full-time but I do it at home, and I don't work in the evenings whereas my full-time colleagues work in the evenings. That's about the only distinction really. [...] You do three-quarters. If you ask any of the half-time staff, they would more or less say that that's how it works out.

However, becoming half time limits these women's careers - promotion as a half-timer does not happen (partially because the post is more teaching centred than research focused). Again, the consequence is that the women in the workplace find it difficult to gain promotion as primary care givers (which, of course, is the role which is discursively constructed as appropriate for women). The effect is that men retain a better chance of promotion than do their female colleagues.

ii) Conformity to "rules" through 'internalisation'

The "freedom" which has always been characteristic of the job has begun to give way to a stated-objective job description laid down in the job contract and university criteria for promotion, itself affected by the RAE. There seems to be an internalisation of these criteria so that lecturers are becoming embodiments of these external influences, creating a "compliance culture" (Johnston 1996). There is pressure to adopt characteristics in the job which accord with the criteria laid down for gaining promotion. Characteristics cited as necessary for undertaking this job included strategies to aid the pursuance of promotion, for example, that "you need to be a manager" (Jonathan) or that "one needs a willingness to make sacrifices in terms of one's time to actually do one's studies" (Roger). Jack holds a position of authority and is regarded by himself

and others as a success. He noted that there is a great deal of pressure on staff to achieve success as measured through assessment procedures:

> *Jack:* It is such a competitive game by and large now if you want to get on, and in a place like this there is the pressure to get on, to succeed, to produce, because we are being assessed, constantly assessed, and all that sort of thing on the teaching side and the research side and so on.

It is these criteria which enable him to ascribe the meaning of success:

> *Jack:* If I was still stuck as a lecturer or a senior lecturer doing a fairly more routine job without the handle, the title, without the kudos, I'm not so sure that I would regard myself as a success.

Jack says having a job with a title equates to success in any "objective" sense; in this way, promotion criteria are "objective". It is university assessment criteria which delimit the "successful" and those promotable to positions of authority. The criteria of success are becoming *the* important definition and the one by which most people measure their own success: people's ambitions are achieved within its parameters. It provides the framework within which people work and within which masculinity is practised. This internalisation has become so prevalent that even Valerie's 'subjective' definition of success reflects professional criteria - levels of publication:

> *How do you measure success?*
> *Valerie:* Subjectively, I would say. I suppose it has to do with recognition from your peers. So if you have something published in good, refereed academic journals, you feel that's a measure of success as an academic.

whilst Paul feels it is a "duty" to be successful in terms of promotion ability:

> *Paul:* it's nice to be successful, and you've got the duty to be successful almost. [...] Is it important to be successful in terms of status? Well, that's the reason that you are successful anyway, so you're in the position to be able to say that.

Overall, actions by individuals inside of the department, such as careerism, have become complicit in the implementation and maintenance of the externally imposed conditions of RAE / TQA: these policies require staff to make their posts more 'cost-effective', which means working much harder. Because the Department regards research as its most important function at this time, working harder equates with doing more research. As a result, academics are working excessively and during their own time. Because research is vital to gaining promotion, individual staff also benefit from being research focused and therefore are much more willing to engage themselves in over-working whether this desire for promotion is for more money to fulfil family 'obligations' such as Brian, or for prestige, such as Trevor, or to fulfil one's potential, such as Sally (or, as Massey 1995 suggests, for one's personal enjoyment and satisfaction). Practices of masculinity exercised at social-institutional-individual scales are mutually constituted and mutually reinforcing: this new work 'culture' enforces and reproduces inequalities between the sexes because of differences in the discursive

constructions of the sexes. This merging of the individual's and organisation's objectives is identified by du Gay (1996: 64) as a coming together of (the Foucauldian concepts of) technologies of power and technologies of the self, "both personally attractive and economically desirable" (du Gay 1996: 65).

iii) Conformity to personalities

In the interviews, the promotions system was constructed as dependent upon "personalities" and (like the management system at SYMP) around "important personalities" who measure worthiness for promotion against their own discursive 'checklist'. Key to this checklist is the occupation of the 'masculine' position; this may not be tied to sex, but in some cases discursively constructed sex is a vital determinant. Thus, not only are the standards for promotion constructed as important, but to reach higher status positions it is also necessary to "play the game" and not put the promotion decision-makers 'off-side':

> *Would you say that there are any bars to promotion in the department or in the university more generally?*
> *Sally:* Not formally, but informally, yeah. Personalities clash. Personality can hold people back [...] and that will be it, their promotion prospects ruined. [...] you will annoy certain people, your head of department, professors. If she or he won't play the game, that's it.

Andrew also constructed career progression as aided by conformity to the ways of being of those with authority over you:

> *Andrew:* slight measure of preference has been given to some but not others [...] people who are looking for mobility within the department upwards may wish or would like to line himself or herself, next to the almighty, yes-man or yes-woman, as readily as possible, and if you are not in line with the almighty the chances of moving upwards would be less.

Some of those in authority have told Andrew that there are: "quote 'unfair preferences or practices' that go on." Promotion to the higher status positions requires support from senior members of the Department. For instance, gaining a professorship is not possible without it. Candidates are put forward to the Faculty to compete against other departments' best candidates for promotion. Key personnel decide these candidates. There appears to be a reproduction of particular values; talking about his own problems in getting promoted, Trevor noted:

> *Trevor:* that was purely a matter of politics. It was a matter of who the department was going to support, as the way the senior lectureships system works is very political. [...] very overtly political, and not very savoury.

In his own case, Trevor feels the only thing which has prevented him from his promotion has been a lack of personal support because there have been one or two influential colleagues with whom he has not got on.

Therefore, the academics recognise differential valuing and treatment of colleagues. In Ros's construction it is stressed that this discrimination is against un-sexed "personalities":

> *Ros:* the only discrimination is not racially or sexually or anything like that, it's a personality discrimination. [...] It's a place that functions on various personalities and abilities rather than the actual male or femaleness. Mind you that may be a very idealistic view [...] If there are any complaints about anyone, it's not about whether they are male or female.

Thus, as Sally commented above, it is important to play by the "rules of the game", which are the same for everyone. However, other accounts construct the scenario as having sex-specific consequences and as a practice of masculinity that perpetuates sexual inequalities:

> *Margaret:* At the moment, the women have to do things according to the rules laid down by the men, so the mechanisms, the criteria which are used are very male dominated.
> *Kate:* I think there are structural reasons why there are promotions problems for everybody, not only for women, but I think if you're not prepared to play the game by men's rules, it becomes more difficult.

There is a construction of the promotions procedure as "male dominated" and which are even "structural" - institutionalised. Rather than suggesting, as Margaret does, that these "rules" are written to benefit men, it appears that it is those reflecting the dominant discursively constructed expectations of women who find it particularly difficult to be promoted. Promotions are more accessible to those who occupy the position of the discursive construction of the 'masculine' - work-defined as a researcher and not as a teacher, able to work in 'free time' and with work unaffected by home life (free of child care responsibilities and less responsible for the domestic economy):

> *Sean:* It's partly that male values dominate. The male standard to get promotion is a pretty gruelling one, which women with families who take that seriously find hard to achieve [...] It's dependent upon having a partner there who's looking after you and the family so that you can get the publications out.

A similar construction was put forward by Paul, that work expectations have differential effects according to conformity to discursive expectations of the sexes. This posits career 'success' as achievable by women occupying the 'masculine' position, but subject to unequal valuing and thus inequalities in the 'feminine' position where they fulfil the expectations for women of the dominant sex discourses:

> *Paul:* the promotions procedures could also be seen to be skewed against women because of the expectation now in universities to get promoted is that you work ridiculously long hours. It's the same in many professional areas and that could be seen as potentially discriminatory against women. By that I mean women who adopt a traditional role, or a traditional female approach to things, rather than adopting the male clothes, so that I think could be seen as discriminatory.

The construction posits 'masculine' characteristics as more highly valued and necessary for promotion:

So would you say that it's necessary to adopt the men's clothes to get on?
Paul: Virtually, yeah. It's the same as many areas of work, the system is established by men and the rules by which it works have been established by men, so it comes as no great surprise that the successful attributes that are picked out of that system are those that men would describe as success rather than women would describe as success, typically.

Conformity is significant, in Paul's account, because values or "attributes" similar to those of men in positions of authority (those who are "successful") are deemed of greater value. Those who display these attributes are then regarded as of value - there is bias towards the 'masculine'. Similarly, Margaret outlines that one of the ways for the ambitious to succeed in the Department is to adopt male "attributes", certain ways of being "which would help one get further if you wanted to" which she says as a woman who has 'succeeded' in the Department.

This reintroduces the argument that 'success' in careers is aided by acting 'like-men' - fulfilling the discursive expectations of men and the 'masculine' position. This again suggests that being female is not automatically a block to progress through the Department. Acting like those in positions of authority - almost exclusively men - may help advancement by being recognised as 'like-them'. Promotion is constructed as available to anyone - male or female - who conforms to an ideal by displaying the characteristics of those already in authority and who influence the appointments process. It is not always men who are constructed as 'masculine' and there are women who reach positions of authority:

Roger: you'll have a lot of different personalities at the top, and the character of a department very often comes down from the people at the top. But I think if you compare it to the individual females ... I know a female professor who's very .. I don't think she would be very different from the present regime in her attitude.

Roger's construction again emphasises the importance of "personality"; he believes that characteristics are valued highly, not the sexed body by which those characteristics are expressed:

Roger: I really don't think it matters about the sex. I had a female head of department who was very aggressive. And I know males who are very soft and gentle and understanding, I just don't think it makes a difference myself.

Therefore, those people who do not conform to the 'masculine' construction (or are unable to) are not as well equipped to get promotion. These people are not necessarily women. For instance, it has been shown how Brian has continually failed to get the promotion he desperately wants even though he has fulfilled some of the 'masculine' requirements, whilst Margaret, who has fulfilled all the expectations of the discursive construction of the 'feminine' as mother, care giver, primary domestic worker and family-orientated, has gained promotions. Talent and skill are still important: not

everyone can be promoted. Rather, it seems that where talent may be equal between men and women, it is those with 'masculine characteristics' who are advantaged in the prospect of promotion because they 'match' the characteristics of those people already in positions of authority, such as Jack who is devoted to his work and who regrets ever having a family or getting married because they do not fit in well with his work ambitions. This highlights the role of 'personalities' in the Department; as Sally commented, it is important to pay attention to the committee who will decide your promotion and to do as they say - promotion may become much more difficult if conformity to their prescription is not followed. In some cases, this conformity will only be complete if your are male; as the example of Peter Collins will show, his practising of discourses of the sexes is so completely tied to biological sex that he will openly discriminate against women because he does not regard them as 'naturally' suitable to academic work.

The examples above have shown that staff engage in the work patterns which will have the best results for the Department - working long hours in their 'freetime' on research. This form of conformity and internalisation of expectation is similar to Willis's (1977) finding that individual study participants who comprised a school counter-culture - "the lads" - enthusiastically took on tedious manual work as valorisation of their socially constructed 'masculine' identities. The consequence was that employers benefited from "the lads'" willingness to take on low-paid jobs (and a similar situation in high-tech industries was found by Massey 1995). Likewise, the Department benefits from its employees' apparent willingness to engage in 'negative' work practices because they also improve one's ability to gain promotion and personal valorisation. About masculinity, Connell notes that there is a reproduction of conditions which make "cyclical practice" that upholds the *status quo* likely:

> What persists is the organization or structure of practice, its effects on subsequent practice ... and can be divergent or cyclical ... The process of 'institutionalization' then is the creation of conditions that make cyclical practice probable ... It [gender] is stabilized to the extent that the groups constituted in the network have interest in the conditions for cyclical rather than divergent practices. (Connell 1987: 141)

The conformity and internalisation of the university work criteria therefore reinforce the existing conditions and reproduce what is already happening there; there is no challenge to work patterns which, although the pressures may exist for both men and women, have differential effects on the sexes, and despite the existence of Equal Opportunities policies which are supposed to prevent such inequalities:

> *Brian:* there is a circular thing that universities are run by, most of the professors are probably male, and they tend to be run by middle-class, middle-age white males, very much.

Valerie: there are all the traditions and reasons why they've selected people who are like themselves.

Brian and Valerie suggest that this elite shares a similar 'weltanschauung', and that they reproduce themselves when deciding their replacements. It is proposed that the key characteristic of the elite is maleness. Conformity to the university criteria may appear 'gender neutral': they are the same criteria for promotion for everyone. But this is part of the problem because not everyone is equal or has the same opportunities to prove their potential:

Margaret: this thing about equal opportunities. Sometimes I feel like saying to them, 'if you could have done what I've done, I'd be very interested to see it'. But of course you're put on the same playing field [...] and we're not in a society where it's equal.

Conformity to personalities, however, is a lot more directly dependent upon relationships between individuals, each's positioning within the discursively constructed sexual framework and each's ability to draw upon authority.

"IMPORTANT" PERSONALITIES II - PETER COLLINS

This reproduction of a male elite is exemplified in the case study of Peter Collins, who displays the exercise of masculinity in an institutional context. Collins deliberately uses his position of workplace authority to articulate discourses of the sexes which are counter to those of the Equal Opportunities policy that the university operates. This should remove the possibility of any one individual exerting undue influence on the discourses they support and practices of masculinity and increasing sexual inequalities. Collins's practices further negate the effectiveness of the principle of Equal Opportunities and again highlight the importance of interpersonal interactions in the production of power and resistance. It also draws attention again to the concepts of conformity and the "bureaucratic kinship system" (Kanter 1977), for Collins has drawn upon his authority to 'reward' people who match the expectations of his own opinions and to 'punish' those who disagree with him or act against the discourses he promulgates. This makes Peter Collins a very important "personality" with whom to conform, because one's compliance or reaction to his discourses can have material consequences. Like the male management at SYMP discussed above, Collins seems to have 'policed' the careers of colleagues and enforced the regulatory framework based upon what he constructs as the appropriate actions of the sexes.

Peter Collins has held a number of different posts in the university and the Department and has worked at the university over the last four decades. This has enabled him (at different times) to exert a great deal of influence. From the interviews with his

colleagues (he declined to be interviewed personally) it emerged that Peter Collins is not well liked, and a lot of animosity was expressed about him, all raised without prompting during the interviews. Andrew has found Collins's approach to be somewhat autocratic:

> *Andrew:* I find there are some people at the top, probably slightly more
> arrogant. Get things the way they want it, yes, there's probably one or two.

It seems that many of the longer serving members of staff have had run-ins with him; Kate, for example, said "I have had a few problems with Peter Collins." Sean found it very difficult to negotiate his relationship with Collins as his probationer when he first joined the Department:

> *Sean:* the worse situation was as a young probationer, I had a professor who was
> my probationer, who shall remain nameless at this point of time, who really had it in
> for me, and that was not a nice period, and he had power over me.

It appears that Peter was able to use his position of sanctioned authority in relation to Sean whose status in the workplace at that time positioned him as vulnerable and unable to challenge it. As a result, Sean was coerced into doing work which he was uncomfortable with and was not officially required to do, with the threat of dismissal if he did not conform to Peter's wishes.

There have been other situations where Collins has used his authority in relation to colleagues in the Department. One instance was a practice of discrimination against women in a pay dispute which ultimately led to their departure from the university:

> *Sally:* there have been one or two occasions in the past where women have had
> complaints about their salary levels and claimed that there was discrimination on
> the basis of sex. They promptly left.

At one point, three new appointments were made at the same time to the Department. Two of them were women and the other was a man. The women were both slightly older, more experienced and more qualified than the man:

> *Trevor:* it came to the attention of the women just through informal discussions and
> so on that he had been appointed on three or four points higher on the scale than
> they had. They were, quite understandably, upset, miffed about this. They went
> along to, guess who? - Peter Collins. And they were perfectly clear and
> unambiguously told to 'piss off'. In consequence of which they did. They both left.

In her reporting of the incident Kate commented that Peter's actions were based much more clearly within his own discursive construction of women. Kate described how when the two women complained about the man being appointed on a higher scale, Peter Collins had said to them:

> *Peter:* Look, my dears. Men have the pleasure of working, women have the
> pleasure of raising a family.

Obviously, within the discourses of the sexes revealed by Peter's actions there are expectations that women will fulfil their 'natural' role as mothers and child carers and

that men will undertake paid employment on behalf of women and families. This discourse is inherently spatial: the sexes have appropriate spheres within which they should perform their gender (echoing the arguments traced in Part One). His decision over this pay claim (which can be assumed to have been accepted and final because the women did decide to leave) acted as a means of enforcing (through the restriction of women's material rewards) this discourse. These discourses blanketed the value of all women to a role of family raiser and devalued the position of women in the workplace, constructing men as deserving of higher pay because they are 'naturally' superior. By benefiting the male appointee, Collins was benefiting men more generally in the Department, effectively removing women from the workplace (and so upholding his discourse that the workplace is the appropriate sphere for men). Collins was using the construction that there are significant 'differences' between the sexes that extend to all areas of life to justify this practice of maintaining inequalities. Reflecting the discourses of women that he agrees with, Trevor did not evaluate this incident as necessarily being discrimination against his colleagues as women:

> Trevor: whether you think that's discrimination against women or they just didn't like them for one or other reason, it's very difficult to say. [...] I'm probably inclined to say that that is the closest to what I would call overt discrimination against women.

Such incidents highlight the juncture between the practice of masculinity at the individual relationships level and the institutional level and highlight the difficulties in implementing organisational and social change. Selznick (1964 in Halford 1992) argues that organisational goals are modified by individuals to create an *informal* structure - organisations are unable to "specify rules and procedures down to the *n*th degree" (Halford 1992: 172). For the interpretation of Equal Opportunities is left to individuals. In this case, Peter Collins is in a position of authority where he is able to make decisions about other people. His position allows him to dictate discourses, to have them accepted as the 'truth'; he uses his authority to enact discourse that women should not be in the workplace, a personal 'unequal opportunities policy'. The practice of masculinity works here at two levels. There is the stating of the discourse that the sexes have complementary, but separate, spheres to appropriately occupy. There is also the situation within which this assertion was made, where Collins was actively creating tangible distinctions between a man and the two women by defending the unfair wage differential between them: he brings in material resources and material consequences to enact discourses and strengthen the inequalities between the sexes which he feels are justified. He was permitting the man to receive financial advantages

because he was *male* and because the complainants were *female*: the practice of masculinity to maintain sexual inequalities.

'FEMINISING' A MAN; THE CASE OF PETER COLLINS AND TREVOR.

It was Trevor who, amongst the academics, detailed the greatest problems with Peter Collins. Their uneasy relationship is called upon by Trevor to explain why he is so embittered, why he works seventy plus hour weeks, and why he wishes to leave the Department. His hard working is part of his plan to earn a professorial chair, which he hopes to gain to spite Peter Collins. Trevor's career plan is designed to prevent him being "trampled on" as he recounts Collins having trampled on him in the past:

> *Trevor:* I made a conscious decision to spend the next three years of my academic career making the rest of my academic career sustainable and liveable, this was fifteen months ago. Because if I don't, then I'm going to be trampled on, I'm not going to get anywhere, and I'm going to get miserable and hate it. [...] That's basically why I'm doing what I'm doing.

Trevor dislikes having to take directions off other people and desires to be in control; promotion is a way out of this situation and a way of 'revenging' Peter. Trevor feels he has had power exercised over him by Collins, and he wants to be in a reciprocal situation. Trevor's continued inability to get the promotions he believes he academically merits hinges upon his relationship with Peter; it is due, he says, to

> *Trevor:* personal politics, personal animosities in relation to one or two people. [...] some very nasty politics.

Trevor recounts that he was treated in a flagrantly incorrect procedural way because of Collins, who he calls "a nasty piece of work, very vindictive":

> *Trevor:* Absolutely unbelievable. [...] There is absolutely no precedent for this, this is completely outrageous. The story gets even more and more unsavoury. [...] And the simple fact of the matter is that Peter Collins absolutely hates my guts and there is absolutely no doubt at all that he is the person who deliberately and personally stymied my promotion.

Trevor accounts for this personal clash through reference to an incident which occurred many years previously. At a function organised around a lecture given by a Visiting Professor (Don Anderton) from America to another department within the university, Trevor was chatting with the Professor's "really rather attractive" wife, Elizabeth.

> *Trevor:* And, all of a sudden, I'm elbowed out of the way by Collins, who was a little pissed, who walks up to Elizabeth Anderton and believe it or not says, 'My, my, my, you look like a young lady made to please men'. Right? Which her response is basically, 'Fuck off, dog breath', at which point I burst out laughing. Right? And he glares at me, and I said, 'You got what you asked for there, didn't you?' The fact that this guy was [position] and powerful never influenced me much. Anyway, I didn't think a great deal of it except I knew at that particular point in time I had probably made some sort of enemy, but you don't really expect people to really bear huge grudges over something like that.

This incident proves to be very significant, especially when considered with the pay-claim incident described above. This scenario shows Peter was sexually interested in Elizabeth Anderton as a woman he finds attractive, and whom Trevor was currently talking to. He 'moved in' with his chat-up line, and when rebuked forcefully and humiliated in front of Trevor, who adds further insult, according to Trevor, Peter deliberately set out to gain revenge at a later time. In this interaction, Peter's individual workplace authority was disregarded and held as ineffective by Trevor, whilst the discourse of women as objects of male sexual desire was challenged as well by Elizabeth's forthright rebuttal. In this situation, Collins was left in the inferior position, where the discourses he disclosed failed to gain any credence in this particular situation (perhaps because he was physically 'outnumbered' too).

This account illustrates the mechanics of an exercise of power in the practice of masculinity and its situational contingency. Peter's sanctioned authority acted as the basis to 'legitimate' the exercise, and was utilised tangibly to prevent Trevor getting his entitled pay and his promotions. Trevor's initial role in the humiliation of Collins at the party ultimately had no tangibility because it had no effect on Collins's material existence. Although Collins was positioned in an 'inferior' role within that particular situation, in other situations it was he who was most able to influence power relations. Both of the men were involved in the 'competition' to determine power; the interaction involved discourses / practices and counter-discourses / practices. In the man-woman situation, Peter's actions were based in the discourse which positioned Elizabeth as primarily a sexual object for men and which positioned himself as dominant and legitimately acting upon this discourse. At the function, not only were these discourses challenged by Elizabeth's rejection and insult, but Collins was also challenged as an individual who supports them, where his workplace authority was ineffective: taken out of the workplace into another situation new positionings in the discursive framework were created. This occasion has ultimately set the scene for continued contestations of power between Collins and Trevor, which Collins has consistently 'won' because back in the work situation Peter has been able to draw upon his authority.

A short time after this event, Trevor found himself in dispute with Collins over the level of pay he was employed at. Upon complaint, Peter's response

> *Trevor:* was basically, 'bugger off, you're damned lucky to have got a job here, and if I had anything to do with it, you wouldn't.'

Trevor received the same response as the two women who complained about their salary in the previous example. In this way, Trevor was forged as 'feminine' by Collins.

Despite being male, Trevor was being refused his higher salary (which he felt unable to successfully challenge at the time for a number of reasons) just like the women. If one accepts Trevor's account that this was 'pay-back' for the Anderton incident, then it can be said that Peter is positioning Trevor in the discourse of women by this action. He uses the same means of 'punishment' for both Trevor and those women - utilising material resources to deprive them and to emphasise his own superiority. This makes the discourses 'tangibly' felt. Peter's interventions to stymie Trevor's promotions and claim for higher pay indicate how as an individual in authority, Peter is able to ignore the institutional structures designed to eliminate such personal discrimination.

Therefore, through Peter Collins masculinity was practised at an individual level against both women and a man - masculinity is not confined solely to practice against women. In much the same way as Peter Collins used his authority against women to maintain the discourse of men as superior to women by creating wage differences between the sexes, he has allegedly prevented Trevor getting promotion, his rightful pay and from reaching the same professional status. He used institutional structures and situations to practice masculinity within individual interactions. This emphasises once more the importance of conformity to certain individuals and again suggests the necessity of conformity in the promotions procedure: in the case of Peter and Trevor, Collins has been able to reproduce likemindedness amongst those people of his status by preventing Trevor's promotion as someone who challenged the discourses he practises.

HOMOSOCIAL REPRODUCTION

The examples above have indicated that members of the academic staff are conforming to certain work expectations. There is institutional pressure for staff to increase their level of work input and to fall into a division of labour - become research-led (and therefore be able to gain promotion) or teaching-centred (which decreases ability for promotion). It has also been suggested that promotion is aided by "likemindedness" - ability to gain promotion is facilitated by conformity to those people who select promotion candidates. Its occurrence in work institutions has been observed by Kanter (1977) in corporations where management positions went to those who shared the same experiences as existing managers, a process of "social homogeneity" (Witz and Savage 1992:15) and was also observed by Cockburn (1991) in the civil service. Out of this process developed a "bureaucratic kinship system", where men in positions of authority 'cloned' themselves, based on homosocial

reproduction, so that they retained the ability to guard power and privilege to those who 'fit in', who match their own characteristics:

> senior men see youthful images of themselves as the ideal candidates within the recruitment process; they, after all, are the successful products of the status quo. ... [They are] appointing men in their own image. (Thornton 1989: 122)

Thornton relates this process directly to the academic workplace. She notes that there is a particular career path followed by men which defines 'success', and it is one which is more difficult for women to attain:

> It is understood within the academic culture that the educational and career path pursued by the average male academic - sound academic record ... uninterrupted career, publications in "international" refereed journals, and so on - epitomises excellence. (Thornton 1989: 117)

For women having children and / or taking a career break, this means they cannot conform to this image of academic excellence; they are 'different' and, Thornton adds, "difference is equated with inferiority" (117). She calls this academic ideal 'the male benchmark', against which women must be measured and which therefore prevents women from having an independent value. Thornton concludes that as a consequence, Affirmative Action or Equal Opportunities programmes are, and will continue to be, ineffective because they are based in an unobjective selection process.

This argument perhaps illustrates the general processes which occur, but does not detail their more sophisticated operation. The Department does not have to *exclude* women from positions of status to prioritise certain ways of being or the exercise of masculinity. The masculinity of likemindedness is not an outright form of sexual discrimination, for this would suggest that there is an essential 'women's nature' that women do match regardless.[4] Rather, it draws distinctions and differentially values the discourses of sex that set the expectations of what is appropriate for men and for women. There is a coercive force (both for women and men) to conform (via display or 'performance') to the appropriate 'masculine' characteristics for success. Hence, women are able to get promoted (which then gives the impression that discrimination does not exist because some women do 'succeed') but which still perpetuates the existing structure of the system. This does not *challenge* but rather *reinforces* the dominant discourses of the sexes. Even this appears too general in the case of the Department. For Margaret has fulfilled all the 'masculine' characteristics of success - such as having a position of status and being highly professionally regarded - whilst still fitting in with the discourse of women's expectations: she has had four children, taken career breaks, been a half-time worker and is family and home centred.

---

[4] Although discourses do generalise to all women, experience may invalidate them and hence the occupation of 'masculine' career positions by some women.

However, as was discussed earlier, she feels that she is excluded from a position of *authority* in that she experiences male colleagues of the same status making her feel 'junior', and that because she seems to conform to the discursively constructed image of women she needs 'protecting' (which takes the form of not being given any workplace responsibilities or decision making capabilities). Likewise, Savage (1992) notes that women are beginning to occupy positions of apparent authority - such as bank managing - at just the time when those positions are being de-powered and leaving women distanced from power. These examples mediate Kanter's claim that 'power wipes out sex':

> Kanter's analysis of the gendered corporate experience, is the view that power differences, not sex differences, explain the different corporate experiences and fortunes of men and women of the corporation. (Witz and Savage 1992: 14-15)

For Margaret ostensibly does 'have power' in that she occupies the same status position as male colleagues who would be described as 'powerful'. But Margaret occupies that 'space of power' differently from male colleagues by virtue of their discursively constructed roles as men and women. Despite having an institutional position of authority, from her accounts Margaret is prevented from exercising her 'way of thinking': in relationships with men she occupies an inferior position in the framework as a mother / woman and so masculinity is practised in relation to her - "what is valorized in patriarchy is not masculinity but male masculinity" (Threadgold and Cranny-Francis 1990: 31). There is an image that the institution's intended discourse of equality is being actualised - women are being promoted - but its understanding is obstructed by individual interactions where conformity to discursive subject positions determines the holding of authority. Similarly, Foucault

> showed how organizational change was inseparably linked to changing forms of power relations. (Witz and Savage 1992: 7)

Power relations in the Department appear to be maintained by the perpetuation of discourses of sex practised by individuals in interactions. This suggests that for change in the workplace to occur requires changes in the bases of these individual interactions through (I would contend) realisation amongst those individuals of how their practices uphold the status quo and a commitment to changing this situation. However, this is unlikely to be successful unless the institution puts in place conditions which make this possible: not just an Equal Opportunities policy, but its realisation through child care facility provision, enforcement of a 35 hour week and flexible working hours etc.

Social homogeneity has also been shown to occur at SYMP where managers (particularly Richard, but also Derek, Tom and John) uphold discourses of masculinity

that de-value women because of their sex and the discursive expectations of women and which value men as possessing 'masculine' traits which make them 'naturally' superior to women. The consequence has been the reproduction of management structures run by men, and the occupation of the 'masculine' position by women is a lot more difficult - the only women managers are those "dragged" up the hierarchy by male managers constructed as all-knowing. This status quo is being maintained by the company in its policy of internal promotion from a male dominated workforce and no active attempt to recruit women. Although the extent of homosocial reproduction appears to vary between the two workplaces - there seems to be more scope for women in the Department - both retain structures that prioritise 'masculine' characteristics and the discursive expectations of men. Challenges to these situations have been unsuccessful and the prospects for future change are not optimistic.

8. THE POWER OF LANGUAGE: "I'M NOT SEXIST, BUT..."

As part of a university, the Department is subject to enforceable employment policies and practices, some of which have been nationally agreed or imposed. It appears that as a consequence of the Equal Opportunities (EO) programme and feminist critiques of academia as masculinist, there have been changes in the discourses of the sexes or, at least, there have been changes in the way thinking about the sexes is now expressed. It emerged that there is a reticence by members of staff to say anything which could be construed as 'sexist'. The sensitivity about this issue is particularly acute because of continuing debates within academia and the media about "politically correct" language (for example, Miller and Swift 1993). The adoption of non-sexist language by the academics therefore provides an example of the response of individuals to an organisational 'edict'. One consequence has been a wariness to comment upon issues or express opinions that could be deemed sexist, for instance to questions such as "what do you think an all-male or all-female Department would be like?" For example, asked this question, George answered that he could not "speculate the differences." There were only few expressions of overtly sexist language in the interviews, despite the general discursive construction of the sexes as very different and despite the existence of sexual inequalities in the workplace. One explanation is that people have learnt to say "the right thing": conforming to what it is thought generally acceptable to say in particular circumstances without (in this example) contravening the institutional policy of Equal Opportunities or academic convention on the use of non-sexist language (what Beck 1986 terms a "rhetoric of

equality"). The result is inconsistency between the expression and the meaning of discourses:

> How do we explain the gap between what many men say ... and what they do? One possible explanation is that their publicly-stated opinions are inauthentic presentations-of-self that can be viewed as attempts to conform to an acceptable image (Messner 1993: 727)

This is similar to Potter and Wetherell's (1987) "disclaimers" notion - a particular way of accounting which distances the self from the discourses one puts forward.

This trend was recognised by Ros who says that she has not witnessed any discrimination since she has been working in universities and explains this through the academic community's attempts to be "politically correct":

> *Ros:* In terms of why there isn't discrimination here, the most probable reason is that I suspect the academic community is very quick to try and not discriminate, to desperately not discriminate, if you see what I mean. [...] I think everyone tries to be as politically correct as possible.

This indicates that staff largely realise that overt comments and acts of discrimination or political incorrectness are not professionally acceptable. Hence, comments are 'apologised' for with "I don't want this to sound sexist, but ..." type phrases. This does not, of course, mean that the comments do not disclose discourses which perpetuate or support inequalities between the sexes: as the analysis of Brian's home and work life exemplified, beneath a surface of anti-sexism there can be discourses which contest power between the sexes. The result was a frequent 'apologism':

> *Roger:* This may sound sort of sexist, but I mean, women find private practice quite difficult because there may be discrimination there and with their commitments to family and stuff lots of women see university life as being more equal.

Andrew's discourses posited the sexes as diametrically opposed with women as sexual objects ancillary to men, but he still ensured that his language was indicative of "the right thing to say". This involved frequent self-correction of references to the third person as "he" and the making of examples sex non-specific. Similarly, Geoff raised the issue of political correctness on a number of separate occasions and showed that he was well aware that he should be seen using it:

> *Geoff:* Well, the sort of thing which I don't do, like slap my children, unlike my grandmother did. An autocrat, a domineering woman, or whatever the right PC phrase is.

Geoff's references to "PC phrases" were usually humorous or mocking. He was conscious of there being a "right thing" to say (or a "wrong thing" not to be said), and this view was credited to most male members of staff.

> *Geoff:* I don't think there's very much which will be said by most men, most members of staff, which isn't politically correct. ... There will no doubt be odd jokes.

This rejoinder suggests that there is not a commitment to political correctness but rather a recognition that one could 'get into trouble' for not using it. Geoff has been 'hitting some difficulties' with the 'correct' use of language recently, and he seems to be trying to learn from his mistakes by being more alert about the terms he does use:

> *Geoff:* If you like, I think that I, I personally hit some difficulties, I think very minor ones, because I grew up in the era which was very much pre-PC.

His use of PC language is due to sexist language being no longer professionally acceptable in academia:

> *Geoff:* I found out on Friday that I mustn't now say things like 'the University is among the big boys when it comes to research'. That's banned. I've got to think of some phrase to say that erm, 'in terms of the faculty, it is a high flyer in comparison to most others.'

Institutional pressure, and pressure from within the academic community, has obviously affected the practices of individuals, who have now been made aware of the sexism of their own language. Geoff and Andrew, for example, are now self-regulating what they say. This can be viewed as very positive progress towards the eradication of sexism in academia. However, the question which this trend also raises is 'has it actually tackled the cause of sexism or is it changing the expression of sexism?' It is unclear whether there has been change to discourses of masculinity.

It is debatable whether this change in language reflects any change in commitment to reducing sexism in the workplace:

> if you cannot get people to understand what they are supposed to be doing and why, there is no chance they will do it with any commitment or skill. (Cameron 1995: 28)

Certainly, Geoff appeared to display neither "skill" nor "commitment" in his newly discovered need to adopt 'politically correct' language. Despite showing earlier his support for equal opportunities and the promotion of good EO practice in the Department, Brian seems to hold political correctness in contempt; for him, PC language "has gone too far". At the beginning of the interviews Brian used PC-esque language, referring to his wife as "my partner". However, towards the end of the second interview he was prepared to criticise PC language; he objected to a challenge made by former colleagues to his choice of language:

> *Brian:* There was a time when I got told off for referring to women at the place I used to work as 'ladies', right? And then I got told off, then we got into this discussion about women being referred to as 'girls', right? Which I can actually understand. Yes, if it's done in a dismissive and diminutive and patronising way, it is highly objectionable, but I made the point, like I've just said to you, in my wife's family, all the males including myself when I was there were referred to as boys, right? Irrespective of what age they were. Or my wife says to me .. 'are you going out for a drink with the boys tonight?', or something like that. And I think, let's not get too nit-picking about these things for heaven's sake!

It's, erm, [he laughs]
Brian: Have you had the same experience? It's a ludicrous business.

Being told off for calling women "ladies" and "girls" (which again reinforces the forging of woman as childlike) is considered by Brian to be "nit picking". There was acknowledgement that such language may be dismissive and patronising and recognition that it can be experienced negatively, but Brian feels he does not use it in this way and so does not recognise that intentions do not necessarily play a part in power and sexual inferiorising, whilst using women calling men 'boys' as justification for continuing his use of patronising language. McAuley (1987) found this way of thinking and acting to be common within a university workplace which he studied:

> Women were sometimes addressed collectively by men colleagues as 'the ladies' or individually as 'dear' - but men did not address each other in this familiar way! (McAuley 1987: 177)[5]

The discourse revealed by Brian's actions holds that there is no harm in using language which can be sexist if it is not *intended* to be sexist - language is 'neutral'. However, 'unintended' sexism reinforces and reiterates sexist ideology and makes its use more acceptable. This is a distancing of self from recognition that everyone is implicated in the reproduction of sexism, in this case, through language.

> In asserting that men as a group use the verbal forms of expression and behaviour to assert their power over women and diminish them, I am not suggesting that all men individually adopt this strategy ... As a group, however, all men are empowered by some men's behaviour. (McDowell 1990: 326)

Not everyone acts the same, but those individuals whose actions and words do have the consequence of perpetuating sexual inequalities create a discourse from which others may benefit, or can benefit *without* necessarily actively doing it themselves. In this way, everyone who does not take an active stance *against* practices of masculinity is culpable. Hence:

> It is also men who have to recognise that currently they use their power in various ways, some explicit, others inadvertently, to oppress and disempower others (McDowell 1990: 331)

It is important to reiterate that it is not just men who need to check practices of masculinity but *everyone*, and so check not *using* power, but the exercise of power. This would hopefully diminish the acceptance of particular dominant discourses.

When I did not oppose his statement, Brian appeared to assume my like-mindedness at which point he describes political correctness as "ludicrous". This re-emphasises the situationally contingent practice of masculinity - it is permissible for Brian to contribute to the ideology which perpetuates sexual inequalities when he talks to a

---

[5] Indeed, whilst other uses of condescending language of women by men included "black lady", "an African girl", "ladies", "lady applicant", "the wife" and "babe", there were no instances where women referred to colleagues as "boys" or "gentlemen".

'like-minded' man. This moment illustrates a "point of revelation" like that of Richard earlier, where one's intentions - "saying the right thing" - give way to a more open recognition of the discourses which are disclosed and practised. Saying the "right thing" is reliant upon certain situations. Some of Jack's comments were spoken because my maleness made the conditions "safe" for a non-sanctioned 'revelation', presumably that we share ways of thinking because of our mutual sex. Commenting on an all-female Department Jack noted (nervously) that:

> *Jack:* I mean, certainly, even a female colleague has said wouldn't it be, one or two .. heated discussion, or issues, inevitable ones, they'll be problems, they're inevitable. More bitchy. And she said this, a senior head of, colleague of mine, said it *will* be more bitchy because they are almost all females. There is something about women together that, that can lead to that, she said. I don't know. Maybe that would be, maybe it would be a little more .. bitchy. Couldn't say that, use that word to you if you were not a man. Actually that was a female colleague who said that to me, saying it as an objective factual thing that's often, from her observation, how a group of women working together can be like that. More than a group of men would. So maybe that's what it would be like.

According to Jack, an all-female department would inevitably create "problems" which are non-existent in all-male environments. A proliferation of women in a department is therefore a "problem" in Jack's eyes, because they are "bitchy", particularly when in groups. Jack's perception of Equal Opportunities and discourses of non-sexist language is that such language 'keeps women happy'. Normally, he would not openly admit that women are "bitchy", because he recognises that this could be construed as sexist, and therefore not 'allowed'. But whilst in male company he is able to use the word "bitchy": he moderates his behaviour and language according to whether interacting with someone male or female. Jack's practice of masculinity (perpetuating a discourse of sex) is therefore situational.[6] To justify his comments, Jack reasons that this idea was told to him by a woman - he is simply repeating a criticism of women that

---

[6] There were other examples of the situational use of language by interviewees. Terry's language changed between the two interviews. The first had taken place in a quiet room, whilst the second was much more public - we sat in a communal area where colleagues and cleaners frequently passed by. He was visibly more agitated by this and less relaxed, almost like two different characters. This was reflected by the terms he spoke in. Whereas in the first interview Helen was referred to as "my woman", by the second interview she had become "my partner". His descriptions of beating women and how women "bug" him gave way to reflections on the moral responsibilities of correct parenting. This changing of oneself and one's language to fit certain circumstances and to achieve certain objectives was recognised by Mick: "you change and adapt to suit the environment." In this way, when he worked as an ice-cream seller as a student: "if she was a girl, you gave her a chat-up line." He said that an all-male environment provokes "a few more dirty jokes" and "richer language". This may account for his use of certain words and ideas about women when he spoke to me - "crumpet", "lay-dees" and "the female of the species": "Loads of crumpet there as well. Football. What more could you want?" These all contrasted sharply with the situation - a suited professional, middle-aged man sitting in his pristine family home. In this way, language appears to be contingent upon situations and the actors who constitute these situations. It contributes to the discursive construction of the 'masculine' and the 'feminine'.

other women have. This enables Jack to distance himself from this discourse but agree with it at the same time: it is an "objective fact" because a woman has said this. Jack is able to generalise one woman's comment as 'evidence' against all women. This excuse is made possible in a construction of women as 'all the same' - an homogenising discourse - and as having shared visions (which feminism has traditionally assumed as well), and which suggests that women are not capable of a practice of masculinity which denigrates other women, such as saying that women are "bitchy". When masculinity is conceptualised as a practice made by either sex, reasoning such as Jack's is undermined, and so just because he is repeating a comment made by a woman does not remove him from 'blame': he is sharing this discourse as well.

It may be that Equal Opportunities policies have made Jack aware that in certain circumstances (that is, in the presence of women) there are certain things that should not be said, but that in the company of men it is perfectly acceptable to do so because (like himself) other men do not agree with political correctness: they are expressing conformity to professional practices. The effectiveness of the implementation of EO policies and moves towards political correctness (and their consequences) should therefore be considered contradictory. Positively, the institution is attempting to impose conditions within which individuals must interact that condemn the open expression of discourses that justify sexual inequalities. The intentions of Equal Opportunities are therefore pro-equality. However, should it be seen as the successful quashing of masculinity or as simply altering the expression of masculinity and disguising how it is practised, with the consequence of making sexism 'invisible' and appearing not to exist? If this is the case, changing people's attitudes and eradicating sexism is even more difficult to achieve than the application of institutional policies; the logic is that discrimination cannot exist because there is an EO policy at the university and everyone is trying so hard to be politically correct - nothing more needs to be done. As Richard and Roger stated, there is now equality between the sexes and anyone who claims discrimination is just excusing their own failures. When opinions like this are held by those with workplace authority the prospects for change seem minimal. By de-legitimising the overt expression of sexism, EO and PC take the ideology of sexism out of view, making practices of masculinity appear to not be happening. This occurrence has been noted in academia:

> For their part, many men had a dawning awareness that there *was* an issue there that would not simply go away. (However an ability to be aware can give rise to

complacency and a false optimism, e.g. that by being more sensitive to language they had then 'done enough' to remedy the situation.) (McAuley 1987: 179)

Problems persist because the underlying dominant discourses which structure how people act remain unchanged. This leads Cameron (1995: 20) to claim that non-sexist language is "the symbolic concession you can make to feminism without ruining your dominant status". It appears that (in this example at least) EO policies and employment legislation cannot eradicate discourses of sex which underpin and justify continued inequalities between the sexes (and indeed are actually based on them). The policy is failing. To succeed, EO policies need to change *individuals*, but are reliant for their success upon imposition from an *institutional* scale. This highlights the difficulties of enacting change. Even where there is a high-level posing of discourses designed to eliminate sexual inequalities, conditions exist which mediate its success: in interactions, individuals are able to play out their own discourses and practice masculinity, perpetuating these inequalities. There are no tangible changes because there is no commitment to make them. This reiterates the importance of understanding power as relational. In the case of Peter Collins, he was able to act upon the discourses he agreed with in individual relations where his authority positioned him more dominantly within the discursive framework, despite the existence of institutional structures designed to prevent such autocratic behaviour. Therefore, do EO policies have any positive effect? Are they working? Is taking away the overt expression of sexual inequalities satisfactory in itself? They have raised an awareness of sexism, pervading the consciousness of even those people least likely to experience discrimination themselves:

> *George:* Discrimination? Not that I'm conscious of at first glance. But I'm an articulate European male, so I probably would say that. [laughs]

But is this enough? How these discourses could be possibly changed is discussed in Part Four. At SYMP, the "right thing" is frequently said, but usually less covertly. Derek commented that the company will not make distinctions in adverts between the sexes because it is *illegal*. There is recognition of the imposition of edicts that promote equality. However, SYMP still maintains a rigid sexual division of labour and therefore seems unaffected by such legislation. Unlike the Department, there is less pressure to eradicate sexist language, and its use was much more common. Thus, the response in workplaces to equality measures appears to be changes in expression in language of masculinity, not in more deep-seated discourses of masculinity.

Language is very important in shaping the world. However, as these examples suggest, a change in language is not sufficient to 'change the world'. The superficial

use of politically correct language *expresses* support of equality: the dogma is that it should be used in the workplace, and generally it is. It is an institutional discourse and its imposition reflects an exercise of power. But "where there is power, there is resistance" (Foucault 1978: 95) in the form of counter-discourses: non-sexist language is being used in the disclosure of dominant discourses that still perpetuate inequalities and which have not changed *practices*. For example, Andrew uses non-sexist language but his practices are still sexually predatory and his valuing of women is purely in terms of sexual attraction. This describes a change in the expression of discourses but not a change in the 'knowledges' accepted as the "truth". This emphasises how discourses are more than just enunciations (Foucault 1972) and suggests that changing inequalities between people in the discursive framework requires change of an extra-discursive materiality (although even change in material reality may not mark "real" change - witness the example of DMP, where changes were still based in dominant discourses). As the examples of this thesis have illustrated, discourses of masculinity are deeply entrenched and the future prospect of their transformation appears difficult at best and impossible at worst. In individual relationships, negotiation of these discourses can bring changes; the potential for re-forming gender power relations at a social scale is a political project whose existence seems distant.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

Part Three has highlighted the importance of masculinity at an organisational scale. The workplaces provided specific situations and conditions within which gender relations were played out or challenged. These conditions were more difficult to negotiate in the workplace than home and therefore more difficult to transform:

> we are constrained by a complex history of intricate power relations, which are not always accessible to individual transformation. (Forbes 1996: 186)

Therefore, masculinity can be said to be institutionalised because it has become structurally embodied in these workplaces. However, this institutionalisation is reliant upon the relational power exercised by individuals in interactions. Organisational work policies in the Department are rendered ineffective in the practising of discourses of masculinity at the "micro-scale". Hence, Part Three has emphasised the importance of workplace authority. Therefore, Peter Collins in the Department and Richard Brown at SYMP were both influential people in the maintenance of the institutionalisation of masculinity; their preference for the 'masculine' and de-valuing of the 'feminine' has the effect of generally advantaging men in these workplaces and generally reinforcing

a construction of women as ancillary to men. The prospects for change were evaluated as pessimistic. This was shown to be particularly so because of the 'disguising' of masculinity - the changing forms of its linguistic expression and the obscuring of its causes - the RAE and other "gender neutral" policies were shown to have gendered consequences that maintain inequalities between the sexes in the workplace. Individuals were shown to be complicit in this by conforming to the pressures and expectations created by these policies. Overall, Part Three has developed and expanded the conceptualisation of masculinity discussed in Parts One and Two and has reiterated the power of discourses of masculinity.

These examples have also highlighted the significance of the practice of masculinity within two contrasting types of workplace. The focus upon management at SYMP has helped to illustrate that the existence of masculinity is not constrained solely to the male-only work areas of the factory shop floor. At the same time, many of the discourses disclosed by managers used the shop floor as their context; for example, the construction of the work as physically demanding was employed to explain the absence of female managers in the company. This study has highlighted the importance of management in shaping gender relations, and in this way it has reinforced Milkman's (1987) conclusion that management is the predominant influence on gender segregation in a workplace. The discussion of the academic department has suggested that even where there is an approximate equal mix of male and female staff, masculinity is still practised. It emerged that the discourses of masculinity in the Department and the university more generally have as constraining an effect on subjects' lives as the discourses at SYMP. The major difference appeared to reflect a difference in expression rather than any substantive contrast.

The Department's status as a non-commercial organisation also suggests some interesting points for discussions on the relationship between capitalism and patriarchy. For Walby (1986) proposes that the two are related, but not always at the same time or in the same place. She suggests that rather than women's subordinate role in the household determining their position in the labour market, it is capitalism's drawing of distinctions between the two sexes that confines women into a subordinate role in the household. It emerged that sex 'differences' were discursively constructed in the Department - creating a workplace stratification of staff - although not important in the creation of capital. It appeared that the job structure of lecturer was conducive to the maintenance of discourses of the sexes - such as women as child carers and

home makers - and that they were reinforced by conditions which existed outside of the workplace. Overall, it intimated that 'patriarchal' value systems were the more important determinant of the division of labour and the politics of interpersonal relationships than were capitalist structures.

The examples in Parts Two and Three have illustrated how the practice of masculinity functions through the emphasis and construction of *differences* between the sexes. For instance, at SYMP there is a clear sexual division of labour, explained by interviewees as the product of "natural" differences in the sexes that determine what is appropriate work for men or women. The resulting inequalities (material and subjective) were "justified" as "natural" too. The analysis of discourses adopted in this study indicated these "differences" to be not based in any material 'truth'. It also highlighted that discourses are utilised to *suppress* differences *within* the sexes. The consequence is the generalisation of experiences; for instance, certain elements of experiences of men are generalised as the "norm" and that discursive expectations of women are generalised as reflective of *all* women (measured against the norm). As a result, the 'masculine' norm is constructed as superior, whilst the expectation is created that women will ('naturally') occupy an inferior position. It was suggested (in the example of career orientation in the Department) that Sally conforms to appropriate 'masculine' characteristics for success, but by doing so reinforces dominant discourses of masculinity. This is termed "social homogeneity" by Witz and Savage (1992: 15), but given its basis in sex in these case studies it is perhaps better termed "sexual homogeneity". Masculinity is based firmly in discursively constructed sexed bodies.

PART FOUR:

"CONCLUSIONS" -

TOWARDS A FEMINIST

POLITICS OF

MASCULINITY?

PART FOUR

In Part Four, the final section of this thesis, the significance of the research undertaken in "Re-Thinking Masculinity" will be considered. I will begin by focusing upon the main issues and conclusions from the empirical work and by suggesting their value for research on masculinity. Their significance will be assessed and, drawing upon developments in feminist theory, the potential for a feminist research agenda for masculinity and the prospects for masculinity studies to inform feminism will be considered. Part Four concludes with an evaluation of the contribution Foucauldian frameworks of study can make to geography.

A) SUMMARY OF THE RESEARCH

Using findings from fifty-one in-depth interviews from employees in two workplaces, this thesis has presented a detailed study of masculinity. Drawing upon the work of contemporary feminist theorists and feminist-informed sociologies of masculinity, this research has attempted to locate the study of masculinity within a framework of power. It has been suggested that this is facilitated by the adoption of a conceptualisation of power as relational, productive and existent only in its exercise. It has been shown how power is articulated by discourses (the combination of enunciation, practices and significant 'silences') which create a regulatory framework that sets out the 'rules', expectations and conditions within which everyday interactions take place.

Influenced by critics who have illustrated the "methodological impasse" (Colman 1990) of much masculinity research, a re-conceptualisation of masculinity was proposed in Part One. It posited that masculinity is articulated through a series of discourses of the sexes (which it was suggested are situationally contingent and subject to constant (re)negotiation) which differentiate between a valued ('masculine') and a ('feminine') position which is constructed as of lesser value. Arguing against the conceptualisation of masculinity as the identity characteristics of men, it was proposed that it is more usefully considered as a practice of both men and women which (when considered from a feminist perspective) can be analysed as creating, endorsing or maintaining socio-sexual inequalities that are evident in our 'patriarchal' society.

This conceptualisation was applied to (and was itself influenced by) an empirical study of two workplaces - a university academic department ("the Department") and a manufacturer of steel goods ("South Yorkshire Metal Products") - from which a number

of conclusions were drawn. Part Two discussed the disclosure of discourses amongst individual study participants, where discourses of "breadwinner" and "home maker" roles proved to be particularly influential in the structuring of everyday lives. In addition, it was shown that sexual objectification is a significant means of constructing 'masculine' and 'feminine' positions as differentially valued. It was also argued that subject positions are actively forged according to situational context. Part Three applied the conceptualisation at an organisational scale, focusing upon the influence of workplace conditions and employment practices and policies on gender relations. Detailed analysis of two "important personalities" emphasised the significance of the enactment of discourses of the sexes by individuals, whose workplace "authority" helps determine the acceptance of the discourses they morally approve of as "truth". This highlighted the value of understanding power as relational and suggested that the "institutionalisation" of discourses of masculinity is disproportionately reliant upon interactions between individuals who are unequally positioned within the discursive framework.

B) CONCLUSIONS FROM THE RESEARCH

As the significance of individual findings has been discussed in the body of the text it is not intended to reiterate these points at length. Instead, this section will focus upon other salient conclusions. One particularly important finding has been that masculinity refers to the experiences of both men and women. The discourses of masculinity revealed in this study refer to women's experiences (for example, of motherhood) and not solely to the experiences of men. Discourses and practices of masculinity were reflected by women as well as men, taking the form both of active pursuance, such as Sally's subject positioning, and of passive complicity, such as Mave's acceptance of discourses which position her husband (as a man) to be superior to her. Rather than characterising particular attitudes and behaviours of men as varying forms of masculinity and those of women as femininity, the study (driven by the empirical findings) has termed as masculinity discourses which create sexual inequalities regardless of the sex of actors. Therefore, the research has revealed a *similarity* in discursive practices between women and men, something which has been largely unacknowledged in gender literature.

Likewise, the research highlighted similarity in discourses across class. The two workplaces were characterised by different socio-economic class - the academics were dominantly 'middle-class' and the employees at SYMP (even the managers who were

interviewed) were broadly 'working-class' - yet a continuity emerged in the dominant discourses that were disclosed. This suggests that the categorisation of masculinities into class masculinities (such as Tolson 1977, Hearn and Collinson 1994) may have undesired effects. These include the drawing of false distinctions between practices of men from different backgrounds and even the 'demonising' of a particular class. In the Precursor, reference was made to Morgan's (1992) observation that researchers have investigated masculinity in those domains where it is conventionally expected to be found, such as solidly male work groups and in male dominated sports. The consequence has been undue emphasis upon 'working-class' men, focusing in particular upon shop-floor cultures and all-male social groups. Effectively, this has meant that 'middle-class' men have largely escaped critical attention and "middle-class" masculinity has been under-researched. Studies which have focused upon 'middle-class' masculinity have tended to examine 'progressive' change, such as movement towards becoming "new men" (for example, Christian 1994 although Roper's (1994) study of management masculinity serves as a worthy exception).

In this way, the results have highlighted an interesting (if unintended) outcome of the choice of case study workplaces. The study was not focused upon the stereotypically masculine spaces which Morgan (1992) identifies. Rather than examining the all-male shop-floor work space, emphasis was upon managerial occupations at SYMP and workers outside of production. This was compared with an academic department - a non-profit making organisation - with an almost equal numerical mix of men and women. Both types of workplace have largely escaped critical attention as sites of masculinity. The findings in this study have illustrated the practices of masculinity to have consistency between locations. Thus, the thesis has emphasised continuity in the discourses of masculinity between an essentially 'middle-class' and 'working-class' workplace. Masculinity was practised in similar ways between the two sites, even if the form of *expression* may have differed at times. Two apparently contrasting workplaces produced similar consequences - a sexual division of labour where 'feminine' tasks (which are largely undertaken by women) are de-valued and leave their occupants in an inferior subject position. Therefore, the distinction between mental and manual workplaces is one which has also been over-stated. Different types of work are gendered differently - in SYMP, 'masculine' work is production work which may involve lifting, whilst in the Department it is research work which involves no particular physical exertion - but within those specific workplaces the gendering is context dependent. The construction of a 'masculine' position is a valued one which brings benefits

although (in these two examples) production work and academic research tasks have no connection and bring different rewards (although, interestingly, most production workers at SYMP earn significantly more than many lecturers). Power relations are no less apparent in the Department than in SYMP (although expression of them sometimes differed, such as in use of language). Therefore, the research has suggested that gender relations at work have cross-occupational similarities which may be masked by the differences in the types of work each profession involves.

This analysis has highlighted power relations articulated through gender to be important across spaces and places, and to have similar consequences regardless of 'class'. Likewise, the study also indicated continuity between the home lives of 'middle-class' and 'working-class' people. The participants were largely homogeneous in that nearly all were married or living with partners, and that the female partner was in paid employment. In every case, it emerged that although levels of direct engagement in domestic economy varied by class (many of the academics employ cleaners, whilst no-one at SYMP reported doing so), there was similarity in that women were discursively constructed as responsible for the home and men assumed a "breadwinner" position. Household division of labour was characterised by women taking greater responsibility and men less. Whilst domestic engagement differed *between*, for example, female academics and women at SYMP, there was less variation *amongst* women in the 'feminine' position in the Department or at SYMP. Therefore, discourses of sex appear to be more important than class in determining the workplace and domestic hierarchies and the exercise of power.

The findings indicated the conceptualisation of masculinity within a Foucauldian framework of power. This discursive formation dis-aggregates the association of men as a class who 'possess' power against women at all times and begins to illustrate the complexities of the exercise of power. Men may exercise power in relation to women and other men and women may even exercise power in relation to men. By understanding power as relational it becomes easier to understand the context-dependent status of its exercise and how positioning within the discursive framework can be differentially "accessed" according to 'social vectors' such as age or race (Cooper 1994). It helps explain why individuals, such as Brian or Ned, are variably 'powerful' and 'powerless': both lack workplace authority and find it difficult to express their discourses of masculinity, whilst in the home context where these conditions do not exist, a whole new set of power relations emerge that enable the discourses that

their practices articulate to become dominant. Additionally, at work Ned has some opportunity to discursively practice masculinity - in mentoring young male colleagues - whilst Brian does not *experience* his privileged positioning within the social hierarchy. Such examples indicate the unstable relationship between self and power, and the need for analysis to remain sensitive to the shifting boundaries.

In their discussions of identity both Westwood (1990) and Jones (1993) have emphasised the important connections between masculinity and the use of space. Connell (1983: 19) noted "To be an adult male is distinctly to occupy space, to have a physical presence in the world", an idea which he related to the workplace and street (Connell 1987). The findings of this thesis have illustrated that space can play an important role in practices of masculinity, but in a qualitatively different way from the studies above. They were concerned with the physical use of space by men and the conscious 'performance' of masculinity in public space. This study has implicated space as relevant in a situational sense: it is significant for the relationally contingent practice of masculinity. The different relationships and potential interactions which exist in the 'two' spaces create different situations within which the practice of masculinity can take place. Emma was able to challenge her discursive positioning as a woman in her relationship with her husband at home, but was unable to initiate any change in the institutional context of the workplace. Similarly, Brian's challenges to his own discursive constructions of the sexes appear to be played out in the home in relation to his wife, whilst left unchallenged (at least explicitly or to my knowledge) at work. Both lack workplace authority (especially Emma) and find it much more difficult to challenge the framework of the sexes through posing counter-discourses (although Emma does have 'coping mechanisms' and Brian plays out his work disgruntlement at home). It was also found that discourses of sex were *spatialised*: discourses of the home and of paid work and the workplace were intertwined with discourses of sex to mutually reinforce one another. Therefore, central to the creation of appropriate expectations for women was that the home is the space of women and the space which occupied most of their concerns, whilst the paid workplace was the appropriate space for men to play out their expectations ("breadwinning" and decision-making).

More specifically, both SYMP and the Department's sexual divisions of labour found spatial expressions. The Department's 'feminine' workplace - the Vocation Course - is located in the building's basement, whilst the highly valued 'masculine' factories at SYMP are physically and symbolically placed at the centre of the company's site,

whilst the administration blocks within which the 'feminine' ancillary administration work takes place are on the site's periphery. At a smaller scale, it was shown that Brian's discourses of masculinity are spatially expressed within the home: the study was a symbol of his 'masculine' "breadwinner" role, the bedroom reflected his control of space, whilst the kitchen, the garden and the family car all served as sites of control. Space was attributed with symbolic meanings which formed significant tools in Brian's (self-constructed) strategies of resistance.

Increasingly, academic interest has focused upon breaking down dichotomous understandings of public and private space, such as the separation of home and work. In this study it emerged that home and work strongly connected, indeed, the research indicated home and work to be mutually constituted. That is, the one informed and contributed to the construction of the other (a finding which was also crucial in Glucksmann's (1990) historical study of women in assembly production work). However, one significant difference did emerge, related to the context they provide for the practice of masculinity. In the two workplaces, there was a complex mix of interactions, interpersonal relationships, employment policies and practices, and types of work and employer objectives that individuals are engaged in. This creates a confined context within which the discourses of masculinity are constructed and contested. In the home, interpersonal relationships and interactions can be more fluid and negotiable - the ability to practice masculinity (or exercise any form of power) is more significantly dependent upon relationships.

Space and the suggested Foucauldian conceptualisation of power also begin to explain the very unclear processes involved in the 'institutionalisation' of masculinity. For whilst (in the case of the Department) there are organisational policies and professional pressures to eliminate discourses of masculinity, their maintenance persists and (as the discussion of language demonstrated) become 'disguised' and subsequently self-concealed. The examples in Part Three have indicated that the acceptance of organisational discourses may be dependent upon relational interactions between individuals and thus ongoing negotiation of the discursive framework. However, it would be unnecessarily bold to claim that this is the sole process; it seems far more uncertain regarding institutionalisation of, for instance, government structures (see Pringle and Watson 1990 for a discussion of Foucauldian analysis and the State). The framework and examples do help to explain the apparent anomaly of 'successful' women in a 'patriarchal' system. For in most organisations

there are now few, if any, overt and written structural blocks on women. Women who occupy a 'masculine' position successfully can start and progress careers and even those in the 'feminine' position can succeed (such as Margaret), whilst (obviously) not all men succeed. However, Part Three did suggest that "homosocial reproduction" (Witz and Savage 1992) - the 'cloning' (Kanter 1977) of those in authority - in both the Department and SYMP has proved significant in restricting places of authority to *men* and not just to anyone occupying the 'masculine' position.

These findings have implications for geographical studies of workplace cultures and for understanding the impact of economic change. Whilst there are increasingly sophisticated theoretical examinations of work, many remain gender-blind: du Gay's (1996) study of consumption, retail and identity at work through a discourse analysis method still treats the category 'worker' as implicitly male and perpetuates a weakness of industrial sociology stemming from Marx through Braverman to contemporary research. Gender remains an important analytic category which is still neglected in favour of 'class' in economic studies. Despite the burgeoning interest in gender identities in geography, there appears to be a continued absence of examinations of their formation within the workplace:

> the significance of the construction of gender identities at work - the development of particular versions of masculinity and femininity appropriate to success in particular occupations - has been neglected by geographers. (McDowell and Court 1995: 231)

In this study, the gender attributes associated with 'success' have been shown to contrast between the two case studies and types of work and, more accurately, have been shown to be place and time specific. 'Success' was related to particular characteristics or ways of being. In the Department, new funding arrangements emerged as key influences in the redefining of research as 'masculine' and teaching as 'feminine', whereas Scott (1984) - in pre-RAE / TQA times - found research *and* teaching to be mutually-dependent in their construction as 'masculine', whilst it was the work of paid research assistants (not 'real' academic work) that was oppositionally positioned as 'feminine'. At SYMP, it emerged that 'success' in a management career was dependent upon exhibition of a 'masculine' identity position, which reduced to being male or to females who rigidly conformed to management-defined conceptualisations of the "career woman". In terms of shop floor work, the occupation revolved around constructions of the work as purely physical and of women as 'naturally' physically incapable. However, these constructions have been highlighted as subject to on-going change as new conditions - economic, political, social and

cultural - bring new relational / discursive situations within which gender subject positions are forged.

This contingency allows for the theorising of occupational gendering to remain open-ended, contradictory and ever-evolving. McDowell and Court (1995) comment that geographers have viewed occupations as "empty slots" to be filled by men and women with fixed gender attributes, and they suggest that questioning should be upon *how* occupational ghettos arise and not on pre-existing gendered categories such as the 'woman worker' (233). This seems to be an important consideration for study, although the examples from this thesis suggest even more free-flowing processes than "ghettoising" may occur. Although positions in the workplaces were shown to be constructed as "sex appropriate", they are still subject to change. Hence, the re-defining of the academic division of labour described above - teaching has become increasingly 'feminised' as academia has opened out to women (at least in terms of initial employment opportunities). Whilst the job of lecturer was completely male dominated (and outside of this example it more generally still is) the gendering of the profession was less obvious. As more women have entered academia, so the gendering of the tasks has accelerated and become more clearly defined. More specifically in the Department, the transformation may be stimulated by *external* forces - not only the introduction of RAE / TQA but also conditions in private practice: as practice has become increasingly competitive, perhaps practitioners are seeking to move into what is perceived as the less pressured academic environment. At SYMP, gendering appears to be a response to market forces. Competition from overseas traders has intensified and prompted rationalisation, but has less affected the key jobs in production which were (and remain) male dominated. However, competition has also prompted company emphasis upon *quality* and *presentation* of products which were shown in Part Three to be stimulating job creation for women on the shopfloor (although leaving dominant discourses of the sexes largely unaffected). Therefore, it is important for geographies of the workplace to remain acutely conscious that the gendering of jobs or occupational relations is in flux, variable and under constant (re)negotiation. Geographers have to be careful not to analyse as radical *transformation* changes which are rather subtle shifts in *expression*.

Amongst the interview respondents, it became clear that the most significant discourse of the sexes was that of reproduction. The dominant discursive construction was that the two sexes should appropriately assume *distinct, separate* and *complementary*

roles in relation to procreation and the raising of children - women as the "mother" who should devote her time and energies to providing direct, primary care to children, and a much less clearly defined position for men, usually detached from child care but constructed as undergoing changes because of new social expectations that men will have, at least, more emotional input into their children's lives. The construction of women's role, however, was found to be so strong that all women (including those who have not had children) were classified as potential "mothers". Therefore, the discourse takes on the appearance of resulting from 'nature' and the sexes' biologies. The exception centred on the concept of "career woman", where women can occupy a 'masculine' position by appearing completely work orientated to the expense of non-work life. Amongst women, discursive expectations to "mother" were commonly experienced. However, men did not connect themselves with reproduction discourses whilst conflating the constructions of 'women' and 'mothers'. It is difficult to over-estimate the influence of this discourse in the lives of the participants; formed around it are material structures - child care provision, work conditions, wages structures - and more abstract concepts - work "cultures", interpersonal relationships, and other discourses of the sexes.

The situation which Brian described as "traditional arrangements" - a husband as sole paid worker in a family and a wife as full-time housespouse - was almost non-existent amongst the interviewees (Tom at SYMP being the only exception). However, the examples in Part Two showed that the discourses which underpin this "tradition" - men as "breadwinners" and women as "mothers" and "home makers" - have remained virtually untouched and appear deeply entrenched. In turn, this re-emphasises the importance of reproduction discourses. The accounts of Kate, Brian, and Steve and Claire, in particular, suggested that it was the physical act of having a child and the necessity that this would interrupt the woman's life (however temporarily) that enforces the breadwinner / home maker dichotomy. From Steve's comments, he and Claire were equally career orientated. However, since the birth of their son, Steve has retained the career man construction, whilst Claire's identity is now constructed solely in terms of being a mother - which Steve calls a "transformation" - and even though she intends to re-start her career. Kate's husband Tim "downed tools" upon the birth of their son, with the consequence that she does all the household work. With Kate's move to half-time lecturing, Tim has become breadwinner. That these discourses are still significant despite tumultuous social changes in the second half of this century (women in paid employment as norm, re-definition of family structures, changes in

divorce and abortion laws etc.) is indicative of the ability of the discourses of the sexes to resist qualitative change and suggests that many early second-wave feminist concerns are still active. Although there is potential for women to negotiate these discourses much more flexibly - such as the example of Sally's careerism - the ultimate expectation and material pressure for women to have and care for children still exists (beyond the limited confines of the case study workplaces). The practising of masculinity which benefits men persists. Whilst feminist theory has necessarily and successfully developed beyond discussion of the politics of housework (such as Oakley 1974), these concerns still need to be acted upon in our everyday lives. (It is important and indicative to note that whilst the masculinity literature continues to focus upon men and families, concern is more usually with the spiritual value of men's involvement with children and the healing of rifts with fathers than about the concomitant position of women and the discourses of masculinity which persist in constructing women as 'natural mothers' and as ineluctably different from men). To retain the continuing interest of overturning, and not just transgressing, these discourses and the intellectual achievements of post-structuralist feminism may require what Grant (1993) terms a 'radical feminism transformed'.

The ability to negotiate even the most entrenched discourses is testified by Emma and her success in changing her husband Scott's "chauvinistic" practices. Other practices (such as women's career orientation or men's adoption of the "home maker" position) may refute and act against the 'natural' assumptions of these discourses, but many of them still comply with, and operate within, the rules of the regulatory discursive framework and therefore do not fundamentally change it. This reaffirms Foucault's claim that it is impossible to escape from power (Foucault 1977, 1978, 1980a). However, this should not be taken to imply the futility of a practice-based feminist politics (contra Deveaux 1994) of conscious engagement in practices which reject discourses that create sexual inequalities. Foucault's method could be said to offer little prospect for social change. Conversely, it could be just regarded as *realistic*, acknowledging that *radical* change, although maybe not impossible, will take considerable effort and may be almost impossible to achieve. Hence, the objective should be less the *subverting* of discourses (such as Sally's practices) and more *changing* them. This may not yet have materialised at a social scale, but in interpersonal relationships it does seem possible, however small successes such as Emma's changed domestic arrangements may seem. Therefore, this study has shown how women are able to exercise power, both in 'positive' and 'negative' fashions: Sally

reflected the exercise of power in practising masculinity by 'miming men' (MacKinnon 1987) - drawing upon discourses of masculinity in her work practices; Emma's exercise of power in the home (in transforming the domestic division of labour) was achieved externally to 'miming men' - she disrupted discourses of masculinity and has (temporarily) removed some sexual inequalities. However, the examples from this study do still illustrate the importance of control of material resources. In the Department, Peter Collins's ability to have a material effect on people's wages and at SYMP Richard Brown's (and others) determination of the domestic structures as breadwinners illustrate the importance of, for example, financial control and the central role they play in these practices of masculinity.

C) RE-ASSESSING METHODOLOGY

If there was an opportunity to build upon this study or the chance to re-do any of the project, there are a number of changes which could be beneficially made. Since the thesis's emphasis is upon the importance of practices and the consequences of practices, it would be useful to engage in a far more in-depth and extensive participant observation at both workplaces, particularly the Department from where very little observational material was obtained for this study. This would allow for an improved understanding of the situational contingency of masculinity and a chance to observe the "mechanics" of the exercise of power through the active construction of subject positions. This could perhaps be achieved by discussing these observations with the people who made these actions, to ascertain their level of consciousness or their "strategy" behind their actions. It would have been useful in this research to have investigated in more detail SYMP's recruitment policy and to have been able to discuss at more length with managers at SYMP their own criteria in the selection of new members of managerial staff. Additionally, it would be valuable to be able to make a more direct comparison within the SYMP workforce between managers and shop floor workers and to assess the continuities or contradictions between their expressions of masculinity.

D) MASCULINITY AND FEMINISM

Early feminism made women 'visible'; studies of masculinity are doing this for men as a gender, but there appears to be little progress beyond this (Tett 1996). As a consequence, there are proliferating studies of men and men's lives which do not progress understanding of sexual inequalities, thereby "celebrating men" - 'we're here,

we're steers and we're not going shopping'. The current impulse is not to be *critical* of men and therefore all that is really being generated are accounts of men - reflecting the status quo and not envisioning new possibilities, accepting and rejoicing in 'masculine' identities and not questioning whether 'masculine' identities really exist or whether we could (and should) exist *without* them. This is precisely the tact of the mytho-poetic men's movement in the US. Perhaps feminism has spawned a monster - it stimulated the initial study of men as a gender, but current directions are disturbing: radically anti-feminist and anti-women; activists demonstrate and run leaflet campaigns on the "myth" of rape in the same fashion that neo-nazis proclaim the myth of ethnic extermination in fascist Europe (Collier 1996b). The initiative in researching masculinity needs to be re-taken by advocates of feminism, and a central way of achieving this is the re-assessment of what constitutes 'masculinity'.

This section considers the potential and future for research of masculinity within a feminist framework. It is suggested that a stronger connection between men and feminism is both achievable and desirable.* Hopefully, this will make clear my understanding of feminism and the important role that men could take in relation to it, and explain an increasing dissatisfaction with the burgeoning 'masculinity' literature. Whilst the study of masculinity has been a product of feminist criticism (Carrigan, Connell and Lee 1985), feminist knowledges have not been incorporated into masculinity research to any great extent. There is concern about the political motivation behind masculinity research and the prospects it offers for contributing to social changes. Increasing interest in 'self-help' and accepting or redefining one's identity as a man appear contrary to a sexual politics for change. This is helping to stimulate a polarised sexual politics between a politics of women and women's identities and a politics of men and men's identities ('masculinism' or 'masculist'). This suggests the need for studies of gender to be *gender* focused - not ignoring the specific gendered experiences of women (or men), and which explores gender as a means to end 'patriarchy'.

In recent years there has been much heated debate amongst academics about the relation between feminism and men. Associating the two has prompted anger, dismay, sometimes disgust, and always much discussion. As such, any alliance between "feminist" men and feminist women has been one fraught with caution and confusion. Middleton (1992) suggests that men cannot engage directly with feminism: "Men who

---

* Some of the arguments discussed here replicate those of Shepherd 1997b.

243

want to challenge dominant masculinities and support feminism have to accept that they appear to be at best tacit supporters of this oppression" (1992: 147). For some men, however, the relation has rightly prompted much self-reflective thinking. Pfeil (1995) comments upon the 'apologism' men have expressed about proclaiming to be feminist, particularly noting the dialogue surrounding Jardine and Smith (1987). He asserts that he will boldly proclaim his feminism, then quietly starts apologising again during the course of the book. This reflects the uneasy role of men with feminism. This tentative relationship will necessarily continue and men's involvement with feminism will always need to be viewed extremely cautiously. However, it will be proposed here that men's involvement in feminism is essential and that a dedicated and genuine involvement will be mutually beneficial.

The relationship between feminism and men, and men and feminism, is dependent upon definitions of feminism and the assessment of its appropriate goals. If the arguments of Butler (1990a, 1990b, 1993) and Grant (1993) are taken seriously, the men / feminism association becomes much less problematic. Both are critical of a feminism reflective of women's experiences, stressing that the terms "feminist" and "women" are not synonymous and that a feminism based within this assumption is destined to failure. This reiterates Part One's criticism of the study of masculinity as the study of men as opposed to the study of gender, and highlights the need for a relational research of gender politics. A more desirable politics of masculinity would not focus upon either one sex or the other, but upon shared visions and practices for what society should be like. An unfortunate consequence of feminism as a politics for, about and of women is that it has created a rationale for a politics for, about and of men. That feminism has stressed its focus as coming from women's experience has set the precedent for men's sexual politics to base itself within the experiences of men.

Grant (1993) has argued that the woman / feminist equation blurs what should be the fundamental objectives of feminism, suggesting that the experiences of a woman are not necessarily indicative of the standpoint of a feminist. She has illustrated that feminism is not a direct reflection of the experiences of women, but rather it analyses these experiences through an "interpretative feminist lens" (109). For women's experiences range from 'untouched by feminism' through 'hostile towards feminism' to 'complicit in the maintenance of male exercises of power'. Feminism may claim to speak for all women, but all women do not speak for feminism. For whom and about what does feminism speak?

What constitutes the "who", the subject, for whom feminism seeks emancipation? If
there is no subject, who is left to emancipate? (Butler 1990b: 327)

Grant (1993: 110) goes on to note that "Encounters with experience cannot provide

foundations for knowledge", and augers against an experientially-based politics.

Whilst feminism is experientially based, there is justification for men's politics to be

experientially based. Men's experiences (just like women's) are often not conducive to

a progressive sexual politics of change. To accept and uncritically present all

experiences of women and men - whether a violent confrontation or one's everyday

social interactions - hinders advancement towards changing the existing structures of

society which are so clearly fraught with sexual inequalities. By reflecting only on

experience, conceptualisations of gender are limited to what is already known,

bypassing the potential for imagined change: Connell's (1995) vision is for a sexual

politics of an unimagined utopia, whilst Grant (1993) looks forward to a world where

humans are liberated from gender. What does it mean to no longer think of

'masculinity' as the identity of men or of 'femininity' as the identity of women? Is

anything really lost from losing the terms? It cannot be denied that men are brought

up (on the whole) differently from women (on the whole). But by uncritically studying

each 'way of being' exclusively there is the potential for reifying (as has been done for

masculinity) those processes, working purely within the realms of 'oppressive' power

and not looking for visions outside of them. Rather, it seems of value to try to "forget"

'masculinity' / 'femininity' and the rules and expectations which *create* them and try to

redefine ourselves and our relations.

Therefore, it is important to reflect upon what is seen, to explain how this relates to

existing structures and to suggest how changing what is seen might change these

structures too. This presses for a feminism for *change* that moves society towards

absence of gender, rather than for one based on achieving equality between

'masculinity' and 'femininity' or finding the "authentic female experience" (Grant 1993:

191). Feminism must work for equality of all people, not the equality of sexed bodies

(which, to follow through the arguments of Foucault 1980b or Butler 1990a, are already

the products of unequal power). This again highlights the utility of Foucauldian

genealogies, which reject the acceptance of rigidly defined concepts (see Visker 1995

for discussion of genealogy as critique), pushing for discovery of the unimagined.

More important than separate politics for women and for men is a politics for everyone.

Rather than creating separate agendas, there need to be shared agendas, not based

solely in experience, but based upon what would be equal experiences. The politics of

experience comprises one of the thrusts of the reactionary politics of "men's rights movements" - many men theorise themselves (rightly or wrongly) as experiencing 'oppression' from structures of gender. These experiences may conflict completely with a feminist politics and can be explicitly anti-feminist. This can be countered with a feminist politics which is not afraid to admit that every experience should not be valued equally, that maybe there should be some normative outline for how society should be structured, or how society should *not* be structured. This also means the evaluation of experiences as 'negative' and that this may include women's experiences or ideas and that some of the experiences and ideas which are progressive towards the feminist vision may come from men. In other words, to be feminist is not exclusively to be female. Feminism is a political way of thinking which extends beyond sex, but which does not include all of one sex. hooks's (1984) vision is for a feminism that initiates a radical transformation of dominant value systems, which she argues will require the co-operation of men as much as women. She proposes that rather than saying "I am a feminist", it is preferable to state that "I advocate feminism", which applies equally to men as women who support this goal. Therefore, emphasis is upon sharing feminist beliefs - desiring fundamental changes to the value system which has produced the "gender regime" (Connell 1987, Hollway 1994). In this way, men (although not necessarily materially) ultimately have as much to benefit from feminism as do women: a society where everyone has the opportunity to live fair and equal lives.

As hooks states, men have been cast as the enemy. What is needed is not a "battle of the sexes", but a battle *for* fundamental change. This will obviously be led by women, but it does not have to exclude men who genuinely want to see change. Therefore, more than just speaking advocacy of feminism, men must prove it. Which is where the place of living feminism comes in. The personal *is* political, and therefore the ways in which we all live our lives is vitally important in the expression of feminism. Bringing feminist ideals into our everyday actions. This thesis has emphasised the importance of *practice*. Far more important than just beliefs, attitudes or intentions are our actions and the results of our actions, which are inextricably linked to the exercise of power. In this way, even the most fervent of feminists can be complicit in maintaining male power when feminist ideals are not acted upon. Although not always obvious, our actions as individuals have consequences at the scale of community and society. Men especially have a duty to check their actions, to eradicate the ways that they contribute to inequalities. A society which truly embraces social justice can only be achieved by women and men working together:

The struggle against patriarchy cannot be won simply by a women's movement. Patriarchy is itself the original men's movement and the struggle to overthrow it must be a movement of men as well as women. But men can only be authentically a part of that struggle if they are able to acknowledge the injustice of their own historical privileges as males and to recognise the ongoing ideologies and economic, political and social structures that keep such privilege in place. (Radford 1992: 17)

Therefore, the challenges of feminism are to break away from strict male-female and masculinity-femininity dichotomies and move towards a progressive politics of change which puts into practice a feminist theory which recognises differences but which unites people under a common cause - to end "sexist oppression". For men who are actively trying to live feminist world views, the emphasis must be upon putting the theory into practice. The role of men is important:

Men who advocate feminism as a movement to end sexist oppression must become more vocal and public in their opposition to sexism and sexist oppression. Until men share equal responsibility for struggling to end sexism, feminist movement will reflect the very sexist contradictions we wish to eradicate. ... In particular, men have a tremendous contribution to make to feminist struggle in the area of exposing, confronting, opposing, and transforming the sexism of their male peers. (hooks 1984: 80-81)

This means putting forward feminist viewpoints, advocating feminism publicly and challenging encountered sexism. *Women Respond to the Men's Movement* (Hagan 1992) outlined what many feminists want men's role in gender change to be. Key points included that any movement of men must work in solidarity with women; that men must want to make the world a better place for everyone, not just moan about how hard it is to be a man in a man's world; that "liberation from the malaise of masculinity" means letting go of male privilege; and that breaking down the dualism of feminine / masculine is vital in dissipating the gender system. Thus, men need to be anti-sexist, anti-patriarchal, feminist and gay-affirmative (Hearn and Morgan 1990). There is a role for men in feminism, and it is a vital one, but it is one where men critically engage with a reconceptualised notion of 'masculinity', one which is concerned with the actions of the individual that permeate to the scale of the social.

This brings in the potential value of the continuing study of 'masculinity'. Although Part One suggested the terms 'masculinity' and 'femininity' are historical constructs manipulated in discourses of sex and that, like Rogoff and Van Leer (1993), the value in keeping the terms is unclear, there may be some value in retaining 'masculinity' as an analytic term, such as the reconceptualisation proposed in this thesis. The conceptualisation put forward here has suggested that masculinity should be understood not as an identity of men, but as a *practice* which can be employed by either sex (wittingly or unwittingly): an exercise of power which creates, reinforces and

maintains sexual inequalities through discourses which construct a ('masculine') superior and a ('feminine') inferior. In sum, it is an exercise of power based on sexual inequalities which benefits men, but one which can advantage individual women in relation to other women. This conceptualisation may have relevance to feminism and feminist scholarship:

Feminism is the struggle to end sexist oppression. (hooks 1984: 26)
In this way, the suggestion for understanding masculinity outlined in the thesis can be regarded as a way of searching for the root causes of "sexist oppression". It is an attempt to isolate and highlight the ways in which power operates and creates a male-biased "gender regime" (Connell 1987). It is an analysis of the actual, *practical*, *everyday* ways through which the exercise of power is perpetuated. It is an analysis which is focused neither solely on men nor solely on women, but upon gender / power relations, and therefore it may have something to offer feminism. The reconceptualisation has implications for the study and understanding of masculinity. A sustained, wider acceptance of the notion that 'masculinity' is not an identity would have the effect of destabilising the simple equation of masculinity with men and femininity with women. The result of this would be, for instance, to highlight the mythopoetic men's movement's fable of the search for a "true masculinity" - men's identity - for what it is: a way of maintaining structures of power. It would mean that the study of masculinity would not be confined to the study of men. This would have the effect of removing the "celebrating men" feel of many studies and would remove the legitimacy for a male-only focus. It would also mean that a study of masculinity could use the words and actions of men, and women, to illustrate the negative impacts that they can have on women and the production of sexist oppression - applying the interpretative feminist lens that Grant (1993) talks of to women's *and* men's experiences.

i) Changing men, not changing masculinities

The conceptualisation also offers new insights to the debate on the reconstruction of masculinities. A leitmotif of the masculinity literature is that a much more sexually egalitarian society will be achieved by changing the current forms of identity men adopt. Hence, the subtitle to Lynne Segal's (1990) book *Slow Motion - Changing Masculinity, Changing Men*. The assumption of masculinity as the identity of men suggests that changing masculinity will change men and altering hegemonic images of masculinity will bring about a fairer society and benefits to women[1], and hence the

---

[1] This argument is also considered in the traditionalist masculinity literature, although by changing masculinity it hopes to re-assert men as the providers for, and protectors of, women (see Bly 1990).

objective of anti-sexist men should be to create "new" masculine identities. This suggests that there is nothing wrong with masculinity as an identity, only that it needs to be re-focused and channelled in new directions (see Bowl 1985). In the anti-sexist men's literature this has meant encouraging men towards 'feminine' pursuits and into the spheres traditionally regarded as 'feminine' - interaction with children and more equal sharing of housework; the implication is that such forms of masculinity are not hegemonic and thus devoid of power and so do not contribute to sexist 'oppression' (see, for instance, Christian 1994).

These arguments will be briefly related to a specific example - Steve. The changes that have occurred in Steve's life exemplify a transition both in his way of thinking and his everyday actions - from "a lad" to "a family man". This is reflected in the change in Steve's "priorities" as he has got older. He talks today about the importance of qualifications and having family responsibilities. At sixteen, however, he was a young lad with his first wage packets - he was more interested in "going out, getting smashed and pulling a few birds". A good time used to be "going round town and getting blasted, falling over and throwing up over my mother's carpet" whereas now it is more "a family sort of thing". As Part Two showed, Steve is now more concerned with being a "role model" for his baby son and being of the "modern age" - sharing household responsibilities with his wife, and he says he cooks and "changes nappies". Steve displayed a perceptive recognition of changes in social gender relations, commenting that there has been a challenge to men's dominance and men's self-identities as superior to women; he is in favour of equal rights and supports the increasing numbers of successful women in business. Steve appears to fulfil criteria of a "changed masculinity". However, such changes must be welcomed with caution. For Part Two also highlighted aspects of Steve's life which were highly contradictory to this "modern age" stance. Fulfilling an objective of early feminism, Steve does appear to engage much more directly in the domestic economy but, as analysis in Part Two illustrated, the discourses which Steve constructs still work from a premise that the home is the sphere more appropriately occupied by women, that women's 'natural' role revolves around reproduction and child care, and that the roles of men and women are complementary but *distinct* (and these were shown to be also differentially powered). In addition, it was also indicated that many of Steve's attitudes echo those of the "men's rights movement", suggesting that in many aspects of life there exists sexual equality and that in others (such as the law where women "get off easily") women's

rights are far in excess of men's - care must be taken to prevent the balance of rights tipping in women's favour.

Therefore, it is not sufficient to urge change in men's 'masculine identities'. Although it has been proposed that there is a fluidity of identities (Gutterman 1994), to suggest that men should change their masculinity implies that this identity is unified and singular, and thus that it can be completely changed by, for example, engaging in more housework or playing with children (or in the case of Bly's mytho-poetic men's movement, banging drums and hugging trees at all-male retreats). Therefore, achievement of a fair and equal society requires more than changing masculinity to change men:

> The problem shifts: men can change in some respects, without apparently undermining the power relations of gender. (Segal 1993: 626)

Roberts (1984: 12) thinks that rather than men even having changed they have simply *adjusted* or what Messner (1993: 733) calls the changing style of presentation of men and which leads Beck (1986: 162) to comment that "consciousness" has moved ahead of "conditions". This leads Cocks (1989: 199) to put forward the concept of "self-conscious loyalists" - men who publicly denounce legitimacy of male power but who are consistently true to 'masculine' ways of being. Changes in 'masculinity' are not sufficient to change society, there has to be restructuring of material interests and relations of power (Connell 1993b). For changing 'masculinity' may be a negative progression:

> Clearly, the question is not "Can men change?" or "Will men change?" Men *are* changing, but not in any singular manner, and not necessarily in the directions that feminist women would like. (Messner 1993: 723)

Men's identities can and are changing in anti-feminist directions. Messner (1993) reports that surveys show men increasingly in favour of equality for women. Caution must be exercised - there are differences between what people say and what people do. As the discussion on the intentions-discourses-practices nexus has shown, the expression of pro-equality attitudes (and even genuine political commitments, such as Sean) may not be matched in practice. Additionally, these attitudes are themselves based around different *interpretations* of equality. Richard's "equality" includes the promulgation of discourses which de-value women (from abstract scales of theorising to individual interactions) which help maintain workplace sexual inequalities and which value all aspects of the 'masculine'. Thus, what needs to be interpreted as 'progressive' in any sexual politics will be based in the consequences of actions:

> to say that the problem with gender relations is the way in which masculinity is constructed, with the solution a "reconstruction of masculinity", is to displace theoretical attention from men's political practices. (McMahon 1993: 692)

The locus for change is not "reconstructing masculinities". The only real change in gender relations comes from consciousness. For men it is only the realisation that theirs and other men's ways of being prove oppressive that a deliberate attempt can be made to change them. Only when a man recognises the unfairness of existing gender relations, only when he wants that to change, and only when he is prepared to accept that change will have negative costs to his own access to power, will real benefits occur. Not by up-dating the image of men or forming "new masculinities". By its very nature 'masculinity' maintains sexist oppression and the exercise of power to benefit men. The only way to counter this is to change the whole underlying ethos and value system which dominates today, and the only means of achieving this is in political action. What is needed is a society which embraces the values of feminism. This requires the elimination of the discourses of masculinity (such as those shown in this thesis) which uphold structural inequalities along sexual lines. All these problems suggest the need for a politics based on a reconstructed conceptualisation of 'masculinity' (as opposed to reconstructed masculine identities) which explicitly draws upon feminism and which is therefore centrally concerned with contributing to and advancing a feminist politics. The practice of masculinity can be countered by the practice of feminism.

Therefore, the study of masculinity must be the study of power relations. I would agree with a leader article for the "radical men's magazine" Achilles Heel (number 15) which called for 'the men's movement' to be "world changing" and not "navel-gazing". Rather than looking for ways to "heal the wound of men's hurt", under the guise of "changing masculinity", there could be a distinct feminist focus on masculinity which aims at important social change. It offers the way to get back to the important issues for men and 'masculinity'; talking about the influence of feminism upon early writings on men and masculinity, Morgan writes

> These themes clearly shaped many of the writings about men and masculinities, emerging most obviously in discussions of sexual and domestic violence, pornography, sexual harassment and divisions of labour within the home and in the labour market. (Morgan 1992: 6)

This focus has been largely lost in recent research, partially the result of thinking about 'masculinity' in terms of identity and therapy, and not in the terms of gender at the social scale. Topics such as "healing the wound" and "we're told that we're powerful but we feel powerless" are a reflection of the powerful justifying their exercise of power. The focus must be upon undermining the powerful - upon the ways through which this power is exercised.

251

ii) Stressing the differences

These findings have implications for research on gender, for much existing literature has perpetuated inequalities by focusing upon sexual "differences". Carrigan, Connell and Lee (1985) note that this was particularly the case with early academic research into "sex roles". However, this emphasis is existent in even feminist literature when masculinity is assumed to refer solely to men and femininity to refer solely to women. Perhaps the importance of understanding gender is in similarities. In many ways acts of men and women do not differ and are much more similar than different, particularly in that they generally both benefit men. The importance of understanding similarities is masked by the perpetual stressing of differences in the constructed discourses of men and women.

> *political similarities that could be cultivated to help feminists speak across difference are suppressed, while the differences that divide us as women are highlighted by one of the major foundational categories of feminist theory* [the category 'woman']. (Grant 1993: 123) [emphasis in original].

This is an effect of power. It is the discursive construction of sex differences which forms the foundation for the practice of masculinity - without the emphasis on differences (where differences are also constructed as inferiorities) the justification for the differential treatment of the sexes would not exist. I would suggest that research should not necessarily proceed from the rationale of looking at gender *differences*. The literature has consistently called for the acknowledgement of differences between men and the study of these differences (note Segal 1993: 630). Of course there are differences, just as there are differences amongst women. Some women find themselves with more social power than men. But the examples presented in this thesis have highlighted that on "important issues" (the creation and maintenance of sexual inequalities) it is the similarities between men (and between women) that are so significant - drawing upon discourses of the sexes to exercise power; frequently "differences" are discursively constructed to justify the initial exercise of power and hence are the products of power. By focusing on these differences, the consequence may be to reify these differences and by celebrating difference we may be celebrating the power that caused their construction. Stressing differences can perpetuate sexual inequalities. I would urge for the focus to be upon why differences appear to exist and what consequence they have. And where material differences do exist, we need to be setting agendas for how we can change them.

These ideas throw into doubt much of what has been proposed by postmodernist thinkers about recognising 'difference'. There are differences between and amongst

people, but there is also a lot of similarity in how people are treated. It has been suggested that there is no unified category 'woman' anymore. Indeed, not all women are alike. *But*, they are still largely treated as if they were all alike - the discourses that have been identified from these two workplaces are indiscriminately applied to women. "Career woman" allows acting 'masculine', but it does not challenge other discourses of women. "Career women" are still discursively positioned as reverting to 'nature' when they do things discursively constructed 'feminine', such as having children or marrying. Individual women may gain some benefits, but not *all* women: this is one difference which should be acknowledged. This indicates that a politics of equality cannot be achieved whilst discourses of the sexes remain as they are. There is great scope and potential for people to act contrary to these dominant discourses, but they are still contained within the regulatory framework whose discourses ultimately determine how one is treated. One's lifestyle may contradict the conventions of these discourses, but are ultimately dictated to by them.

E) THE END AND BEYOND

In this final section, I want to discuss briefly what it is hoped the thesis has achieved and to ponder upon future directions for research, both of gender and of geography. Perhaps one of the most ambitious aims has been to theorise a conceptualisation of masculinity sensitive to feminist theory and which could possibly contribute something back to feminist knowledges. In this way, it has hopefully contributed to the flourishing interest amongst geographers in assessing the implications of Judith Butler's challenges to existing understandings of gender (which are evidently influential in Bell and Valentine 1995 and Cream 1995, amongst others), to examinations of gender "performance" in the workplace (such as McDowell and Court 1994, 1995) and to understand the deployment of discourses of "identity" in workplaces (such as du Gay 1996). Butler (1990a, 1993) has made the use of "gender" uncertain, and as geographers apply her work this will no doubt add to the uncertainty of geography as well. It is also hoped that "Re-Thinking Masculinity" has contributed a new angle to the expanding body of work focused upon masculinity. By employing a Foucauldian / feminist critique to existing means of conceptualising masculinity, the thesis hopes to have added to the very positive debates challenging the power and privileges which are socially afforded to men. Foucauldian frameworks of understanding have been surprisingly absent from research on masculinity, and this research hopes to be one of many to merge Foucauldian critiques with empirical study (which has also been largely neglected from the literature).

The theoretical concept of "archaeology" formed the focus of Foucault's analysis of discourses. His primary intention was to create an archaeology of the human sciences, to uncover the 'epistemes' of particular discursive formations (which can be broadly categorised as academic disciplines such as 'psychology', 'philosophy' or 'geography'). This thesis has attempted to utilise this method (as was described in Part One), but to apply it in an alternative manner to Foucault in his own projects. It has applied it to relational interactions - the immediate ways in which gender relations are lived - but at the same time remained distinct from "discourse analysis" (as defined in Potter and Wetherell 1987). This has potential value for geography and geographers. It is an analysis of discourse which is not abstracted into a discussion purely of language because it retains a central concern with power and with its observation in empirical circumstances. Thus, it is applicable to analysis of conventional 'geographical' subjects of examination. It also remains critical of the existence of "reality", but is based in negotiation of (discursive) realities and therefore in how people live out imagined reality, and so can be utilised in a vital aspect of geographical study - empirical investigation.

Genealogy has also been somewhat neglected in geography. As an analytical method, genealogy is exceptionally useful as a device for critique (note Visker 1995) - it has been invaluable as a means to re-thinking masculinity - placing (continuing) doubt into the most stable of categories in order to "make strange our otherwise familiar fictions of the past" (Gregory 1994: 150). Genealogies of geography (of which there are an increasing number - see Livingstone 1992, Driver 1995, Matless 1995) will no doubt highlight and question the dominant discourses of the discipline (as Foucault did for his own, psychology - Foucault 1965, 1967, 1978). These will, perhaps, indicate that certain concepts have proved dogmatic. I (rightly or wrongly) have found this to be the case for 'space' (see Shepherd 1995), that at times in this research it led me down some "blind alleys"; whilst the study had started out as a 'mapping exercise' - spatialising academic concepts - what remained obscured for a long time was the importance of attending to the critical investigation of the more significant object of study - masculinity itself. Therefore, what the PhD process, Foucauldian philosophy, and the existence of a geographical discipline unsure of its own identity - increasingly influenced by feminism - have taught me is always to remain critical, questioning and uncertain of what we 'measure, inquire and examine' (Foucault 1980a: 75).

APPENDIX ONE

APPENDIX ONE

This Appendix details biographies of the interview participants from the two case study workplaces.

THE PARTICIPANTS FROM THE DEPARTMENT:

I interviewed seventeen members of the staff (eleven male, six female) on two occasions each over a period of four months.

Andrew: Andrew is a lecturer in his twenties, and this is his second academic post. He is single and lives alone in the area but has lived most of his life in a nearby city. His professional ambition is to be a professor within a decade.

Brian: Brian is a lecturer in his late forties who has had a variety of jobs both in private practice and in other universities. He is married with children, he lives locally, and is originally from the area. He expresses severe disappointment with the direction his career has headed in recent years.

David: David is a lecturer on the Vocation Course who has joined the Department within the last five years from private practice (with which he still has contact as a consultant). He left practice to find new challenges. He is married with one child, and is in his thirties. He is originally from this area.

Geoff: Geoff is in his forties and is a lecturer. He has worked all his adult life in universities, and is originally from elsewhere in the north of England. He is married with children. Geoff worries that his outlook on life is very narrow because he has a very limited work history.

George: George is a recent recruit to the Department from practice and still combines consultancy and lecturing. He lives alone in a small village outside the district and is in his early forties. He would like to see more corporate identity brought into the running of universities.

Jack: Jack is a professor in the Department and holds positions of authority within the university. He lives locally with his wife and children, whom he seriously regrets having. Jack is looking forward to a long and happy retirement and is in his fifties.

Jane: Jane is in her early thirties. She became a lecturer after leaving practice where she found the pressures becoming too great. She has had a very varied and unusual work history. She is currently looking for a new house to move into with her partner.

Jonathan: Jonathan is a lecturer in his first academic post and he has no ambitions for promotion. He regrets the demise of the academic intellectual. He is in his late twenties, and he lives locally with his wife. He is originally from the south of England.

Kate: Kate is a half-time lecturer who joined the Department from a full-time post upon the birth of her only child. She is happy not to have realised her academic potential, but is angry that there are institutional blocks on other mothers doing so. She lives with her husband and child in a small town to the south of the area.

Margaret: Margaret is a professor in the Department. She has held a number of different types of tenure since she joined the Department as her first paid job. She also has a function as a social dignitary which takes her away from this workplace fairly regularly. She lives outside the district with her husband (a retired academic) and her four children, and she is in her mid-forties.

Paul: Paul is a senior lecturer and he has never held paid employ outside of the Department, although he does do some consultancy work. He is in his early thirties, lives in town with his partner, and is originally from a nearby city. He is worried by his recent decision to leave the job soon to work in practice.

Roger: Roger is a senior lecturer and has held similar posts in other universities. He lives in another city to the north of the area with his wife and two young children, near to where he was born. He left previous jobs over personality clashes and his secretary says he works too hard.

Ros: Ros is a lecturer who came to the Department after a period of unemployment. She has spent many years living overseas and now lives nearby in the same set of flats as her boyfriend. She is in her early thirties and says she has little interest in research.

Sally: Sally is a lecturer in her first full-time post. She is originally from Scotland and would like to move back. She is working very hard towards promotion. She shares a house locally and commutes regularly to see her boyfriend. She is in her twenties.

Sean: Sean is a professor in the Department. He has had a varied work history and he would ultimately like to leave the profession. His work focus is upon research, and he uses funding to "buy himself out" of teaching. He shares a house locally, is divorced and is a father and grandfather. He has just turned 50.

Trevor: Trevor is a reader in the Department, and has spent his entire adult life in education, whether teaching or studying. He admits to being totally obsessed with the idea of becoming a professor, which he feels he should be already. He would like to leave the Department, possibly to go back home to the USA. He is in his later forties, and he lives locally with his wife and young child.

Valerie: Valerie is a lecturer who came into lecturing late after a career in the public sector. She is fully work-orientated but accepts that she will never get promoted. She lives with her husband in a new town to the east of the district. She is in her early forties.

THE PARTICIPANTS FROM SOUTH YORKSHIRE METAL PRODUCTS

I interviewed eleven people (eight men and three women), most of them on two occasions, over a period of three months. Two sets of interviews were with married couples (Mave and Len, and Ned and Norma), and were not pre-planned. Derek, Emma, Richard and Tom work in the same department ("Human Resource Management", alongside Graham, with whom I had an informal meeting), as do Mave, Norma and Richard.

Derek: Derek holds a managerial post at SYMP, a company he has worked for since the 1970s. He has had a number of different functions within the company in this time including shop floor foreman. He wishes that he had been more successful in his career there. He has authority over Emma and Tom. He lives locally with his wife and children and he is in his forties.

Emma: Emma has an administrative job in the company which she has been doing for nearly five years since she left shop work. She wants to leave SYMP because she is

no longer career orientated. She has recently married (between our two meetings) and lives with her husband in a nearby town. She is in her twenties.

Frank: Frank has worked for the company since the 1970s and has had a number of different jobs, both at SYMP and elsewhere. He now holds a position in security. He is looking forward to retiring soon. He is a widower, and lives locally with one of his children.

John: John has a managerial position in the firm, for which he has worked for over thirty years. He is semi-retired. Other members of his family also work for SYMP. He hopes for a long and active retirement and wishes that his younger wife would retire too. He lives locally with his wife and has grown-up children. He is in his sixties.

Len: Len works for a company in the same line of business as SYMP, and has been doing the job for over thirty years. He is married to Mave and lives locally.
Mave: Mave works in the catering side of SYMP and has been doing this job full-time for the last couple of years, although she did it part-time for four years. She has had a few other jobs and took a career break of fifteen years to have children. She is married to Len and they have grown-up children. They are also grandparents. Mave is in her fifties.

Ned: Ned has had a very varied work history and joined SYMP in the 1970s, where he is now a handyman and gardener, although he has had a number of other posts there including production work. He prides himself on being a very hard worker. He is in his fifties. He is married to Norma and they live locally.
Norma: Norma works in the catering division of SYMP part-time. She has been doing this job for three years. She has had other jobs, but only either side of having children. She may start working full-time soon. She is in her forties, and is married to Ned, with whom she has had three children who all live at home. One of them (Glenn) also works at SYMP.

Richard: Richard has a management post at SYMP with a wide remit - he has authority over a number of people, including Ned, Norma, Mave, Emma and Tom. He has had a varied work history and has been with the company for over twenty five years. He is still very enthusiastic about his work and says he will retire when he no

longer gets enjoyment from it. He lives five miles from SYMP with his fourth wife and some of his very large, close, extended family.

Steve: Steve is relatively new to the firm having only joined within the last year after a career in another industry. He has an administrative / management role and he is very keen to build a successful career with the firm. He is studying for qualifications which will help him realise his ambition. He lives locally with his wife and new born child, and he is in his late twenties.

Tom: Tom has worked for SYMP for thirty years and is now in a managerial position with authority over a number of people. He has had other positions within the company including work on the shopfloor. He aims to keep working until retirement, although he has suffered bouts of ill-health in the past. He lives in a village to the west of the area with his wife.

THE PARTICIPANTS IN THE PILOT STUDY

Bob: Bob is in his early thirties, is unemployed and lives with his partner.

Kevin: Kevin is a forty year old social worker and is single.

Mick: Mick works in the practice field related to the Department. He is married with two children.

Terry: Terry is a social worker in his thirties. He lives with his partner and child.

KEY TO TRANSCRIPTS

        [...]   - omission of data; said at a later time

        ...   - pause (length of pause is reflected by the number of dots)

      [words] - addition of data

      Italics   - my questions or comments

The transcription presented in the thesis has been "cleaned", that is, most 'erms' or pauses have been removed. Where they have been included, the purpose has been to demonstrate difficulties a participant may have had in articulating a particular response or some other significant reason.

The material is not always presented sequentially, but where quotes are taken from a different part of the interviews, this is marked by [...]. The amount of material presented from any one interview or interviewee reflects the significance of what was

being said. There has been no effort to give each individual an "equal voice" in the research.

REFERENCES

<u>REFERENCES</u> ·

Achilles Heel (1996) "Working men", *Achilles Heel*, 20: 4.

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

Adkins, L. (1992) "Sexual work and the employment of women in the service industries" pp. 207-228 in Savage, M. & Witz, A. (eds) *op cit.*

Adler, S., Laney, J. & Packer, M. (1993) *Managing Women: Feminism and Power in Educational Management*, Buckingham: Open University Press.

Allan, G. & Crow, G. (1989) "Introduction" pp. 1-13 in Allan, G. & Crown, G. (eds) *Home and Family: Creating the Domestic Sphere*, London: Macmillan.

Andrew, C. & Moore Milroy, B. (eds) (1988) *Life Spaces*, Vancouver: University of Vancouver Press.

Arber, S. & Gilbert, N. (eds) (1992) *Women and Working Lives*, London: Macmillan.

Armistead, N. (1975) "Men's Liberation and Men Against Sexism" in *Men Against Sexism or The Pig's Last Grunt*, publishers not known.

Association of University Teachers (1994) *Long Hours, Little Thanks*, London: AUT.

Back, L. (1993) "Gendered participation" pp. 215-233 in Bell, D. *et al* (eds) *op cit.*

Bailey, M.E. (1993) "Foucauldian feminism: contesting bodies, sexuality and identity" pp. 99-122 in Ramazanoglu, C. (ed.) *op cit.*

Baker, P. (1994) "Who's afraid of the big bad women?", *The Guardian*, 24 January 1994: 11-12.

Bakhtin, M.M. (1984) *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Bartky, S.L. (1990) *Femininity and Domination - Studies in the Phenomenology of Oppression*, London: Routledge.

Baumli, F. (ed.) (1985) *Men Freeing Men*, Jersey City: New Atlantic Press.

Beck, U. (1986) *Risikogesellschaft Auf Dem Weg in Eine Andere Moderne*, Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.

Bell, C. & Roberts, H. (eds) (1984) *Social Researching: Politics, Problems and Practice*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Bell, D., Binnie, J., Cream, J. & Valentine, G. (1994) "All hyped up and nowhere to go", *Gender, Place and Culture*, 1: 31-48.

Bell, D. & Valentine, G. (1995) "The sexed self. Strategies of performance, sites of resistance" pp. 143-157 in Pile, S. & Thrift, N. (eds) *op cit.*

Bell, D., Caplan, P. & Karim, W.J. (eds) (1993) *Gendered Fields*, London and New York: Routledge.

Bem, S.L. (1974) "The measurement of psychological androgyny", *Journal of Consultation in Clinical Psychology*, 42, 2: 155-162.

Berg, B.L. (1989) *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences*, Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Berg, L. (1994) "Masculinity, place and a binary discourse of 'theory' and 'empirical investigation' in the human geography of Aotearoa / New Zealand", *Gender, Place and Culture*, 1, 2: 245-260.

Berger, M., Wallis, B. & Watson, S. (eds) (1996) *Constructing Masculinity*, London: Routledge.

Bertaux-Wiame, I. (1981) "The life history approach to the study of internal migration" pp. 249-265 in Bertaux, D. (ed.) *Biography and Society*, Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications.

Blair, J. (1981) "Private parts in public places" in Ardener, S. (ed.) *Women and Space*, London: Croom Helm.

Bloch, M., Heading, B. & Lawrence, P. (1979) "Power in social theory: a non-Relative view" pp. 243-260 in Brown, S.C. (ed.) *op cit.*

Bly, R. (1990) *Iron John*, Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Bondi, L. & Domosh, M. (1992) "Other figures in other landscapes: on feminism, postmodernism and geography", *Environment and Planning 'D': Society and Space*, 10: 199-213.

Bonnett, A. (1996) "The new primitives: identity, landscape and cultural appropriations in the Mythopoetic Men's Movement", *Antipode*, 28, 3: 273-291.

Bordo, S. (1990) "Feminism, postmodernism, and gender-scepticism" pp. 133-156 in Nicholson, L. (ed.) *op cit.*

Bordo, S. (1993) "Feminism, Foucault and the politics of the body" pp. 179-202 in Ramazanoglu, C. (ed.) *op cit.*

Bowl, R. (1985) *Changing the Nature of Masculinity - A Task for Social Work?*, Social Work Monograph 30, Norwich: University of East Anglia.

Bowles, G. & Klein, R.D. (eds) (1983) *Theories of Women's Studies*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Bowlby, S. (1992) "Feminist geography and the changing curriculum", *Geography*, 77: 349-60.

Bradley, H. (1989) *Men's Work: Women's Work*, Oxford: Polity Press.

Bradley, M., Danchik, L., Fager, M. & Wodetzki, T. (1971) *Unbecoming Men*, Albion, California: Times Change Press.

Brannon, R. (1985) "A scale for measuring attitudes about masculinity" pp. 110-116 in Sargent, A.G. (ed.) *op cit.*

British Journal of Criminology (1996) "Masculinities, social relations and crime", *British Journal of Criminology*, 36, 3, special issue (edited by Jefferson, T. & Carlen, P.).

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

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

Brod, H. (1990) "Pornography and the alienation of male sexuality" in Hearn, J. & Morgan, D.H.J. (eds) *op cit.*

Brod, H. & Kaufman, M. (eds) (1994) *Theorizing Masculinities*, Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Brown, S.C. (ed.) (1979) *Philosophical Disputes in the Social Sciences*, Brighton: Harvester Press.

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

Butler, J. (1990b) "Gender trouble, feminist theory, and psychoanalytic discourse" pp. 324-340 in Nicholson, L. (ed.) *op cit.*

Butler, J. (1993) *Bodies That Matter*, New York: Routledge.

Cahill, M. (1994) *The New Social Policy*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Cahn, S.K. (1993) "From the 'muscle moll' to the 'butch' ballplayer: mannishness, lesbianism, and homophobia in U.S. women's sport", *Feminist Studies*, 19, 2: 348-368.

Cameron, D. (1995) "Lost in translation: non-sexist language", *Trouble & Strife*, 32: 20-32.

Campbell, A. (1993) *Out of Control. Men, Women and Aggression*, London: Pandora.

Campbell, B. (1993) *Goliath*, London: Methuen.

Canaan, J.A. & Griffin, C. (1989) "Men's studies: part of the problem or part of the solution?", *Network*, 43: 7-8.

Canaan, J.A. & Griffin, C. (1990) "The new men's studies: part of the problems or part of the solution?" pp. 206-214 in Hearn, J. & Morgan, D.H.J. (eds) *op cit.*

Canadian Geographer (1993) "Focus: feminism as method", *Canadian Geographer*, 37, 1: 48-61.

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

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

Christian, H. (1994) *The Making of the Anti-Sexist Men*, London: Routledge.

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

Clark, D. (1987) "Changing partners: marriage and divorce across the life course" in Cohen, G. (ed.) *Social Change and the Life Course*, London: Tavistock.

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

Cockburn, C. (1984) "Foreword" pp. 9-11 in Game, A. & Pringle, R. *op cit.*

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

Cocks, J. (1989) *The Oppositional Imagination*, London: Routledge.

Cohen, D. (1991) "What a man's got to do", *New Statesman and Society*, 8 June 1990: 30-32.

Collier, R. (1996a) "'Coming together?': post-heterosexuality, masculine crisis and the new men's movement", *Feminist Legal Studies*, 4, 1: 3-48.

Collier, R. (1996b) Paper presented at the Feminist Reading Group, Department of Geography, University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, January.

Collinson, D.L. (1988) "'Engineering humour': masculinity, joking and conflict in shop-floor relations", *Organisation Studies*, 9, 2: 181-199.

Collinson, D.L. & Collinson, M. (1989) "Sexuality in the workplace: the domination of men's sexuality" pp. 91-109 in Hearn, J. *et al* (eds) *op cit.*

Colman, W. (1990) "Doing masculinity / doing theory" pp. 186-202 in Hearn, J. & Morgan, D.H.J. (eds) *op cit.*

Coltrane, S. (1994) "Theorizing masculinities in contemporary social science" pp. 39-60 in Brod, H. & Kaufman, M. (eds) *op cit.*

Connell, R.W. (1983) *Which Way Is Up?*, Sydney: George Allen & Unwin.

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

Connell, R.W. (1990) "The state, gender, and sexual politics: theory and appraisal", *Theory and Society*, 19: 507-544.

Connell, R.W. (1992) "A very straight gay: masculinity, homosexual experience, and the dynamics of gender", *American Sociological Review*, 57, 6: 735-751.

Connell, R.W. (1993) "The big picture: masculinities in recent world history", *Theory and Society*, 22, 5: 597- 623.

Connell, R.W. (1993b) "Book reviews", *Signs*, Autumn: 280-285.

Connell, R.W., Davis, M.D. & Dowsett, G.W. (1993) "A bastard of a life - homosexual desire and practice among men in working-class milieus", *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology*, 29, 1: 112-135.

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

Conway-Long, D. (1994) "Ethnographies and masculinities" pp. 61-81 in Brod, H. & Kaufman, M. (eds) *op cit.*

Cook, I. & Crang, M. (1995) *Doing Ethnographies*, Norwich: University of East Anglia.

Cooper, D. (1994) "Productive, relational and everywhere? Conceptualising power and resistance within Foucauldian feminism", *Sociology*, 28, 2: 435-454.

Cooper, M. (1990) "Searching for the anti-sexist man", *Achilles Heel*, 10: 10-13.

Cornwall, A. & Lindisfarne, N. (eds) (1994) *Dislocating Masculinity*, London: Routledge.

Cosgrove, D. & Daniels, S. (1988) *Iconography of the Landscape*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Craig, S. (ed.) (1992) *Men, Masculinity and the Media*, California: Sage Publications.

Crang, P. (1994) "It's showtime: on the workplace geographies of display in a restaurant in Southeast England", *Environment and Planning 'D': Society and Space*, 12: 675-704.

Cream, J. (1995) "Women on trial. A private pillory?" in Pile, S. & Thrift, N. (eds) *op cit.*

David, D. & Brannon, R. (eds) (1976) *The Forty-Nine Percent Majority: The Male Sex Role*, Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Davidoff, L. & Hall, C. (1987) *Family Fortunes*, London: Hutchinson.

Davidson, N. (1990) *Boys Will Be ...? Sex Education and Young Men*, London: Bedford Square Press.

Davies, C. (1992) "Gender, history and management style in nursing: towards theoretical synthesis" pp. 229-252 in Savage, M. & Witz, A. (eds) *op cit.*

Davis, K. (1988) *Power Under the Microscope: Toward a Grounded Theory of Gender Relations in Medical Encounters*, Dordrecht: Foris Publications.

Davis, K. (1991) "Critical sociology and gender relations" pp. 65-86 in Davis, K., Leijenaar, M. & Oldersma, J. (eds) *op cit.*

Davis, K., Leijenaar, M. & Oldersma, J. (eds) (1991) *The Gender of Power*, London: Sage Publications.

Delsing, R. (1991) "Sovereign and disciplinary power: a Foucaultian analysis of the Chilean Women's Movement" pp. 129-153 in Davis, K. *et al* (eds) *op cit.*

Devaney, K. (1991) "Mining - a world apart" pp. 159-168 in Seidler, V.J. / *Achilles Heel, op cit.*

Deveaux, M. (1994) "Feminism and empowerment: A critical reading of Foucault", *Feminist Studies*, 20, 2: 223-247.

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

Dowling, R. & Pratt, G. (1993) "Home truths: recent feminist constructions", *Urban Geography*, 14, 5: 464-475.

Dowsett, G.W. (1993) "I'll show you mine, if you show me yours - gay men, masculinity research, men's studies, and sex", *Theory and Society*, 22, 5: 697-709.

Dreyfus, H.L. & Rabinow, P. (1982) *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*, Brighton: The Harvester Press.

Driver, F. (1985) "Power, space and the body: a critical assessment of Foucault's *Discipline and Punish*", *Environment and Planning 'D': Society and Space* 3: 425-446.

Driver, F. (1995) "Sub-merged identities: familiar and unfamiliar histories", *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 20, 4: 410-413.

Dworkin, A. (1981) *Pornography: Men Possessing Women*, London: The Women's Press.

Dwyer, P.J. (1995) "Foucault, docile bodies and post-compulsory education in Australia", *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 16, 4: 467-477.

Dyck, I. (1993) "Ethnography: a feminist method?", *Canadian Geographer*, 37, 1: 52-57.

Easthope, A. (1986) *What a Man's Gotta Do. The Masculine Myth in Popular Culture*, London: Paladin.

Edwards, T. (1990) "Beyond sex and gender: masculinity, homosexuality and social theory" pp. 110-123 in Hearn, J. & Morgan, D.H.J. (eds) *op cit.*

Emerson, R.M. (1962) "Power dependence relations", *American Sociological Review*, 27: 31-40.

Eyles, J. & Smith, D. (1988) *Qualitative Methods in Human Geography*, Cambridge: Polity.

Faith, K. (1994) "Resistance: lessons from Foucault and feminism" pp. 33-66 in Radtke, H.L. & Stam, H.J. (eds) *op cit.*

Faludi, S. (1992) *Backlash,* London: Chatto & Windus.

Farrell, W. (1974) *The Liberated Man*, New York: Random House.

Farrell, W. (1994) *The Myth of Male Power*, London: Fourth Estate.

Fiske, J. (1987) *Television Culture*, London: Routledge.

Fitzsimons, A. (1996) "Book review: *Masculinities*", *Journal of Gender Studies*, 5, 2: 251-252.

Fitzsimmons, M. (1989a) "Re-constructing nature", *Environment and Planning 'D': Society and Space*, 7: 1-3.

Fitzsimmons, M. (1989b) "The matter of nature", *Antipode*, 21, 2: 106-120.

Flax, J. (1990) "Postmodernism and gender relations in feminist theory" pp. 39-62 in Nicholson, L. (ed.) *op cit.*

Foord, J. (1994) "Changing masculine geographies: past shortcomings and future potentials of feminism's engagement with economic geography". Paper presented at the 1994 I.B.G. Conference, University of Nottingham.

Forbes, J. (1996) "Disciplining women in contemporary discourses of sexuality", *Journal of Gender Studies*, 5, 2: 177-189.

Foucault, M. (1965) *Madness and Civilisation*, New York: Pantheon.

Foucault, M. (1967) *Madness and Civilisation*, London: Tavistock Publications.

Foucault, M. (1971) *The Order of Things. An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*, New York: Pantheon.

Foucault, M. (1972) *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, London: Tavistock Publications.

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

Foucault, M. (1978) *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Foucault, M. (1979) "Truth and Power", in Morris, M. and Patten, P. (eds) *op cit.*

Foucault, M. (1980a) *Power / Knowledge*, Hertfordshire: Harvester Press.

Foucault, M. (1980b) *Herculine Barbin*, Brighton: Harvester Press.

Foucault, M. (1982) "The subject and power" in Dreyfus, H.L. & Rabinow, P. *op cit.*

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

Frosh, S. (1994) *Sexual Difference: Masculinity and Psychoanalysis*, London: Routledge.

Game, A. & Pringle, R. (1984) *Gender at Work*, London: Pluto Press.

Gane, M. (ed.) (1986) *Towards a Critique of Foucault*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

du Gay, P. (1996) *Consumption and Identity at Work*, London: Sage.

Giddens, A. (1984) *The Constitution of Society*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Gilmore, D. (1990) *Manhood in the Making: Cultural Concepts of Masculinity*, New Haven: Yale University Press.

Glaser, B. & Strauss, A. (1967) *The Discovery of Grounded Theory*, New York: Aldine.

Glucksmann, M. (1990) *Women Assemble. Women Workers and the New Industries in Inter-War Britain*, London: Routledge.

Goodwin, M., Duncan, S. & Halford, S. (1993) "Regulation theory, the local state, and the transition of urban politics", *Environment and Planning 'D': Society and Space*, 11, 1: 67-88.

Gordon, C. (ed.) (1980) *Power / Knowledge*, Hertfordshire: Harvester Press.

Gould, R. E. (1974) "Measuring masculinity by the size of a paycheck" in Pleck, J.H. & Sawyer, J. (eds) *op cit.*

Grant, J. (1993) *Fundamental Feminism*, New York: Routledge.

Greenstein, B. (1993) *The Fragile Male*, London: Boxtree.

Green, E. & Cohen, L. (1995) "'Women's business': are women breaking new ground or simply balancing the demands of 'women's work' in a new way?", *Journal of Gender Studies*, 4, 3: 297-314.

Gregory, D. (1994) *Geographical Imaginations*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Gregory, D. & Urry, J. (eds) (1985) *Social Relations and Spatial Structures*, London: Macmillan.

Gregson, N. (1989) "On the (ir)relevance of structuration theory to empirical research" pp. 235-248 in Held, D. & Thompson, B. (eds) *Social Theory and Modern Societies: Anthony Giddens and His Critics*, Cambridge University Press.

Gregson, N. (1995) "And now it's all consumption?", *Progress in Human Geography*, 19, 1: 135-141.

Gregson, N. & Lowe, M. (1994) *Servicing the Middle Classes. Class, Gender and Waged Domestic Labour*, London: Routledge.

Gregson, N. & Lowe, M. (1995) "'Home'-making: on the spatiality of daily social reproduction in contemporary middle-class Britain", *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 20, 2: 224-235.

Grey, S. (1987) "Sharing the shop floor" in Kaufman, M. (ed.) *op cit.*

Griffin, C. & Wetherell, M. (1992) "Feminist psychology and the study of men and masculinity Part II: Politics and practices", *Feminism and Psychology*, 2, 2: 133-168.

Grosz, E. (1990) "Inscriptions and body-maps: representation and the corporeal" in Threadgold, T. & Cranny-Francis, A. (eds.) *op cit.*

Gutek, B. (1989) "Sexuality in the workplace: key issues in social research and organisational practice" pp. 56-70 in Hearn, J. *et al* (eds) *op cit.*

Gutterman, D.S. (1994) "Postmodernism and the interrogation of masculinity" pp. 219-238 in Brod, H. & Kaufman, M. (eds) *op cit.*

Gutting, G. (ed.) (1994) *The Cambridge Companion to Foucault*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Haas, L. (1993) "Nurturing fathers and working mothers: changing gender roles in Sweden" pp. 238-261 in Hood, J. (ed.) *op cit.*

Hacking, I. (1986) "The archaeology of Foucault" pp. 27-40 in Hoy, D.C. (ed.) *op cit.*

Hagan, K.L. (ed.) (1992) *Women Respond to the Men's Movement*, San Francisco: Pandora.

Halford, S. (1992) "Feminist change in a patriarchal organisation: the experiences of women's initiatives in local government and implications for feminist perspectives on state institutions" pp. 155-185 in Savage, M. & Witz, A. (eds) *op cit.*

Hanmer, J. (1990) "Men, power and the exploitation of women" pp. 21-42 in Hearn, J. & Morgan, D.H.J. (eds) *op cit.*

Hanmer, J. & Maynard, M. (eds) (1987) *Women, Violence and Social Control*, Hampshire: Macmillan Press.

Hanson, S. (1992) "Presidential address - geography and feminism: worlds in collision?", *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 82: 569-586.

Hanson, S. & Pratt, G. (1995) *Gender, Work and Space*, London: Routledge.

Harding, S. (ed.) (1987) *Feminism and Methodology*, Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press.

Harding, S. (1987) "Introduction. Is there a feminist method?" pp. 1-14 in Harding, S. (ed.) *op cit.*

Harvey, D. & Haraway, D. (1995) "Nature, politics and possibilities: a debate and discussion with David Harvey and Donna Haraway", *Environment and Planning 'D': Society and Space*, 13: 507-527.

Hartsock, N. (1990) "Foucault on power: A theory for women?" pp. 157-175 in Nicholson, L. (ed.) *op cit.*

Hayden, D. (1986) *Redesigning the American Dream. The Future of Housing, Work, and Family Life*, New York: WW Norton & Company.

Haynes, R. (1994) "Every man (?) a football artist: football writing and masculinity" pp. 55-76 in Redhead, S. (ed.) *op cit.*

Hearn, J. (1983) *Birth and Afterbirth*, London: Achilles Heel Publication.

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

Hearn, J. (1989) "Reviewing men and masculinities or mostly boys' own papers", *Theory, Culture & Society*, 6: 685-89.

Hearn, J. (1992) *Men in the Public Eye*, London: Routledge.

Hearn, J. (ed.) (1993) *Researching Men and Researching Men's Violence*, Research Paper No.4, Bradford: Research Unit on Violence.

Hearn, J. & Collinson, D. (1994) "Unities and differences between men and masculinities" pp. 97-118 in Brod, H. & Kaufman, M. (eds.) *op cit.*

Hearn, J. & Morgan, D.H.J. (eds) (1990) *Men, Masculinity and Social Theory*, London: Unwin Hyman.

Hearn, J. & Morgan, D.H.J. (1990) "Critique of men" pp. 203-205 in Hearn, J. & Morgan, D.H.J. (eds), *op cit.*

Hearn, J. & Parkin, W. (1987) *'Sex' at 'Work'*, Brighton: Wheatsheaf Books.

Hearn, J., Sheppard, D.L., Tancred-Sheriff, P. & Burrell, G. (eds) (1989) *The Sexuality of Organisation*, London: Sage Publications.

Henriques, J., Hollway, W., Urwin, C., Venn, C. & Walkerdine, V. (1984) *Changing the Subject. Psychology, Social Regulation and Subjectivity*, London and New York: Methuen.

Henry, N. & Massey, D. (1994) "High tech masculinities". Paper presented at the 1994 I.B.G. Conference, University of Nottingham.

Herod, A. (1993) "Gender issues in the use of interviewing as a research method", *Professional Geographer*, 45, 3: 305-317.

Hite, S. (1994) "Sons and lovers", *The Guardian*, 3 March 1994, 2-3.

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

Hoff, J. (1996) "A reply to my critics", *Women's History Review*, 5, 1: 25-30.

Holland, J., Blair, M. & Sheldon, S. (eds) (1995) *Debates and Issues in Feminist Research and Pedagogy*, Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters / Open University.

Holland, J., Ramazanoglu, C., Sharpe, S. & Thomson, R. (1992) "Pleasure, pressure and power", *Sociological Review*, 40, 4: 645-673.

Holland, J., Ramazanoglu, C. & Sharpe, S. (1993) *Wimp or Gladiator: Contradictions in Acquiring Masculine Sexuality*, London: Tufnell Press.

Hollway, W. (1984) "Gender difference and the production of subjectivity" pp. 227-263 in Henriques, J. *et al, op cit.*

Hollway, W. (1994) "Separation, integration and difference: contradictions in a gender regime" pp. 247-269 in Radtke, H.L. & Stam, H.J. (eds) *op cit.*

Hood, J. (ed.) (1993) *Men, Work and Family*, Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications.

Hood-Williams, J. (1996) "Goodbye to sex and gender", *Sociological Review*, 44, 1: 1-16.

hooks, b. (1984) *Feminist Theory: From Center to Margin*, Boston: South End Press.

hooks, b. (1991) *Yearning: Race, Gender and Cultural Politics*, London: Turnaround Press.

Hopkins, J. (1996) "Men in the making: spaces of 'big brothers' and masculine identities". Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Association of American Geographers, Charlotte, North Carolina, April.

Horrocks, R. (1994) *Masculinity in Crisis*, New York: St.Martin's Press.

Hoy, D.C. (ed.) (1986) *Foucault: A Critical Reader*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Hoy, D.C. (1986a) "Power, repression, progress: Foucault, Lukes and the Frankfurt School" pp. 123-148 in Hoy, D.C. (ed.), *op cit.*

Housiaux, K. (1995) "Reconceptualising consumption: a geography of masculine identities". Paper presented at the 1995 I.B.G. Conference, Newcastle.

Huczynski, A. & Buchanan, D. (1991) *Organizational Behaviour*, Second edition, Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall.

Hume, M. (1996) "What's wrong with masculinity?", *Living Marxism*, 90: 4-5.

Ingraham, C. (1994) "The heterosexual imaginary: feminist sociology and theories of gender", *Sociological Theory*, 12: 202-219.

Itzin, C. (ed.) (1993) *Pornography - Women, Violence and Civil Liberties*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jackson, D. (1990) *Unmasking Masculinity: A Critical Autobiography*, London: Unwin Hyman.

Jackson, D. (1996) "Forgotten men", *Achilles Heel*, 20: 22-23.

Jackson, P. (1991) "The cultural politics of masculinity: towards a social geography", *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 16: 199-213.

Jackson, P. (1992) *Maps of Meaning*, London: Routledge.

Jackson, P. (1993) "Identity and the cultural politics of difference". Paper presented at the British-Georgian Geographical Seminar at Tbilisi State University, 12-19 September 1993.

Jackson, P. (1994) "Black male: Advertising and the cultural politics of masculinity", *Gender, Place and Culture*, 1, 1: 49-59.

Jackson, P. (1995) "Changing geographies of consumption", *Environment and Planning 'A'*, 27, 12: 1875-1876.

Jackson, S. (1995) "Gender and heterosexuality: a materialist feminist analysis" in Maynard, M. & Purvis, J. (eds) *op cit.*

Jardine, A. & Smith, P. (eds) (1987) *Men in Feminism*, New York and London: Routledge.

Jefferson, T. (1996a) "From 'Little Fairy Boy' to 'The Compleat Destroyer': subjectivity and transformation in the biography of Mike Tyson" pp. 153-167 in Mac an Ghaill, M. (ed.) *Understanding Masculinities*, Buckingham: Open University Press.

Jefferson, T. (1996b) "'Tougher than the rest': Mike Tyson and the destructive desires of masculinity", *Arena Journal*, forthcoming.

Jeffords, S. (1989) *The Remasculinization of America,* Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Jeffreys, S. (1990) *Anti-Climax - A Feminist Perspective on the Sexual Revolution,* London: The Women's Press.

John, A.V. (1980) *By the Sweat of Their Brow: Women Workers at Victorian Coal Mines,* London: Croom Helm.

Johnston, R.J. (1996) "Whose gatekeeping the gatekeepers?", *Professional Geographer,* 48, 1: 91-93.

Jones, A. (1993) "Defending the border", *Cultural Studies From Birmingham,* 2: 77-123.

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

Kappeler, S. (1986) *The Pornography of Representation,* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Kaufman, M. (ed.) (1987) *Beyond Patriarchy: Essays by Men on Power, Pleasure and Change,* Toronto: Oxford University Press.

Kaufman, M. (1987a) "The construction of masculinity and the triad of men's violence" pp. 3-29 in Kaufman, M. (ed.) *op cit.*

Kaufman, M. (1987b) "Introduction" pp. i - xvi in Kaufman, M. (ed.) *op cit.*

Kaufman, M. (1994) "Men, feminism and men's contradictory experiences of power" pp. 142-163 in Brod, H. & Kaufman, M. (eds) *op cit.*

Keen, S. (1991) *Fire in the Belly: On Being a Man,* New York: Bantam Press.

Keith, M. & Pile, S. (eds) (1993) *Place and the Politics of Identity,* London: Routledge.

Kent, S. & Morreau, J. (eds) (1990) *Women's Images of Men,* London: Pandora.

Kervin, D. (1990) "Advertising masculinity: the representation of males in *Esquire* advertisements", *Journal of Communication Inquiry,* 14, 1: 51-70.

Kimmel, M.S. (1987) *Changing Men: New Directions in Research on Men and Masculinity,* Newbury Park, California: Sage.

Kimmel, M.S. (1990) "The contemporary 'crisis' of masculinity in historical perspective" pp. 121-153 in Brod, H. (ed.) *op cit* [Second edition].

Kimmel, M.S. (1993a) "Invisible masculinity", *Society,* 30, 6: 28-35.

Kimmel, M.S. (1993b) "Sexual Balkanization: gender and sexuality as the new ethnicities", *Social Research*, 60, 3: 571-587.

Kimmel, M.S. (1994) "Masculinity as homophobia" pp. 119-141 in Brod, H. & Kaufman, M. (eds) *op cit.*

Kimmel, M.S. & Kaufman, M. (1994) "Weekend Warriors" pp. 259-288 in Brod, H. & Kaufman, M. (eds) *op cit.*

Kimmel, M.S. & Mosmiller, T. E. (1992) *Against The Tide: Profeminist Men in the United States 1776-1990*, Boston; Beacon Press.

Kivel, P. (1992) *Men's Work*, Center City, Minnesota: Hazelden.

Komter, A. (1991) "Gender, power and feminist theory" pp. 42-64 in Davis, K. *et al* (eds) *op cit.*

Kopytoff, I. (1990) "Women's roles and essential identities" pp. 77-98 in Sanday, P.R. & Goodenough, R.G. (eds) *op cit.*

Krutnik, F. (1991) *In a Lonely Street. Film Noir, Genre and Masculinity*, London: Routledge.

Leighton, G. (1992) "Wives' and husbands' labour market participation and household resource distribution in the context of middle-class male unemployment" pp. 131-147 in Arber, S. & Gilbert, N. (eds) *op cit.*

Lewis, G. (1983) *Real Men Like Violence*, Kenthurst: Kangaroo Press.

Lewis, P. (1985) "Men on Pedestals", *Ten.8*, 17: 22-29.

Leyland, J. (1987) "On the conflicts of doing feminist research into masculinity", *Studies in Sexual Politics*, 16: 38-47.

Lines, C. (1990) *Companion to the Industrial Revolution*, Oxford: Facts on File.

Little, J. (1994) *Gender, Planning and the Policy Process*, Oxford: Pergamon.

Living Marxism (1996) no. 90, London: Junius Publications.

Livingstone, D. (1992) *The Geographical Tradition: Episodes in the History of a Contested Enterprise*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Lorber, J. (1996) "Beyond the binaries: depolarizing the categories of sex, sexuality and gender", *Sociological Inquiry*, 66, 2: 143-159.

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

Lukes, S. (1979) "On the relativity of power" pp. 261-274 in Brown, S.C. (ed.) *op cit.*

Lyndon, N. (1992) *No More Sex War: The Failures of Feminism*, London: Sinclair-Stevenson.

Lyotard, J.F. (1984) *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Mac an Ghaill, M. (1994a) *The Making of Men*, Buckingham: Open University Press.

Mac an Ghaill, M. (1994b) "The making of black English masculinities" pp. 183-199 in Brod, H. & Kaufman, M. (eds) *op cit.*

MacCannell, D. & MacCannell, J.F. (1993) "Violence, power and pleasure: a revisionist reading of Foucault from the victim perspective" pp 203-238 in Ramazanoglu, C. (ed.) *op cit.*

MacKinnon, C. (1987) *Feminism Unmodified: Discourses of Life and Law*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Mangan, J.A. & Walvin, J. (eds) (1986) *Manliness and Morality. Middle Class Masculinity in Britain and America 1800-1940*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Massey, D. (1984) "Introduction" pp. 1-11 in Massey, D. & Allen, J. (eds) *op cit.*

Massey, D. (1984) *Spatial Divisions of Labour*, London: Macmillan.

Massey, D. (1995) "Masculinity, dualisms and high technology", *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 20, 4: 487-499.

Massey, D. & Allen, J. (eds) (1984) *Geography Matters!*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Matejka, L. & Pomorska, K. (eds) (1971) *Readings in Russian Poetics - Formalist and Structuralist Views*, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Matless, D. (1995) "Effects of history", *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 20, 4: 405-409.

Maynard, M. & Purvis, J. (eds) (1995) *(Hetero)sexual Politics*, London: Taylor & Francis.

McArdle, D. (1996) "Brothers in arms: sport, the law and the construction of gender identity", *International Journal of the Sociology of Law*, 24, 2: 145-162.

McAuley, J. (1987) "Women academics: a case study in inequality" pp. 158-181 in Spencer, A. & Podmore, D. (eds) *op cit.*

McDowell, L.L. (1990) "Sex and power in academia", *Area*, 22, 4: 323-332.

McDowell, L. (1991) "Life without father and Ford: the new gender order of postfordism", *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 16: 400-419.

McDowell, L. (1992a) "Doing gender: feminism, feminists and research methods in human geography", *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 17: 399-416.

McDowell, L. (1992b) "Valid games? A response to Erica Schoenberger", *Professional Geographer*, 44, 2: 212-215.

McDowell, L. (1993) "Power and masculinity in city workplaces". Paper presented at the 1993 I.B.G. Conference Royal Holloway and Bedford New College.

McDowell, L. (1995) "Body work" pp. 75-95 in Bell, D. & Valentine, G. (eds) *Mapping Desire*, London: Routledge.

McDowell, L. & Court, G. (1994) "Performing work: bodily representation in merchant banks", *Environment and Planning 'D': Society and Space*, 12: 727 - 750.

McDowell, L. & Court, G. (1995) "Missing subjects: gender, power and sexuality in merchant banking", *Economic Geography*, 71, 3: 229-251.

McDowell, L. & Massey, D. (1984) "A woman's place?" pp. 128-147 in Massey, D. & Allen, J. (eds) *Geography Matters!*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McCracken, G. (1988) *The Long Interview*, Newbury Park, California: Sage.

McKay, J. (1993) "'Marked men' and 'wanton women'", *The Journal of Men's Studies*, 2, 1: 69-87.

McMahon, A. (1993) "Male readings of feminist theory: the psychologization of sexual politics in the masculinity literature", *Theory and Society*, 22, 5: 675-695.

McNay, L. (1992) *Foucault and Feminism*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

McNeill, M. (1993) "Dancing with Foucault; feminism and power-knowledge" pp. 147-178 in Ramazanoglu, C. (ed.) *op cit.*

Mercer, K. & Julien, I. (1988) "Race, sexual politics and black masculinity: a dossier" pp. 97-164 in Chapman, R. and Rutherford, J. (eds) *op cit.*

Messerschmidt, J. (1993) *Masculinities and Crime: Critique, and Reconceptualization of Theory*, Lanham, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield.

Messner, M.A. (1990a) "Boyhood, organised sports, and the construction of masculinities", *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 18, 4: 416-444.

Messner, M.A. (1990b) "Men studying masculinity: some epistemological issues in sport sociology", *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 7, 2: 136-153.

Messner, M.A. (1993) "'Changing men' and feminist politics in the United States", *Theory and Society*, 22, 5: 723-737.

Messner, M.A. & Sabo, D.F. (eds) (1990) *Sport, Men, and the Gender Order*, Champaign, Illinois: Human Kinetics.

Metcalf, A. & Humphries, M. (eds) (1985) *The Sexuality of Men*, London: Pluto Press.

Middleton, P. (1992) *The Inward Gaze*, London: Routledge.

Miles, I. (1989) "Masculinity and its discontents", *Futures*, 21, 1: 47-59.

Miles, R. (1992) *The Rites of Man*, London: Paladin.

Milgram, S. (1974) *Obedience to Authority*, London: Tavistock.

Milkman, R. (1987) *Gender at Work. The Dynamics of Job Segregation by Sex During World War Two*, Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press.

Miller, C. & Swift, K. (1995) *The Handbook of Non-Sexist Writing for Writers, Editors and Speakers*, London: Women's Press.

Mills, A.J. (1989) "Gender, sexuality and organization theory" pp. 27-44 in Hearn, J. *et al* (eds) *op cit.*

Moore, S. (1993) "Power cut", *The Guardian*, 8 November 1993: 10.

Moore, S. (1994) "Sloth about the house", *The Guardian*, 25 February 1994: 5.

Morgan, D.H.J. (1981) "Men, masculinity and the process of sociological enquiry" pp. 83-113 in Roberts, H. (ed.) *op cit.*

Morgan, D.H.J. (1987a) "Masculinity and violence" pp. 180-192 in Hanmer, J. & Maynard, M. (eds) *op cit.*

Morgan, D.H.J. (1987b) "It will make a man of you: notes on National Service, masculinity and autobiography", *Studies in Sexual Politics*, 17: 1-90.

Morgan, D.H.J. (1990) "Masculinity, autobiography and history", *Gender and History*, 2: 34-39.

Morgan, D.H.J. (1992) *Discovering Men*, London: Routledge.

Morris, M. & Patten, P. (ed.) (1979) *Michel Foucault: Power, Truth, Strategy*, Sydney: Feral Publications.

Mort, F. (1988) "Boy's own? Masculinity, style and popular culture" pp. 193-224 in Chapman, R. and Rutherford, J. (eds), *op cit.*

Mort, F. (1994) "Masculinity and the symbolic spaces of the Boulevard: the re-development of Soho, London, in the 1980s". Paper presented at the 1994 I.B.G. Conference, University of Nottingham.

Moss, P. & Fonda, N. (1980) "Introduction" pp. 7-21 in Moss, P. & Fonda, N. (eds) *op cit.*

Moss, P. & Fonda, N. (eds) (1980) *Work and the Family*, London: Temple-Smith.

Nash, C. (1996) "Reclaiming vision: looking at landscape and the body", *Gender, Place and Culture*, 3, 2: 149-170.

Namaste, K. (1996) "Genderbashing: sexuality, gender, and the regulation of public space", *Environment and Planning 'D': Society and Space*, 14: 221-240.

Nayak, N. & Kehily, M.J. (1996) "Playing it straight: masculinities, homophobias and schooling", *Journal of Gender Studies*, 5, 2: 211-230.

Newburn, T. & Mair, G. (eds) (1996) *Working with Men*, London: Russell House Publishing.

Newburn, T. & Stanko, E. (eds) (1994) *Just Boys Doing Business?*, London: Routledge.

Newton, T. (1996) "Agency and discourse: recruiting consultants in a life insurance company", *Sociology*, 30, 4: 717-739.

Nicholson, L. (ed.) (1990) *Feminism and Postmodernism*, London: Routledge.

Nixon, S. (1994) *Hard Looks: Masculinities, the Visual and Practices of Consumption in the 1980s*, unpublished PhD thesis: Open University.

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

Oakley, A. (1974) *The Sociology of Housework*, London: Martin Robertson.

Oakley, A. (1981a) *Subject Women*, Oxford: Martin Robertson.

Oakley, A. (1981b) "Interviewing women: a contradiction in terms" pp. 30-61 in Roberts, H. (ed.) *op cit.*

Ogborn, M. (1995) "Knowing the individual: Michel Foucault and Norbert Elias on *Las Meninas* and the modern subject" pp. 57-76 in Pile, S. & Thrift, N. (eds) *op cit.*

Oldersma, J. & Davis, K. (1991) "Introduction" pp. 1-20 in Davis, K., Leijenaar, M. & Oldersma, J. (eds) *op cit.*

Pahl, R.E. (1985) "The restructuring of capital, the local political economy and household work strategies" pp. 242-264 in Gregory, D. & Urry, J. (eds) *op cit.*

Parr, H. & Philo, C. (1995) "Mapping mad identities" pp. 199-205 in Pile, S. & Thrift, N. (eds) *op cit.*

Parker, R. (1990) "Images of men" pp. 44-52 in Kent, S. & Morreau, J. (eds) *op cit.*

Pfeil, F. (1995) *White Guys. Studies in Postmodern Domination and Difference,* London and New York: Verso.

Philo, C. (1992) "Foucault's geography", *Environment and Planning 'D': Society and Space,* 10: 137-161.

Pile, S. (1994) "Masculinism, the use of dualistic epistemologies, and third spaces", *Antipode,* 26: 255-277.

Pile, S. & Thrift, N. (eds) (1995) *Mapping the Subject. Geographies of Cultural Transformation,* London: Routledge.

Pinch, S. & Storey, A. (1992) "Who does what, where?: a household survey of the division of domestic labour in Southampton", *Area,* 24, 1: 5-12.

Pinchbeck, I. (1969) *Women Workers and the Industrial Revolution 1750-1850,* London: Cass.

Pleck, J. & Sawyer, J. (eds) (1974) *Men and Masculinity,* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Pleck, J.H., Sonenstein, F.L. & Ku, L.C. (1993) "Masculinity ideology: its impact on adolescent males' heterosexual relationships", *Journal of Social Issues,* 49, 3: 11-29.

Porter, S. (1996) "Contra-Foucault: soldiers, nurses and power", *Sociology,* 30, 1: 59-78.

Poster, M. (1986) "Foucault and the tyranny of Greece" pp. 205-220 in Hoy, D.C. (ed.) *op cit.*

Potter, I. & Wetherell, M. (1987) *Discourse and Social Psychology. Beyond Attitudes and Behaviour,* London: Sage Publications.

Pratt, G. & Hanson, S. (1991) "Time, space and the occupational segregation of women: a critique of human capital theory", *Geoforum,* 22: 149-158.

Pringle, R. (1989a) *Secretaries Talk. Sexuality, Power and Work,* London: Verso.

Pringle, R. (1989b) "Bureaucracy, rationality and sexuality: the case of secretaries" pp. 158-177 in Hearn, J. *et al* (eds) *op cit.*

Pringle, R. & Watson, S. (1990) "Fathers, brothers, mates: the fraternal state in Australia" pp. 229-243 in Watson, S. (ed.) *op cit.*

Professional Geographer (1994) "Women in the field", *Professional Geographer,* 46, 1: 55-89.

Rabinow, P. (ed.) (1986) *The Foucault Reader,* Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Peregrine Books.

Radford, R.R. (1992) "Patriarchy and the men's movement: part of the problem or part of the solution?" in Hagan, K.L. (ed.) *op cit.*

Radtke, H.L. & Stam, H.J. (eds) (1994) *Power / Gender,* London: Sage Publications.

Ramazanoglu, C. (1987) "Sex and violence in academic life or you can keep a good woman down" pp. 61-74 in Hanmer, J. & Maynard, M. (eds) *op cit.*

Ramazanoglu, C. (1992) "What can you do with a man? Feminism and the critical appraisal of masculinity", *Women's Studies International Forum,* 15, 3: 339-350.

Ramazanoglu, C. (ed.) (1993) *Up Against Foucault,* London: Routledge.

Ramazanoglu, C. (1993a) "Introduction" pp. 1-28 in Ramazanoglu, C. (ed.) *op cit.*

Ramazanoglu, C. (1996) "Unravelling postmodern paralysis: a response to Joan Hoff", *Women's History Review,* 5, 1: 19-23.

Ramazanoglu, C. & Holland, J. (1993) "Women's sexuality and men's appropriation of desire" pp. 239-264 in Ramazanoglu, C. (ed.) *op cit.*

Raymond, J. (1993) "Pornography and the politics of lesbianism" pp. 166-178 in Itzin, C. (ed.) *op cit.*

Redhead, S. (ed.) (1994) *The Passion and the Fashion,* Aldershot: Avebury.

Reinharz, S. (1992) *Feminist Methods in Social Research*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Reiter, R.R. (ed.) (1975) *Toward an Anthropology of Women*, New York: Monthly Review Press.

Renzetti, C.M. & Lee, R.M. (eds) (1993) *Researching Sensitive Topics*, Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications.

Reynaud, E. (1983) *Holy Virility. The Social Construction of Masculinity*, London: Pluto Press.

Richards, B. (1987) "Bruce Springsteen and the crisis of masculinity", *Free Associations*, 9: 91-94.

Richards, B. (1990) "Masculinity, identification, and political culture" pp. 160-169 in Hearn, J. & Morgan, D.H.J. (eds) *op cit.*

Richardson, D. (1993) "Sexuality and male dominance" pp. 74-98 in Richardson, D. & Robinson, V. (eds) *op cit.*

Richardson, D. & Robinson, V. (eds) (1993) *Introducing Women's Studies*, London: Macmillan.

Roberts, H. (ed.) (1981) *Doing Feminist Research*, London: Routledge.

Roberts, Y. (1984) *Man Enough. Men of Thirty Five Speak Out*, London: Chatto & Windus.

Roberts, Y. (1992) *Mad About Women*, London: Virago.

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

Rogoff, I. & van Leer, D. (1993) "Afterthoughts ...", *Theory and Society*, 22, 5: 551-604.

Roper, M. & Tosh, J. (eds) (1991) *Manful Assertions*, London: Routledge.

Rose, G. (1992) "Geography as a science of observation: landscape, the gaze and masculinity" in Rose, G. & Driver, F. *Nature and Science*, Cheltenham: Historical Geography Research Series.

Rose, G. (1993a) "Progress in geography and gender. Or something else", *Progress in Human Geography*, 17, 4: 531-537.

Rose, G. (1993b) *Feminism and Geography*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Rose, G. (1994) "Engendering and degendering", *Progress in Human Geography*, 18, 4: 507-515.

Rowbotham, S. (1973) *Hidden From History*, London: Pluto Press.

Roy, D. (1973) "Banana time: job satisfaction and informal interaction" pp. 205-222 in Salaman, G. & Thompson, K. (eds) *People and Organisations*, London: Longman.

Rubin, G. (1975) "The traffic in women: notes on the 'political economy' of sex" pp. 157-210 in Reiter, R.R. (ed.) *op cit.*

Salaman, G. (1986) *Working*, London: Tavistock.

Sanday, P.R. & Goodenough, R.G. (eds) (1990) *Beyond the Second Sex: New Directions in the Anthropology of Gender*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Sargent, A.G. (ed.) (1985) *Beyond Sex Roles*, St.Paul, Minnesota: West Publishing.

Saunders, P. & Williams, P. (1988) "The constitution of the home: towards a research agenda", *Housing Studies*, 3, 2: 81-93.

Savage, M. (1992) "Women's expertise, men's authority: gendered organisations and the contemporary middle classes" pp. 124-154 in Savage, M. & Witz, A. (eds) *op cit.*

Savage, M. & Witz, A. (eds) (1992) *Gender and Bureaucracy*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Sayer, A. (1992) *Method in Social Science: A Realist Approach*, London: Routledge.

Sawicki, J. (1994) "Foucault, feminism and questions of identity" pp. 286-313 in Gutting, G. (ed.) *op cit.*

Schoenberger, E. (1991) "The corporate interview as research method in economic geography", *Professional Geographer*, 43, 2: 180-189.

Schoenberger, E. (1992) "Self-criticism and self-awareness in research: a reply to Linda McDowell", *Professional Geographer*, 44, 2: 215-218.

Scott, S. (1984) "The personable and the powerful" pp. 165-178 in Bell, C. & Roberts, H. (eds) *op cit.*

Sedgwick, E.K. (1996) "Gosh Boy George, you must be awfully secure in your masculinity" pp. 11-20 in Berger, M. *et al* (eds) *op cit.*

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

Segal, L. (1993) "Changing men: masculinities in context", *Theory and Society*, 22, 5: 625-641.

Seidler, V.J. (1989) *Rediscovering Masculinity: Reason, Language and Sexuality*, London: Routledge.

Seidler, V.J. / *Achilles Heel* (1991) *The Achilles Heel Reader*, London: Routledge.

Selznick, P. (1964) "An approach to a theory of bureaucracy" in Coser, L. & Rosenberg, B. (eds) *Sociological Theory*, New York: Macmillan.

Shepherd, M.D. (1995) "From the inside looking out: two views on the question 'what is geography?'", *Praxis*, 31: 15-21.

Shepherd, M.D. (1997a) "Re-thinking masculinity", *masculinities*, in press.

Shepherd, M.D. (1997b) "Feminism, men and the study of masculinity: which way now?", *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 17, 1/2: 116-127.

Sheridan, A. (1980) *Michel Foucault. The Will to Truth*, London: Tavistock Publications.

Shields, R. (1991) *Places on the Margins*, London: Routledge.

Simpson, M. (1994) *Male Impersonators*, London: Cassell.

Skelly, G.U. & Lundstrom, W.J. (1981) "Male sex roles in magazine advertising, 1959-1979", *Journal of Communication*, 31, 4: 52-57.

Smart, B. (1985) *Michel Foucault,* Chichester, Sussex: Ellis Horwood.

Snodgrass, J. (ed.) (1977) *For Men Against Sexism*, Albion, California: Times Change Press.

Soja, E. (1985) "The spatiality of social life - towards a transformative retheorisation" pp. 90-127 in Gregory, D. & Urry, J. (eds) *op cit.*

Somerville, P. (1989) "Home sweet home: a critical comment on Saunders and Williams", *Housing Studies*, 4, 2: 113-118.

Sommers, J. (1996) "'A national disgrace': masculinity and the politics of place in Vancouver". Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Association of American Geographers, Charlotte, North Carolina, April.

Spain, D. (1992) *Gendered Spaces*, London: University of North Carolina Press.

Spencer, A. & Podmore, D. (eds) (1987) *In a Man's World*, London and New York: Tavistock Publications.

Stanley, L. (1982) "'Male needs': the problems and problems of working with gay men" pp. 190-213 in Friedman, S. & Sarah, E. (eds) *op cit.*

Stanley, L. & Wise, S. (1983) *Breaking Out*, London: Routledge.

Stanley, L. & Wise, S. (1993) *Breaking Out Again*, London: Routledge.

Stansell, C. (1987) *City of Women*, Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Stewart, T.A. (1989) "New ways to exercise power", *Fortune*, 6th November: 46-53.

Strauss, A. (1987) *Qualitative Analysis for Social Scientists*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1990) *Basics of Qualitative Research*, Newbury Park, California: Sage.

Taylor, I., Evans, K. & Fraser, P. (1996) *A Tale of Two Cities*, London: Routledge.

Taylor, I. & Jamieson, R. (1996) "'Proper Little Mesters' - nostalgia and protest masculinity in de-industrialised Sheffield" in Westwood, S. & Williams, J. (eds) *Imagining Cities*, London: Sage.

Tett, L. (1996) "Theorising practice in single-sex work", *Studies in the Education of Adults*, 28, 1: 48-64.

Thompson, E.P. (1967) "Time, work-discipline, and industrial capitalism", *Past and Present*, December: 56-97.

Thornton, M. (1989) "Hegemonic masculinity and the academy", *International Journal of the Sociology of Law*, 17: 115-130.

Threadgold, T. & Cranny-Francis, A. (eds.) (1990) *Feminine, Masculine and Representation*, London: Allen & Unwin.

Tiger, L. (1969) *Men in Groups*, London: Granada Publishing.

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

Turkel, S. (1985) *Working*, New York: Ballantine.

Valentine, G. (1993) "(Hetero-)sexing space: lesbian perceptions and experiences of everyday spaces", *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 11: 395-413.

Visker, R. (1995) *Genealogy as Critique*, London: Verso.

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

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

Walker, R. (ed.) (1985) *Applied Qualitative Research*, Aldershot: Gower.

Watson, S. (ed.) (1990) *Playing the State: Australian Feminist Interventions*, London: Verso.

Watson, S. (1991) "The restructuring of work and home: productive and reproductive relations" pp. 136-154 in Allen, J. & Hamnett, C. (eds) *Housing and Labour Markets. Building the Connections*, London: Unwin Hyman.

Watson, S. (1992) "Femocratic feminisms" pp. 186-204 in Savage, M. & Witz, A. (eds) *op cit.*

Weber, M. (1978) *Economy and Society*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Weir, L. (1994) "Post-modernizing gender: from Adrienne Rich to Judith Butler" pp. 210-218 in Radtke, H.L. & Stam, H.J. (eds) *op cit.*

Wells, R.H. (1996) "Book review: *Masculinities*", *Journal of Gender Studies*, 5, 2: 249-250.

Westwood, S. (1990) "Racism, black masculinity and the politics of space" pp. 55-71 in Hearn, J. & Morgan, D.H.J. (eds) *op cit.*

Wetherell, M. (1986) "Linguistic repertoires and literary criticism: new directions for a social psychology of gender" pp. 77-95 in Wilkinson, S. (ed.) *op cit.*

Wetherell, M. & Griffin, C. (1991) "Feminist psychology and the study of men and masculinity Part I: Assumptions and perspectives", *Feminism and Psychology*, 1, 3: 361-391.

Wheelock, J. (1991) *Husbands at Home*, London: Routledge.

Widdicombe, S. (1995) "Identity, politics and talk: a case for the mundane and the everyday" pp. 106-127 in Wilkinson, S. & Kitzinger, C. (eds) *op cit.*

Wight, D. (1994) "Boys' thoughts and talk about sex in a working class locality of Glasgow", *Sociological Review*, 42, 4: 703-737.

Wilkinson, S. (ed.) (1986) *Feminist Social Psychology: Developing Theory and Practice*, Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Wilkinson, S. & Kitzinger, C. (eds) (1995) *Feminism and Discourse*, London: Sage Publications.

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

Willis, P. (1979) "Shop floor culture, masculinity and the wage form" pp. 185-200 in Clarke, J., Critcher, C. & Johnson, R. (eds) *Working Class Culture*, London: Hutchinson.

Winning, R. (1988) "Pee Wee Herman un-mascs our cultural myths about masculinity", *Journal of American Culture*, 11, 2: 57-63.

Witz, A. & Savage, M. (1992) "The gender of organisations" pp. 3-63 in Savage, M. & Witz, A. (eds) *op cit.*

Zaretsky, E. (1976) *Capitalism, the Family and Personal Life*, Cambridge: Pluto Press.